Intersectionality

2nd edition

Patricia Hill Collins and Sirma Bilge

polity

Copyright © Patricia Hill Collins and Sirma Bilge 2020

The right of Patricia Hill Collins and Sirma Bilge to be identified as Authors of this Work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First edition published in 2016 by Polity Press
This second edition first published in 2020 by Polity Press

Polity Press
65 Bridge Street
Cambridge CB2 1UR, UK

Polity Press
101 Station Landing
Suite 300
Medford, MA 02155, USA

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purpose of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

ISBN-13: 978-1-5095-3969-7

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Hill Collins, Patricia, author. | Bilge, Sirma, author.
Title: Intersectionality / Patricia Hill Collins and Sirma Bilge.
Description: Second edition. | Cambridge, UK ; Medford, MA : Polity Press, 2020. | Series: Key concepts | Includes bibliographical references and index. | Summary: “In this fully revised and expanded second edition of their popular text, Hill Collins and Bilge provide a much-needed introduction to the field of intersectional knowledge and praxis for students new to the field”-- Provided by publisher.
Identifiers: LCCN 2019036788 (print) | LCCN 2019036789 (ebook) | ISBN 9781509539673 (hardback) | ISBN 9781509539680 (paperback) | ISBN 9781509539697 (epub)
Subjects: LCSH: Intersectionality (Sociology) | Critical theory. | Sociology. | Interdisciplinary research.
Classification: LCC HM488.5 .H55 2020 (print) | LCC HM488.5 (ebook) | DDC 301--dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2019036788
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2019036789

The publisher has used its best endeavours to ensure that the URLs for external websites referred to in this book are correct and active at the time of going to press. However, the publisher has no responsibility for the websites and can make no guarantee that a site will remain live or that the content is or will remain appropriate.

Every effort has been made to trace all copyright holders, but if any have been overlooked the publisher will be pleased to include any necessary credits in any subsequent reprint or edition.

For further information on Polity, visit our website: politybooks.com (http://politybooks.com)

Contents

Cover

Front Matter

Abbreviations

Preface

1 What Is Intersectionality?

- Using Intersectionality as an Analytic Tool
- Core Ideas of Intersectional Frameworks
- Notes

2 Intersectionality as Critical Inquiry and Praxis

- Intersectionality as Critical Inquiry
- Intersectionality as Critical Praxis
- The Synergy of Inquiry and Praxis
- What Does It Mean to Be Critical?
- Notes

3 Getting the History of Intersectionality Straight?

- Intersectionality and Social Movement Activism
- Intersectionality's Institutional Incorporation in the Academy
- What's in a Name?
- Notes

4 Intersectionality's Global Reach

- Intersectionality and Human Rights
- A Closer Look: Intersectional Frameworks and Human Rights Policy
- Intersectionality and Reproductive Justice
- Digital Debates: Intersectionality and Digital Media
- Notes

5 Intersectionality, Social Protest, and Neoliberalism

- Intersectionality and Global Social Protest
- The Coercive Turn in Nation-States

Securitization: A Problem for Everyone?
Intersectionality, Social Protest, and Far-Right Populism
Notes
6 Intersectionality and Identity
Hip-hop, intersectionality, and identity politics
Intersectionality and Identity Debates in the Academy
Then What Kind of Identity for Intersectionality?
Notes
7 Intersectionality and Critical Education
A Critical Convergence: Intersectionality and Education
Multicultural Education, Diversity, and Urban Public Schools
Intersectionality, Diversity, and Higher Education
Intersectionality, Critical Education, and Social Justice
Notes
8 Intersectionality Revisited
Social Inequality
Intersecting Power Relations
Social Context
Relationality
Complexity
Social justice
Coda
References
Index
End User License Agreement

Abbreviations

AAPF
African American Policy Forum

AIWA
Asian Immigrant Women Advocates

AWUC
Asian Women United of California

BIWOC
black, indigenous, and women of color

CBSA
Canadian Border Security Agency

CRC
Combahee River Collective

EU
European Union

FIFA
Fédération Internationale de Football Association (International Federation of Association Football)

IACHR
Inter-American Commission on Human Rights

IAF
Industrial Areas Foundation (Texas)

IAHRS
Intersectionality in the Inter-American Human Rights System

IBPA
Intersectionality-Based Policy Analysis

ICT
information and communications technology

IMF
International Monetary Fund

ISA

International Sociological Association

LGBTQ
lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer

MBK
My Brother's Keeper

NBFO
National Black Feminist Organization

NGO
nongovernmental organization

OAS
Organization of American States

OECD
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

OWAAD
Organization of Women of Asian and African Descent

PAR
participatory action research

SFNM
Strong Families of New Mexico

STEM
science, technology, engineering, and mathematics

UN
United Nations

USSF
United States Soccer Federation

WCAR
World Conference Against Racism

WIR
World Inequality Report

WNBA
Women's National Basketball Association

YWU
Young Women United

Preface

The time is right for this new edition of our book. People around the world face new and unprecedented social issues concerning the environment, women's reproductive issues, the resurgence of far-right politics, food security, militarism, and migration. This context of global social change is a major catalyst for this new edition, in which we revisit and sharpen our analyses of intersectionality. In making our revisions, we opted to leave the structure of the original book intact and instead deepen our main arguments and conclusions by providing new case studies, updating information, and placing more emphasis on global issues. We make intersectionality's growing global reach more visible and, by doing so, highlight its analytical and political usefulness for addressing important social issues.

This new edition continues our process of developing ideas in conversation and writing collaboratively. Intersectionality mandates doing this kind of dialogical intellectual work. Because our collaboration can be taken as an example of intersectionality's global reach, we thought we would share a bit about our process. We first met in 2006 in Durban, South Africa, at the 16th World Congress of Sociology, the first meeting of this international group of delegates from more than 150 countries to be held in continental Africa. Patricia was a keynote speaker early on in the week-long event, and Sirma, a new assistant professor, was a presenter in the intersectionality session organized by Nira Yuval-Davis. By happy coincidence, we took the same bus on a field trip to the Kwa Muhle Apartheid Museum and to townships that bore the effects of apartheid. We had our first – albeit all too brief – conversation during that tour. Six years later, we met again at the 6th International Congress of French-Speaking Feminist Research (Congrès international des recherches féministes francophones) in Lausanne, Switzerland. This grouping had been meeting since the mid-1990s in different cities across the French-speaking world, from Paris to Dakar to Rabat to Ottawa. The Lausanne conference, with its theme "Interlocking power relations and the discriminations and privileges based on gender, race, class and sexuality," brought together some 610 delegates, feminist scholars, and activists from Europe, Africa, the Americas, and the Middle East. This time, we were both on keynote panels. Afterwards, we struck up a conversation that we continued during a visit to the Musée de l'art brut, a small but striking museum that contained work by groups that had been considered outsiders, such as the art of psychiatric inmates. During this visit, we discovered that we shared similar perspectives not just on the conference and our sensibilities concerning intersectionality; we learned that Sirma is a painter, that Patricia is a dancer, and that the arts infuse our

intersectional sensibilities. While we didn't know it then, our collaboration for this book had already begun.

This book, then, is the result of a true collaboration. Neither one of us could have written it alone. We felt the need for a book that would introduce the complexities beyond the audiences with whom we both felt comfortable. We started our conversation from our different locations within inter-sectionality and worked our way toward carving out points of connection. Sirma writes about intersectionality in French and English within a francophone academic context of the linguistically restless Tiohtià:ke (Montreal) situated on the unceded Kanien'kéha (Mohawk) territory, where the competition between French and English overshadows indigenous language struggles. Acutely aware of the problems of translation across her three languages of Turkish, French, and English, Sirma brings a commitment to situating intersectionality within global frameworks and the geopolitics of knowledge. Always mindful of her roots in a working-class, African American neighborhood in Philadelphia, Patricia writes for academic audiences and general readers in US and UK contexts. Her work is widely recognized, yet the demands of helping to institutionalize intersectionality in the academy has limited her involvement in activist settings. During many conversations, we hammered out the arguments that we felt would be most useful to our readers.

We could see how we complemented one another and knew that the ideas that could travel across the kinds of differences that shaped our own lives were likely to be the strongest ideas for intersectionality. One core premise of intersectionality concerns the relationships between ideas, practices, and, in this case, the execution of this book. This entailed working through and across many differences. Yet we quickly found out that dialog is hard work. In a sense, we lived our material via the process we chose to follow in writing this book. Don't get us wrong! It is not as easy as it sounds, and there is nothing romantic about that. It involves labor and it creates tension – but generative tension.

There were so many moving points to this kind of conversation and, by implication, to the kind of work that intersectionality must do. The process involved getting fluent in each other's language of intersectionality, in each other's ways of putting things together, in each other's perspective and perception. We also needed to speak several languages, for intersectionality is everywhere, and it is polyglot: it speaks the language of activism and community organizing as much as it speaks that of academia or of institutions. It speaks to young people through social media and popular culture and to established scholars through journals and conferences. These different fields of practice of intersectionality do not engage each other as much as they should, perhaps because they lack a common language. If such is

the case, then our book needs to speak to these different constituencies in ways that are not mutually exclusive, in a language that is audible and makes sense for them.

Consider this book an invitation for entering the complexities of intersectionality. We provide some navigational tools for moving through intersectionality's vast terrain. The book is a road map for discovery and not a portrait of a finished product. We simply could not include everything in one volume. You may find that some of your favorite authors are barely mentioned and that authors of whom you have never heard are discussed at length. We mention many areas of intersectionality, but could not include an extensive discussion of public health, epistemology, environmental issues, the arts, and many other areas where people have taken up the ideas of intersectionality. Just as we brought different areas of expertise and interest to the process of writing the book, yet learned to listen to one another and translate along the way, we encourage you to do the same as you pursue these areas.

Just as our collaboration was crucial for the book, so we value the support of others who helped us along the way. We both thank the team at Polity for shepherding this project through unexpected delays. Thanks to Louise Knight, our editor, who brought the idea for this book to us and trusted our ability to get it done; to Evie Deavall, production editor at Polity; editorial assistant Inès Boxman; and copyeditor Sarah Dancy. We also appreciate the comments of the two anonymous reviewers whose critical eye greatly strengthened this text, as well as anonymous scholars who have used the first volume of our book in their teaching and who gave Polity feedback.

First and foremost, Sirma wishes to thank her partner Philippe Allard, who always stood by her through the ups and downs of all her writing projects, and her sister Gönenç Bilge-Sökmen and her mother Figen Bilge for their unfailing love and support, despite the great physical distance that separates her from them. Sirma thanks graduate students who attended her past and present seminars at the Université de Montréal for being a constant reminder of the utter necessity of pursuing critical work, and for making her feel intellectually and emotionally less out of place. They are far too many to list here. Their reception and critical engagement with the first edition of this book in Sirma's graduate seminar on intersectionality have been invaluable. Her appreciation also goes to colleagues in the sociology department at the Université de Montréal, with special thanks for their support to Anne Calvès, Christopher McCall, and Marianne Kempeneers, the department's head, and librarian Catherine Fortier. Sirma expresses heartfelt gratitude for the friendship and solidarity of some amazing scholars and activists, for many impassioned conversations: thanks especially to Sara Ahmed, Paola Bacchetta, Leila Bdeir, Leila Ben Hadjoudja, Karma Chávez, João Gabriell, Eve Haque, Jin Haritaworn, Suhraiya Jivraj, Yasmin Jiwani, Délice Mugabo, Jen Petzen, Julianne Pidduck, Malinda Smith, Michèle Spieler, and Rinaldo

Walcott. Arashi needs to be thanked for bringing feline grace and mandatory playtime to her life. Last but not least, Sirma wishes she could thank her father, Ugur Bilge, for his constant support, for never failing to ask, “Isn’t it finished yet?” and for prompting her to translate it into Turkish. Ugur Bilge, who planted the passion for reading in Sirma’s life first through the children’s books of Iranian Marxist Samed Behrengi, suddenly passed away in 2014; Sirma dedicates this book to his memory.

Patricia would like to thank Roberto Patricio Korzeniewicz, whose strong leadership of the department of sociology at the University of Maryland provided a welcome backdrop for this project. She also is indebted to the many graduate students who contributed to this work: Les Andrist, Melissa Brown, Kathryn Buford, Rod Carey, Nihal Celik, Valerie Chepp, Michelle Corbin, Paul Dean, Rachel Guo, Tony Hatch, Nazneen Kane, Wendy Laybourn, Chang Won Lee, Angel Miles, Allissa Richardson, Jillet Sam, Dina Shafey, Michelle Smirnova, Margaret Austin Smith, Danny Swann, Kristi Tredway, Kevin Winstead, Laura Yee, and Sojin Yu. Patricia extends special thanks to Ana Claudia Pereira and her many new colleagues and friends in Brazil for numerous wonderful conversations about intersectionality and black feminism. She also thanks her many colleagues who, over the past several decades, have contributed to the success of this book. She wishes she could thank them all, but she particularly thanks Margaret Andersen, Juan Battle, Cathy Cohen, Brittney Cooper, Kimberlé Crenshaw, Jessie Daniels, Angela Y. Davis, Kristi Dotson, Michael Eric Dyson, Joe Feagin, Cheryl Gilkes, Evelyn Nakano Glenn, Beverly Guy-Sheftall, Sandra Harding, Elizabeth Higginbotham, Dorothy Roberts, Graham Hingangaroa Smith, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Catherine Knight Steele, Bonnie Thornton Dill, Lynn Weber, and Nira Yuval-Davis. Finally, Patricia could not have finished this project without the support of her family and friends: Roger, Valerie, Lauren, and Patrice. Her amazing grandsons Harrison and Grant are the light of her life, and she dedicates this book to their generation.

1
What Is Intersectionality?

In the early twenty-first century, the term “intersectionality” has been widely taken up by scholars, policy advocates, practitioners, and activists in many places and locations. College students and faculty in interdisciplinary fields such as women’s studies, ethnic studies, cultural studies, American studies, and media studies, as well as those within sociology, political science, and history and other traditional disciplines, encounter intersectionality in courses, books, and scholarly articles. Human rights activists and government officials have also made intersectionality part of ongoing global public policy discussions. Grassroots organizers look to varying dimensions of intersectionality to inform their work on reproductive justice, antiviolence initiatives, workers’ rights, and similar social issues. Bloggers use digital and social media to influence public opinion. Teachers, social workers, high-school students, parents, university support staff, and school personnel have taken up the ideas of intersectionality with an eye toward transforming schools of all sorts. Across these different venues, people increasingly claim and use the term “intersectionality” for their diverse intellectual and political projects.

If we were to ask them, “What is intersectionality?” we would get varied and sometimes contradictory answers. Most, however, would probably accept the following general description:

> Intersectionality investigates how intersecting power relations influence social relations across diverse societies as well as individual experiences in everyday life. As an analytic tool, intersectionality views categories of race, class, gender, sexuality, class, nation, ability, ethnicity, and age – among others – as interrelated and mutually shaping one another. Intersectionality is a way of understanding and explaining complexity in the world, in people, and in human experiences.

This working definition describes intersectionality’s core insight: namely, that in a given society at a given time, power relations of race, class, and gender, for example, are not discrete and mutually exclusive entities, but rather build on each other and work together; and that, while often invisible, these intersecting power relations affect all aspects of the social world.

We begin this book by recognizing the tremendous heterogeneity that currently characterizes how people understand and use intersectionality. Despite debates about the

meaning of this term, or even whether it is the right term to use at all, intersectionality is the term that has stuck. It is the term that is increasingly used by stakeholders who put their understandings of intersectionality to a variety of uses. Despite these differences, this broad description points toward a general consensus about how people understand intersectionality.

Using Intersectionality as an Analytic Tool

People generally use intersectionality as an analytic tool to solve problems that they or others around them face. Most colleges and universities in North America, for example, face the challenge of building more inclusive and fair campus communities. The social divisions created by power relations of class, race, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, sexuality, and ability are especially evident within higher education. Colleges and universities now include more college students who formerly had no way to pay for college (class), or students who historically faced discriminatory barriers to enrolment (race, gender, ethnicity, indigeneity, citizenship status), or students who experience distinctive forms of discrimination (sexuality, ability, religion) on college campuses. Colleges and universities find themselves confronted with students who want fairness, yet who bring very different experiences and needs to campus. Initially, colleges in the US recruited and served groups one at a time, offering, for example, special programs for African Americans, Latinx groups, women, gays and lesbians, veterans, returning students, and persons with disabilities. As the list grew, it became clearer not only that this one-group-at-a-time approach was slow, but that most students fit into more than one category. First-generation college students could include Latinos, women, poor whites, returning veterans, grandparents, and transgender women and men. In this context, intersectionality can be a useful analytic tool for thinking about and developing strategies to achieve campus equity.

Ordinary people can draw upon intersectionality as an analytic tool when they recognize that they need better frameworks to grapple with social problems. In the 1960s and 1970s, African American women activists confronted the puzzle of how their needs concerning jobs, education, employment, and healthcare simply fell through the cracks of antiracist social movements, feminism, and unions organizing for workers' rights. Each of these social movements elevated one category of analysis and action above others; for example, race within the civil rights movement, or gender within feminism, or class within the union movement. Because African American women were simultaneously black and female and workers, these single-focus lenses on social inequality left little space to address the complex social problems that they face. Black women's specific issues remained subordinated within each movement because no social movement by itself would, or could, address the entirety

of discriminations they faced. Black women's use of intersectionality as an analytic tool emerged in response to these challenges.

Intersectionality as an analytic tool is neither confined to nations of North America and Europe nor a new phenomenon. People in the Global South have used intersectionality as an analytic tool, often without naming it as such. Consider an unexpected example from nineteenth-century colonial India in the work of Dalit social reformist Savitribai Phule (1831–97), regarded as an important first-generation modern Indian feminist. In an online article titled "Six Reasons Every Indian Feminist Must Remember Savitribai Phule," published in January 2015, Deepika Sarma suggests:

> Here's why you should know more about her. She got intersectionality. Savitribai along with her husband Jyotirao was a staunch advocate of anti-caste ideology and women's rights. The Phules' vision of social equality included fighting against the subjugation of women, and they also stood for Adivasis and Muslims. She organized a barbers' strike against shaving the heads of Hindu widows, fought for widow remarriage and in 1853, started a shelter for pregnant widows. Other welfare programmes she was involved with alongside Jyotirao include opening schools for workers and rural people, and providing famine relief through 52 food centers that also operated as boarding schools. She also cared for those affected by famine and plague, and died in 1897 after contracting plague from her patients.

Phule confronted several axes of social division, namely caste, gender, religion, and economic disadvantage or class. Her political activism encompassed intersecting categories of social division – she didn't just pick one.

These examples suggest that people use intersectionality as an analytic tool in many different ways to address a range of issues and social problems. One common use of intersectionality is as a heuristic, a problem-solving or analytic tool, much in the way that students on college campuses developed a shared interest in diversity, or African American women used it to address their status within social movement politics, or Savitribai Phule advanced women's rights. Even though those who use intersectional frameworks all seem to be situated under the same big umbrella, using intersectionality as an analytic tool means that it can assume many different forms because it can accommodate a range of social problems.

In this book, we examine multiple aspects of intersectionality but, for now, we want to show three uses of intersectionality as an analytical tool. In line with Cho et al.'s argument that "what makes an analysis intersectional is not its use of the term 'intersectionality,' nor its being situated in a familiar genealogy, nor its drawing on lists of standard citations," our

focus is on "what intersectionality *does* rather than what intersectionality is" (2013: 795). Our cases of how intersecting power relations characterize international football, the growing recognition of global social inequality as an intersectional phenomenon, and the emergence of the black Brazilian women's movement in response to specific challenges of racism, sexism, and poverty illustrate different *uses of* intersectionality as an analytic tool. Specifically, they suggest how intersectional analyses of sports illuminate the organization of institutional power, how intersectionality has been used to diagnose social problems, and how intersectional responses to social injustices enhance activism. These cases both introduce important core ideas of intersectional frameworks and demonstrate different uses of intersectionality as an analytic tool.

Power plays: the FIFA World Cup

Across the globe, there is no way of knowing exactly how many people play football. Yet surveys by the International Federation of Association Football (FIFA) provide a good guess: an estimated 270 million people are involved in football as professional soccer players, recreational players, registered players both over and under age 18, futsal and beach football players, referees, and officials. This is a vast pool of both professional and amateur athletes and a massive audience that encompasses all categories of race, class, gender, age, ethnicity, nation, and ability. When one adds the children and youth who play football but who are not involved in any kind of organized activity detectable by FIFA, the number swells considerably.

Intersectionality's emphasis on social inequality seems far removed from the global popularity of this one sport. Yet using intersectionality as an analytic tool to examine the FIFA World Cup sheds light on how intersecting power relations of race, gender, class, nation, and sexuality organize this particular sport, as well as sports more broadly. Rich nations of the Global North and poor nations of the Global South offer different opportunity structures to their youth to attend school, find jobs, and play sports, opportunity structures that privilege European and North American nations, and that disadvantage countries in the Caribbean, continental Africa, the Middle East, and selected Latin American and Asian nations. These national differences align with racial differences, with black and brown youth from poor countries, or within neighborhoods within rich ones, lacking access to training and opportunities to play. Girls and boys may want to play football, but rarely get to be on the same teams or compete against one another. As a sport that highlights physical ability, football brings a lens to the phrase "able-bodied" that underpins analysis of ability. At its foundation, football is big business, providing financial benefit to its backers as well as to a small percentage of elite athletes. Differences of wealth, national citizenship, race, gender,

and ability shape patterns of opportunity and disadvantage within the sport. Moreover, these categories are not mutually exclusive. Rather, the patterns of their intersection determine which individuals get to play football, the level of support they receive, and the kinds of experiences they have if and when they play. Using intersectionality as an analytic tool illuminates how these and other categories of power relations interconnect.

Because it is a global phenomenon, the FIFA World Cup is a particularly suitable case to unpack in order to show how intersecting power relations underpin social inequalities of race, gender, class, age, ability, sexuality, and nation. Power relations rely on durable, albeit changing, organizational practices that, in this case, shape the contours of FIFA World Cup soccer regardless of when and where the games occur and who actually competes. Four distinctive yet interconnected domains of power describe these organizational practices – namely, the *structural, cultural, disciplinary*, and *interpersonal*. These domains of power are durable across time and place. FIFA's organizational practices have changed since its inception and have taken different forms in Europe, North America, continental Africa, Latin America, Asia, the Middle East, and the Caribbean. Yet FIFA is also characterized by tremendous change brought on by new people, changing standards, and a growing global audience. Using intersectionality to analyze the FIFA World Cup sheds light on specific intersections of power relations within the organization; for example, how gender and national identity intersect within FIFA writ large, as well as the specific forms that intersecting power relations take *within* distinctive domains of power. Here we briefly discuss intersecting relations within each domain of power within FIFA, thereby laying a foundation for analyzing intersecting power relations.

The *structural domain of power* refers to the fundamental structures of social institutions such as job markets, housing, education, and health. Intersections of class (capitalism) and nation (government policy) are key to the organization of sports. In this case, ever since its inception in 1930, the World Cup tournament has grown in scope and popularity to become a highly profitable global business. Headquartered in Switzerland, FIFA enjoys legal protection as an international nongovernmental organization (NGO) that allows it to manage its finances with minimal government oversight. Managed by an executive committee of businessmen, FIFA wields considerable influence with global corporations and national governments who host the World Cup. For example, for the 2014 games in Brazil, FIFA succeeded in having the Brazilian parliament adopt a General World Cup Law that imposed bank holidays on host cities on the days of the Brazilian team's matches, cut the number of places in the stadiums, and increased prices for ordinary spectators. The law also allowed beer to be taken into the stadiums, a change that benefited Anheuser-Busch, one of FIFA's main sponsors. In addition, the bill exempted companies working for FIFA from

Brazilian taxation, banned the sale of any goods in official competition spaces, immediate surroundings, and principal access routes, and penalized bars that tried to schedule showings of the matches or promote certain brands. Finally, the bill defined any attack on the image of FIFA or its sponsors as a federal crime.

Hosted by different nations that compete for the privilege years in advance, FIFA events typically showcase the distinctive national concerns of its host countries. Brazil's experiences illustrate how national concerns shape global football. Fielding one of the most successful national teams in the history of the World Cup, Brazil has been one of a handful of countries whose teams have played in virtually every World Cup tournament. In 2014, the potential payoff for Brazil was substantial. Hosting the World Cup signaled its arrival as a major economic player on the global stage, minimizing its troubled history with a military dictatorship (1964–85). A victorious Brazilian football team promised to enhance Brazil's international stature and foster economic policies that would help its domestic population. Yet the challenges associated with hosting the matches began well before the athletes arrived on the playing fields. Brazil estimated having to spend billions of US dollars in preparation for the event. The initial plan presented to the public emphasized that the majority of the spending on infrastructure would highlight general transportation, security, and communications. Less than 25 percent of total spending would go toward the 12 new or refurbished stadiums. Yet, as the games grew nearer, cost overruns increased stadium expenses by at least 75 percent, with public resources reallocated from general infrastructure projects.

In several Brazilian cities, the FIFA cost overruns sparked public demonstrations against the increase in public transportation fares and political corruption. On June 20, 2013, 1.5 million people demonstrated in São Paulo, Brazil's largest metropolitan area, protesting the exorbitant cost of stadiums, the displacement of urban residents, and the embezzlement of public funds (Castells 2015: 232). As the countdown to the kickoff began, Brazilians took to the streets in more than 100 cities, with slogans expressing objections to the World Cup, such as "FIFA go home!" and "We want hospitals up to FIFA's standards!" "The World Cup steals money from healthcare, education and the poor. The homeless are being forced from the streets. This is not for Brazil, it's for the tourists," reported a *Guardian* article (Watts 2014). This social unrest provided the backdrop for the games in which, despite making the semifinals, Brazil suffered a historic loss to Germany.

Because FIFA is unregulated, it should come as no surprise that for years it has been accused of corruption. Disputes over where to hold the event, the competition of nations and their financial backers, have characterized the World Cup since its inception. Corporate sponsors, wealthy backers, and the global media outlets appear to be the primary

beneficiaries of the World Cup's global success. There appears to be little if any financial benefit to countries that actually host the World Cup – South Africa recouped approximately 10 percent of its outlay on stadiums and infrastructure for the 2010 World Cup, and many of the 12 stadiums that Brazil constructed for the 2014 event were investigated for graft. Yet nations may have reasons beyond financial gain for hosting the games. Qatar was granted the right to host the 2022 World Cup, suggesting that the fiscal and political controversies that characterize FIFA's operation will persist.[1]

An intersectional analysis of capitalism and nationalism sheds light on structural power relations that enabled FIFA as a global business to influence the public policies of nation-states that host the games. But other categories of analysis in addition to class and nation are also hardwired into FIFA's structural power relations. Take, for example, gender inequalities. Sports generally, and professional sports in particular, routinely provide more opportunities for men than for women. Thus far, we've focused on FIFA's male athletes, primarily because the first FIFA World Cup held in 1930 was restricted to men. Yet since 1991, when the first women's games were held in China, FIFA has also administered women's World Cup soccer. When the US hosted the landmark 1999 World Cup, only a few countries were considered contenders. Since then, women's World Cup soccer has grown in popularity, reaching unprecedented global audiences by the 2019 event in France. Despite this growing interest, financial benefits that accrue to elite female football players pale by comparison with those offered their male counterparts. These gendered structures within football – for example, the men's FIFA World Cup launched in 1930 and the women's FIFA World Cup launched 60 years later in 1991 – foster accumulated advantages and disadvantages based on gender within FIFA's structural domain of power.

The cultural domain of power emphasizes the increasing significance of ideas and culture in the organization of power relations. The FIFA World Cup is an excellent example of how the power of ideas, representations, and images in a global marketplace normalize cultural attitudes and expectations concerning social inequalities. Significantly, the World Cup is the most widely watched sporting event in the world, exceeding even the Olympic Games. For example, FIFA's audit of the 2018 World Cup in Russia reports that a combined 1.12 billion viewers worldwide watched the final. Over the course of the games, a combined 3.572 billion viewers – more than half of the global population aged 4 and over – tuned in to watch some aspect of the games at home on TV, in public viewing areas of bars and restaurants, and on digital platforms. From the perspective of FIFA's organizers and financiers, the possibilities of reaching this massive global consumer market of sports fans are limitless.

Given the growth of mass media and digital media, it is important to ask what cultural messages concerning race, gender, class, sexuality, and similar categories are being

broadcast to this vast global audience. In this case, promoting and televising football offers a view of fair play that in turn explains social inequality. Broadcast across the globe, the World Cup projects important ideas about competition and fair play. Sports contests send an influential message: not everyone can win. On the surface, this makes sense, but why is it that some individuals and groups of people *consistently* win whereas others consistently lose? FIFA has ready-made answers. Winners have talent, discipline, and luck, while losers suffer from lack of talent, inferior self-discipline, and/or bad luck. This view suggests that fair competition produces just results. Armed with this worldview concerning winners and losers, it's a small step toward using this frame to explain social inequalities of race, class, gender, and sexuality, as well as their intersections.

What conditions are needed for this frame to remain plausible? This is where the idea of a level or flat playing field, one advanced by professional football and sports in general, becomes crucial. Imagine a tilted football field installed on a gently sloping hillside with the red team's goal at top of the hill and the blue team's goal in the valley. The red team's players have a clear advantage: when they try to score, the structure of the playing field helps them. No matter how gifted they are, because they are helped by the invisible force of gravity, their players need not work as hard as those from the blue team to score. In contrast, the blue team's players have an ongoing uphill battle to score a goal. They may have talent and self-discipline, but they have the bad luck of playing on a tilted playing field. To win, blue team members may need to be especially gifted. Football fans would be outraged if the actual playing field were tilted in this way. Yet this is what social divisions of class, gender, and race that are hard-wired into the structural domain of power do – we all think we are playing on a level playing field when we are not.

The cultural domain of power helps manufacture and disseminate this narrative of fair play that claims that we all have equal access to opportunities across social institutions, that competitions among individuals or groups (teams) are fair, and that resulting patterns of winners and losers have been fairly accomplished. This myth of fair play not only legitimates the outcomes of the competitive and repetitive nature of major global sporting competitions such as the World Cup and the Olympics, it also reinforces cultural narratives about capitalism and nationalism. Mass media spectacles of all sorts reiterate the belief that unequal outcomes of winners and losers are normal outcomes of capitalist marketplace competition. Sporting events, beauty pageants, reality television, and similar popular competitions broadcast on a regular basis the idea that the marketplace relations of capitalism are socially just as long as there is fair play. By showcasing competitions between nations, cities, regions, and individuals, mass media reinforces this all-important cultural myth. As long as they play by the rules and their teams are good enough, 195 or so nation-

states can theoretically compete in the FIFA World Cup. Yet because rich nations have far more resources than poor ones, a handful of nation-states can field men's and women's teams, and even fewer can host the World Cup. When national teams compete, nations themselves compete, with the outcome of such competitions explained by cultural myths.

These mass media spectacles and associated events also present important scripts of gender, race, sexuality, and nation that work together and influence one another. The bravery of male athletes on national teams makes them akin to war heroes on battlefields, while the beauty, grace, and virtue of national beauty pageants are thought to represent the beauty, grace, and virtue of the nation. Women athletes walk a fine line between these two views of masculinity and femininity that draw meaning from binary understandings of gender.

Why is this myth of fair play so durable? Because many people enjoy sporting events or play sports themselves, sports often serve as the template for equality and fair play. Football is a global sport that theoretically can be played almost anywhere by almost anyone. Children and youth who play football typically love the sport. Football does not require expensive lessons, or a carefully manicured playing field, or even shoes. Recreational football requires no special equipment or training, only some kind of ball and enough players to field two teams. Compared with tennis, American football, ice skating, or skiing, football seemingly creates far fewer barriers between individuals with athletic talent and access to opportunities to play the game.

The fanfare granted to the World Cup is a small tip of the iceberg of how football draws upon categories of class, gender, and race, among others, to shape cultural norms of fairness and social justice. From elite athletes to poor kids, football players want to compete on a fair playing field. It doesn't matter how you got to the field: all that matters once you are on it is what you can do. The sports metaphor of a level playing field speaks to the desire for fairness and equality among individuals. Whether winners or losers, this team sport rewards individual talent, yet also highlights the collective team nature of achievement. When played well and unimpeded by suspect officiating, football rewards individual talent. In a world that is characterized by so much unfairness, competitive sports such as football become important venues for seeing how things should be. The backgrounds of the players should not matter when they hit the playing field. What matters is how well they play. Mass media spectacles may appear to be mere entertainment, yet they are essential to the smooth working of the cultural domain of power.

The disciplinary domain of power refers to how rules and regulations are fairly or unfairly applied to people based on race, sexuality, class, gender, age, ability, and nation, and similar categories. Basically, as individuals and groups, we are "disciplined" to fit into and/or challenge the existing status quo, often not by overt pressure, but by ongoing disciplinary

practices. Within football, disciplinary power operates when some youth are forbidden to play, others are discouraged from playing, whereas others receive top-notch coaching in first-class facilities to cultivate their talent. Many are simply told that they are the wrong gender or lack the ability to play at all. In essence, intersecting power relations use categories of gender or race, for example, to create pipelines to success or marginalization, and then encourage, train, or coerce people to stay on their prescribed paths.

Within athletics, intersections of race and nation are important dimensions of disciplinary power. For example, South Africa's hosting of the 2010 World Cup highlights the obstacles that African boys face in playing professional football. Lacking opportunities for training, development, and even basic equipment, African youth look toward European clubs. European football clubs offer salaries on a par with those offered within US professional football, basketball, and baseball to play for teams in the UK, France, Italy, and Spain. The surge in the number of Africans playing at big European clubs reflects the dreams of young African football players to have successful professional careers. Yet the lure of European football also makes youth vulnerable to exploitation by unscrupulous recruiters. Filmmaker Mariana van Zeller's 2010 documentary *Football's Lost Boys* details how thousands of young players were lured away from their homelands, with their families giving up their savings to predatory agents, and how they were often left abandoned, broke, and alone, a process that resembles human trafficking.

The increasing racial/ethnic diversity of elite European teams that recruit African players, other players of color from poorer countries, and racialized immigrant minorities may help national teams to win. But this racial/ethnic/national diversity of elite football teams also highlights the problem of racism in European football. The visible diversity among team players upends longstanding assumptions about race, ethnicity, and national identity. When France's national team defeated the Brazilian team to win the 1998 World Cup, some fans saw the team as non-representative of France because most of the players were not white. Moreover, although white European fans may love their teams, many feel free to engage in racist behavior, such as calling African players monkeys, chanting racial slurs, and carrying signs with racially derogatory language.[2]

FIFA's gendered rules also reflect disciplinary power in ways that produce significantly different experiences for male and female athletes. An intersectional analysis suggests that the convergence of class and gender translates into pay inequities and differential opportunities after a professional soccer career. Beyond the initial division between male and female athletes, different rules that set FIFA policy reflect gendered assumptions about women and sports. Recognizing the disparity of support for men's and women's soccer, on March 8, 2019, International Women's Day, the US players filed a federal gender

discrimination lawsuit against the United States Soccer Federation (USSF), the national governing body for the sport. In response, in a legal filing, the USSF denied unlawful conduct, attributing gendered pay differentials to "differences in the aggregate revenue generated by the different teams and/or any other factor other than sex." In other words, from the perspective of USSF, any gendered economic inequality reflects marketplace structures and cultural norms that lie outside FIFA's purview, not gender discrimination within FIFA itself.

The fight for equal pay within US soccer generated considerable attention, especially since the US women's team had consistently outperformed the men's team, on the field, in media interest, and in revenue. The US men's team failed to qualify for the 2018 games, whereas the women's team won the World Cup in 2015 and 2019. Viewership for the women's team also outpaced that for the men's team. In 2015, some 25 million people watched the US women's team win the World Cup final – at that time, a record US audience for any soccer game, with their 2019 victory breaking that record. But while important, gender-only frameworks miss intersectional dimensions of how both the rules as well as the tools for fighting social injustice discriminate. In 2019, the US women's team was paid less than the men and had the legal rights and means to file a lawsuit. In contrast, the Reggae Girlz of Jamaica, the first national soccer team from the Caribbean to qualify for the World Cup, had difficulty raising the funds to attend the games. They fared better than the Super Falcons, the Nigerian national team, which, even though they were nine-time winners of the Africa Cup, were not paid at all. Chronically underfunded, the Super Falcons protested at the house of Nigeria's president and eventually received increased financial support to attend the games.

These gender differences between men's and women's soccer intersect with differences of race and class within both the men's and the women's game. The rules of soccer in turn shape team rankings that discipline players through differential expectations. Rankings among the women's teams correlate with race and nation and, by implication, with the different levels of support provided to women athletes in rich and poor countries. Despite being one of the wealthiest countries in continental Africa, South Africa sent its first women's team to the 2019 World Cup, joining Nigeria and Cameroon as one of only three African teams that qualified. All three were ranked at the bottom of the list of teams that qualified and lost in the first round to better-funded teams. Intersections of race and gender characterize both men's and women's football, with important financial implications for all players.

The interpersonal domain of power refers to how individuals experience the convergence of structural, cultural, and disciplinary power. Such power shapes intersecting identities of

race, class, gender, sexuality, nation, and age that in turn organize social interactions. Intersectionality recognizes that perceived group membership can make people vulnerable to various forms of bias, yet because we are simultaneously members of many groups, our complex identities can shape the specific ways that we experience that bias. For example, men and women often experience racism differently, just as women of different races can experience sexism differently, and so on. Intersectionality highlights these aspects of individual experience that we may not notice.

For the FIFA World Cup, intersecting identities are hypervisible on a global stage. New information and communications technologies (ICTs) have increased the visibility and scope of individual identities, in the case of FIFA offering sports competitions that are designed to entertain and educate, but that also provide a window into people's lives. Like everyone else, FIFA's athletes must craft their identities within intersecting power relations. Moreover, the visibility granted athletes' bodies within sporting competitions means that the embodied nature of intersecting identities is on constant display. Much is at stake in cultivating the right image and brand. The ways in which athletes handle their identities can result in lucrative endorsements, contracts as sportscasters, and opportunities to broker their excellence and visibility in coaching and ancillary opportunities. Given the global scope and mass media intensity of the FIFA World Cup tournament, individual players have to decide not only how they will play the game, but how their individual image both on and off the pitch will be received by fans. As the aforementioned name-calling and racist commentary within European football suggests, fans can be fickle, rooting for the home team that has players of color, yet hurling racial epithets at players on the opposing team. The commodification of identity is big business.

Because gender is a foundational social division in everyday life, managing identities of masculinity and femininity takes on larger-than-life significance in this global public area. Regardless of sport, women have faced an uphill battle to play sports at all, to do so on an elite level, and to receive equitable compensation for doing so. Moreover, because women's sports ostensibly disrupt longstanding norms of femininity, the treatment of women athletes in sports where they have managed to establish well-paying careers as is the case of women's tennis – or a living wage as is the case of women's basketball – offers a lesson to the female athletes in World Cup football. Women's sports have been fraught with consistent efforts to manage women's dress and appearance.

The treatment of women athletes who appear to violate norms of femininity offers a window into the broader issue of how elite athletes deal with hegemonic masculinity and femininity in professional sports. As more women play professional sports, they increasingly contest the rules of het-eronormativity. For example, tennis stars Venus and Serena Williams have

been legendary in challenging the dress code of women's tennis and both have been accused of being overly masculine because they ostensibly play like men. At the inception of the Women's National Basketball Association (WNBA), the league's overwhelmingly black female players were encouraged to model traditional femininity to counter accusations of lesbianism. Athletes attended to their hair and makeup and brought children and male partners to games to signal their sexual orientation. As the league has matured, players are increasingly embracing an androgynous fashion style that is more in tune with contemporary notions of gender fluidity.

As individuals, FIFA athletes may have comparable talent, aspire to the same things, or hold similar values. Yet norms of heteronormativity are closely aligned with these disciplinary practices that shape individual decisions about identity, masculinity, and femininity. Playing an elite sport is one thing. Being accepted by the fans that fund that sport is another. Intersecting identities and experiences reflect power plays across the structural, cultural, disciplinary, and interpersonal domains of power, identities that play out in everyday social interactions as well as public images. Overall, professional football is not just a game, but rather offers a rich site for using intersectionality as an analytical tool.

Economic inequality: a new global crisis?

When it comes to highlighting global economic inequality as an important social problem, 2014 was a pivotal year. Drawing more than 6,000 participants from all over the world, the Eighteenth International Sociological Association (ISA) World Congress of Sociology convened in Yokohama, Japan. In his presidential address, Michael Burawoy (2005), a distinguished Marxist scholar, argued that inequality was the most pressing issue of our time. Burawoy suggested that growing global inequality had spurred new thinking not only in sociology, but also in economics and related social sciences. Burawoy had long been a proponent of public sociology, the perspective holding that sociological tools should be brought to bear on important social issues. Interestingly, he stressed the significance of the 2013 election of Pope Francis. As the first pope from the Global South, Pope Francis expressed a strong commitment to tackling the questions of social inequality, poverty, and environmental justice, even qualifying economic inequality as "the root of social evil." It is not every day that a Marxist scholar quotes the Pope before an international gathering of social scientists.

That same year, more than 220 business leaders and investors from 27 countries assembled in London at the May 2014 Conference on Inclusive Capitalism. As Nafeez Ahmed reported in a May 28, 2014 *Guardian* article, the attendees gathered to discuss "the need for a more socially responsible form of capitalism that benefits everyone, not just a wealthy minority."

Representing the most powerful financial and business elites, who controlled approximately US$30 trillion worth of liquid assets, or one-third of the global total, this group was concerned about, as the CEO of Unilever put it, "the capitalist threat to capitalism." The stellar guest list for the conference included Prince Charles, Bill Clinton, the governor of the Bank of England, and several heads of global corporations. Interestingly, in her keynote speech, Christine Lagarde, then head of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), invoked the same reference to Pope Francis's depiction of increasing inequality as "the root of social evil." Referencing Marx's insight that capitalism "carried the seeds of its own destruction," Lagarde argued, something needs to be done. Here again, it is not every day that the head of the IMF quotes both the Pope and Marx before the global financial elite.

Since the 1990s, economic inequality in income and wealth has grown exponentially, both within individual nation-states and across an overwhelming majority of countries, affecting 70 percent of the world's population. And this economic inequality contributes to social inequality more broadly. Nearly half of the world's wealth, some US$110 trillion, is owned by only 1 percent of the world's population; between them, this tiny group owns more than the other 99 percent put together (Oxfam 2015).[3] These trends suggest that by 2014 the state of global inequality was serious enough that people who were typically on opposite sides of many issues took notice. Lagarde and Burawoy were both concerned about the impact of a changing global economy. Under Lagarde's leadership, the IMF offered a mainstream view of the causes and solutions to the social inequality brought on by a changing global economy. Like Burawoy, many sociologists have long offered a critical assessment of this mainstream view, pointing instead to structural power relations. By 2014, growing global social inequality was so significant that both mainstream and critical groups identified global social inequality generally, and economic social inequality in particular, as a global social problem.

Examining the specific histories of nation-states fosters different angles of vision on global economic inequalities. For instance, if we look at what happens *between* countries, we see that global income inequality has been in decline since the mid-1970s, which is related to the economic growth in fast-developing countries such as India and China. However, if we look at what happens *within* countries, we see that absolute income inequality has increased dramatically in the same period (UNU 2016). Moreover, even though income inequality has increased since the mid-1970s/early 1980s in nearly all countries, there are important regional variations. According to the World Inequality Report (WIR) 2018, income inequality has increased exponentially in North America, China, India, and Russia, and moderately in Europe, while it has remained relatively stable, at extremely high levels, in the Middle East, sub-Saharan Africa, and Brazil. From a broad historical perspective, the report

notes, “this increase in inequality marks the end of a postwar egalitarian regime which took different forms in these regions” (WIR 2018).

Using intersectionality as an analytic tool points to several important dimensions of growing global inequality. First, social inequality does not fall equally on women, children, people of color, differently abled people, transgendered people, undocumented populations, and indigenous groups. Rather than seeing people as a homogeneous, undifferentiated mass of individuals, intersectionality provides a framework for explaining how categories of race, class, gender, age, and citizenship status, among others, position people differently in the world. Some groups are especially vulnerable to changes in the global economy, whereas others benefit disproportionately from them. Intersectionality brings a framework of intersecting social inequalities to economic inequality as the measure of global social inequality.

By focusing on race, gender, age, and citizenship status, intersectionality shifts how we think about jobs, income, and wealth, all major indicators of economic inequality. For example, income differences that accompany labor market practices of hiring, job security, retirement benefits, health benefits, and pay scales do not fall equally across social groups. Black people, women, young people, rural residents, undocumented people, and differently abled people face barriers to finding well-paying, secure jobs with benefits. Many of these groups live in areas that have been hard hit by a changing global economy and environmental hazards. Factories have relocated, leaving few opportunities for those who cannot afford to move. Many people remain poor from one generation to the next because they cannot earn a decent wage that provides them with income security. Labor market discrimination that pushes some people into part-time jobs with low pay, irregular hours, and no benefits, or that renders them structurally unemployed, does not fall equally across social groups.

Similarly, intersectionality also fosters a rethinking of the concept of the wealth gap. Rather than seeing the wealth gap as unconnected to categories such as race, gender, age, and citizenship, an intersectional lens posits that differences in wealth reflect interlocking systems of power. The racialized structure of the wealth gap has been well documented in the US, where disparities between whites, blacks, and Latinos have reached record highs (Chang 2010; Pew Research Center 2011).[4] Yet the wealth gap is not only racialized but also simultaneously gendered. The wealth gap is generally analyzed through an either/or lens, race or gender, but with noteworthy exceptions (see, e.g., Oliver and Shapiro 1995), less often through an intersectional both/and lens. Measuring economic inequality by means of data on households, rather than on individuals, helps document the wealth gap between racially differentiated households and sheds light on the situation of households headed by

single women across races. Intersectional analyses demonstrate how the structure of the inequality gap is simultaneously racialized and gendered for women of color.[5]

Second, using intersectionality as an analytic tool complicates class-only explanations for global economic inequality. Both the neoclassical economics accepted in US venues and Marxist social thought more often found in European settings foreground class as the fundamental category for explaining economic inequality. Both of these class-only explanations treat race, gender, sexuality, dis/ability, and ethnicity as secondary add-ons, namely, as ways to describe the class system more accurately. Yet by suggesting that economic inequality can neither be assessed nor effectively addressed through class alone, intersectional analyses propose a more sophisticated map of social inequality that goes beyond class-only accounts. Feminist theorist Zillah Eisenstein (2014) argues that class and capitalism are inherently intersectional:

> When civil rights activists speak about race they are told they need to think about class as well. When anti-racist feminists focus on the problems of gendered racism they are also told to include class. So … when formulating class inequality, one should have race and gender in view as well. *Capital is intersectional*. It always intersects with the bodies that produce the labor. Therefore, the accumulation of wealth is embedded in the racialized and engendered structures that enhance it. (Italics added)

Positing that contemporary configurations of global capital that fuel and sustain growing social inequalities are about class exploitation, racism, sexism, and other systems of power fosters a rethinking of the categories used to understand economic inequality. Intersectional frameworks that go beyond class reveal how race, gender, sexuality, age, ability, citizenship, and so on relate in complex and entangled ways to produce economic inequality.

Third, using intersectionality as an analytic tool reveals how differential public policies of nation-states contribute to reducing or aggravating growing global inequality. The post-World War II period was marked by the growth of social welfare states in some national contexts, and the absence of such states in others, and more recently the dismantling of social welfare states in yet others. There are many variations of states and policies – for example, public policies of countries in the former Soviet Union that pursued a different course toward social equality, or colonies that became countries – but here we focus on social democracy and neoliberalism as shorthand terms for much broader sets of ideas or philosophies that have had and seemingly will continue to have an important influence on the public policies of nation-states. These overarching intellectual frameworks of social democracy and neoliberalism inform the public policies of nation-states as well as

understandings of each other. They also differ in important ways on their interpretations of social inequality.

Drawing on the tenets of social democracy, social welfare state policies strive to protect the interests of the public. As a philosophy, social democracy is grounded in the belief that democratic institutions flourish best when they see the protection of social welfare of all people as part of their mandate. In this sense, participatory democracy is a strong pillar of social democracy because it assumes that fostering both broad citizen participation and fair access to the decision-making processes of the social welfare state strengthens democratic institutions. Unemployment, poverty, racial and gender discrimination, homelessness, illiteracy, poor health, and similar social problems constitute threats to the public good when social problems such as these remain unaddressed. To confront these challenges, social welfare states aim to promote public well-being via various combinations of establishing regulatory agencies for electricity, water, and similar entities, investing in public infrastructure and basic services, and providing direct state services. For example, in the US, environmental safety and food security have long been the purview of the federal government in the belief that, in order to protect everyone, industrial polluters of water and air, as well as the meat-packing industry, require a fair yet vigilant regulatory climate. Social welfare policies provide for a range of projects, including highway funding, school funding, and public transportation, as well as programs that care for the elderly, children, poor people, the disabled, the unemployed, and other people who need assistance. Overall, the basic idea is that, protecting its citizens and acting on behalf of the public good constitute core values of social democracy and strong social welfare states require participatory democracy.

In contrast, neoliberal state policies take a different view of the role of the state in promoting public well-being. As a philosophy, neoliberalism is grounded in the belief that markets, in and of themselves, are better able than governments to produce economic outcomes that are fair, sensible, and good for all. The state practices associated with neoliberalism differ dramatically from those of social welfare states. First, neoliberalism fosters the increased privatization of government programs and institutions like public schools, prisons, healthcare, transportation, and the military. Under the logic of neoliberal ideology, private firms that are accountable to market forces rather than democratic oversight of citizens can potentially provide less costly and more efficient services than government workers. Second, the logic of neoliberalism argues for the scaling back, and in some cases elimination of, the social welfare state. The safety net of government assistance to the poor, the unemployed, the disabled, the elderly, and the young is recast as wasteful spending characteristic of irresponsible government. Third, neoliberal logic claims that

fewer economic regulations and more trade that is free of government constraints protect jobs. This freedom from environmental regulation and entities such as unions should produce greater profitability for some companies, which should lead to more jobs. Finally, neoliberalism posits a form of individualism that rejects the notion of the public good. By neoliberal logic, people have only themselves to blame for their problems: solving social problems comes down to the self-reliance of individuals (Cohen 2010; Harvey 2005).

The relationship between neoliberalism and social democracy has been contentious. Neoliberal philosophies have been used to launch sustained attacks on the public programs of social democracies that were put in place to address social inequality. The effects have been shrinking funding for public institutions of all sorts, including public schools, healthcare, housing, and transportation. The philosophy of neoliberalism predicted that such cuts would not foster social inequality, but that they might reduce it. Yet, since the 1980s, as the exponential growth within nations of both income and the wealth gap shows, the results of neoliberal policies are quite the opposite. Democratic states that pursued neoliberal policies identify big government not as a solution to social inequality, but as one of its causes. Following the trickle-down economics principle that claims that tax cuts for businesses and the wealthy in society stimulate business investment in the short term and benefit society at large in the long term, such policies want less government intrusion in the marketplace, on the assumption that neoliberal policies will reduce social inequality by growing the market and providing more opportunities for everyone. Global social inequality has grown in tandem with the weakening of the social democratic state.

Increasingly, many social democratic nation-states that try to remedy social inequality by adopting neoliberal economic policies face serious challenges, among them, the rise of far-right populism. On the one hand, refusing to implement policies that are informed by neoliberalism can make a state less competitive in the global marketplace. Making industries more competitive in the global marketplace via computer automation and artificial intelligence, deskilling, and job export increases the profitability of companies. Industry 4.0 is a name given to the current trend of automation and data exchange in manufacturing technologies. It includes cyber-physical systems, the Internet of Things, cloud computing, and cognitive computing. This will have an increasing impact on global economic competition between states and between cities. Yet, such policies can aggravate existing economic inequality, fanning the flames of right-wing populism by those who consider they are the ones left behind.

On the other hand, as we discuss in Chapter 5, implementing neoliberal public policies as the solution to inequality can foster social unrest. Economic development of the nation-state does not necessarily reduce economic inequality. Those same strategies eliminate jobs and

suppress wages, leaving closed factories, unemployed workers, and the serious potential for social unrest in their wake. Brazil's experiences in the wake of hosting the 2014 FIFA World Cup capture the tensions that distinguish a nation-state that aimed for a balance between social welfare policies and neoliberal aspirations. The money spent in preparation may have raised Brazil's profile in the global arena, yet it simultaneously sparked massive social protest about cost overruns and corruption. Ironically, it also led to the emergence of a national far-right populist leader in the 2018 elections.

Intersectional analysis illuminates the differential effects of public policies on producing economic inequality of people of color, women, young people, rural residents, undocumented people, and differently abled people. Yet intersectionality's focus on people's lives provides space for alternative analyses of these same phenomena that do not stem from the worldviews of academic elites or government officials. Black people, women, poor people, LGBTQ people, ethnic and religious minorities, indigenous peoples, and people assigned to inferior castes and groups have never enjoyed the benefits of full citizenship and, as a result, they have less to lose and more to gain. People who bear the brunt of shrinking benefits from social welfare states or neoliberal marketplace policies may be more hopeful than their public officials about the possibilities of social democracy. Drawing inspiration from Pope Francis, they may also view growing economic inequality, as well as the social forces that cause it, as "the root of social evil," yet refuse to sit passively watching it destroy their lives. Without hope of change, neither social protest nor social movements are possible.

The black women's movement in Brazil

More than 1,000 black women and their allies attended the seventh annual meeting of Latinidades, the Afro-Latin and Afro-Caribbean women's festival in Brasilia. As the largest festival for black women in Latin America, the 2014 event was scheduled to coincide with the annual International Day of Black Latin American and Caribbean Women. Latinidades was no ordinary festival. Several decades of black women's activism in Brazil had created the political, social, and artistic space for this annual festival that was devoted to the issues and needs of black women in Brazil specifically, as well as Afro-Latin and Afro-Caribbean women more generally.

In 1975 at the beginning of the United Nations (UN) Decade of Women, black women presented the Manifesto of Black Women at the Congress of Brazilian Women. The Manifesto called attention to how black women's life experiences in jobs, families, and the economy were shaped by gender, race, and sexuality. During this Decade of Women, white feminists remained unwilling or unable to address black women's concerns. Léila Gonzalez,

Sueli Carneiro, and many other black feminist activists continued to push for black women's issues. Their advocacy is all the more remarkable given that it occurred during the term of Brazil's military government (1964–85) and that it preceded contemporary understandings of intersectionality.

Brazil's national policy concerning race and democracy militated against such activism. Brazil officially claimed not to have "races," a position that rests on the Brazilian government's approach to racial statistics. Without racial categories, Brazil officially had neither "races" nor black people as a socially recognized "racial" group. Ironically, the myth of Brazilian national identity erased race in order to construct a philosophy of racial democracy, one where being Brazilian superseded other identities such as those of race. In essence, by erasing the political category of race, Brazil's national discourse of racial democracy effectively eliminated language that might describe the racial inequalities that affected black Brazilian people's lives. This erasure of "blackness" as a political category allowed discriminatory practices to occur in areas of education and employment against people of visible African descent because there were neither officially recognized terms for describing racial discrimination nor official remedies for it (Twine 1998). Brazil's cultivated image of national identity posited that racism did not exist and also that color lacks meaning, apart from when it was celebrated as a dimension of national pride. This national identity neither came about by accident nor meant that people of African descent believed it. Women of African descent may have constituted a visible and sizable segment of Brazilian society, yet in a Brazil that ostensibly lacked race, the category of black women did not exist as an officially recognized population. Black women challenged these historical interconnections between ideas about race and Brazil's nation-building project as setting the stage for the erasure of Afro-Brazilian women.

Black feminists' ongoing criticisms of racial democracy and advocacy for the needs of black women provided a foundation for the new generation of activists to organize Latinidades. These intergenerational social movement ties enabled younger black women to highlight the connections between gender, race, and class that were advanced within intergenerational networks of black feminist activists. In this context, Latinidades's expressed purpose of promoting "racial equality and tackling racism and sexism" both continued the legacy of an earlier generation and showcased the use of intersectionality as an analytical category within Afro-Brazilian feminism. For example, Conceição Evaristo, Afro-Brazilian author and professor of Brazilian literature, attended the festival. Her novel *Ponciá Vicencio*, a landmark in black Brazilian women's literature, remains a classic in examining the challenges and creativity of an ordinary black woman who faces multiple expressions of oppression (Evaristo 2007). Evaristo's presence spoke both to the synergy of arts, activism,

and academic work among Afro-Brazilian feminists, and also to the significance of intergenerational intellectual and political engagement for the black women's movement in Brazil.

The festival cultivated a range of relationships that typically were seen as separate. As is the case with intersectionality, the festival accommodated people from all walks of life. Community organizers, professors, graduate students, parents, artists, schoolteachers, high-school students, representatives of samba schools, government officials, and music lovers, among others, all made the journey to Brasilia to attend Latinidades. The festival centered on women of African descent, but many men and members of diverse racial/ethnic groups from all areas of Brazil's states and regions, as well as from Costa Rica, Ecuador, and other Latin American and Caribbean nations, also attended. This transregional and transnational heterogeneity enabled participants to share their strategies for tackling how racism and sexism affected Afro-Latin women.

But the festival's inclusivity also highlighted an expansive understanding of intersectionality that reflected the synergy of intellectual and activist work. Black women's activist traditions informed both its sessions and its special events. Latinidades did not just talk about the need for relations across social divisions of race, class, gender, sexuality, age, nationality, and ability; it promoted opportunities to do so. Community organizers rubbed shoulders with academics, as did young people with revered elders. For example, Angela Davis's keynote address got the audience on its feet, many with fists raised in the Black Power salute. The festival also set aside time for a planning meeting to educate attendees about the upcoming Black Women's March for a National Day of Denouncing Racism. Another programming strand emphasized the significance of African diasporic cultural traditions, especially in Brazil. Writers, artists, activists, and academics learned from one another. From the content of academic sessions, to a workshop for girls on black aesthetics and beauty, to a session on the art of turbans and their connections to black beauty, to a capoeira workshop, and a tree-planting ceremony of the seedlings of sacred baobab trees, Latinidades saw culture as an important dimension of Afro-Latin and Afro-Caribbean women's lives. After two days of intensive workshops, talks, and films, festival participants spilled out of the museum onto its expansive plaza to enjoy two nights of live music. Latinidades was a festival where serious work and play coincided.

Latinadades's use of intersectionality as an analytic tool for structuring the conference illustrates broader issues concerning how Afro-Brazilian women's longstanding commitment to challenging racism and sexism reflects the specific social context of their experiences. Notwithstanding its myth of racial democracy, Brazil's specific history with slavery, colonialism, dictatorship, and democratic institutions has shaped its distinctive

patterns of intersecting power relations of race, gender, and sexuality. Sexual engagements, both consensual and forced, among African, indigenous, and European-descended populations created a Brazilian population with varying hair textures, skin colors, body shapes, and eye colors, as well as a complex and historically shifting series of terms to describe them. Skin color, hair texture, facial features, and other aspects of appearance became de facto racial markers for distributing education, jobs, and other social goods. As Kia Caldwell points out, "popular images of Brazil as a carnivalesque, tropical paradise have played a central role in contemporary constructions of mulata women's social identities. Brazil's international reputation as a racial democracy is closely tied to the sexual objectification of women of mixed racial ancestry as the essence of Brazilianness" (2007: 58). For Afro-Brazilian women, those of mixed ancestry or with more European physical features are typically considered to be more attractive. Moreover, women of visible African ancestry are typically constructed as non-sexualized, and often as asexual laborers or, conversely, as prostitutes (Caldwell 2007: 51). Appearance not only carries differential weight for women and men, but different stereotypes of black women rest on beliefs about their sexuality. These ideas feed back into notions of national identity, using race, gender, sexuality, and color as intersecting phenomena.

Intersectionality's framework of mutually constructing identity categories enabled Afro-Brazilian women to develop a collective identity politics. In this case, they cultivated a political black feminist identity politics at the intersections of racism, sexism, class exploitation, national history, and sexuality. The political space created by reinstalling democracy in the late 1980s benefited both women and black people. Yet there was one significant difference between the two groups. In a climate where women's rights encompassed only the needs of white women, and where black people experienced an anti-black racism in a context of alleged racial democracy, Afro-Brazilian women experienced differential treatment within both the feminist movement and the Black Movement. Clearly, women and men had different experiences within Brazilian society – there was no need to advocate for the integrity of the categories themselves. Yet the framing of the women's movement, even around such a firm subject as "woman," was inflected through other categories. Because both upper- and middle-class women were central to the women's movement, their status as marked by class, yet unmarked by race (most were white), shaped political demands. Brazil's success in electing women to political office reflected alliances among women across categories of social class. With the noteworthy exception of Benedita da Silva, the first black woman to serve in the Brazilian Congress in 1986 and the Senate in 1994, feminism raised issues of gender and sexuality, but did so in ways that did not engage issues of anti-black racism that were so important to Afro-Brazilian women.

Unlike white Brazilian women, black Brazilians of all sexes and genders had to create the collective political identity of "black" in order to build an antiracist social movement that highlighted the effects of anti-black racism. Brazil's history with transatlantic slavery left it with a large population of African descent – by some estimates, 50 percent of the Brazilian population. Those who claimed an identity as "black" seemed to contradict the national identity of racial democracy, and thus ran the risk of being accused of disloyalty and not being fully Brazilian. In this sense, the Black Movement that emerged in the 1990s did not call for equal treatment within the democratic state for an already recognized group. Rather, recognition meant both naming a sizable segment of the population and acknowledging that it experienced anti-black racial discrimination (Hanchard 1994).

Neither Brazilian feminism led by women who were primarily well-off and white, nor a Black Movement that was actively engaged in claiming a collective black identity that identified racism as a social force could by itself adequately address Afro-Brazilian women's issues. Black women who participated in the Black Movement found willing allies when it came to antiracist black activism, but much less understanding of how the issues faced by black people took gender-specific forms. Indeed, they found little recognition of the special issues of living lives as black women in Brazil at the intersections of racism, sexism, class exploitation, second-class citizenship, and heterosexism. Brazil's history of class analysis, which saw capitalism and workers' rights as major forces in shaping inequality, made space for exceptional individuals such as Benedita da Silva. Yet when it came to race as a category of analysis, black women faced similar pressures to subordinate their special concerns under the banner of class solidarity. These separate social movements of feminism, antiracism, and workers' movements were important, and many black women continued to participate in them. Yet because no one social movement alone could adequately address Afro-Brazilian women's issues, they formed their own.

Taking a step back to view black Brazilian women's ideas and actions illustrates how a collective identity politics emerged around a politicized understanding of a collective black women's identity based on common experiences of domination, exploitation, and marginalization (Caldwell 2007). For example, when black domestic workers organized, it was clear that women of African descent were disproportionately represented in this occupational category. Not all domestic workers were "black," but the job category was certainly closely associated with black women. Afro-Brazilian women were more vulnerable to violence, especially those living in favelas and who did domestic work. Drawing on cultural ties to the African diaspora, black women activists also saw their roles as mothers and othermothers as important for political action. Women of African descent in Brazil knew on one level, through personal experience, that they were part of a group that shared

certain collective experiences. They were disproportionately engaged in domestic work. Their images were maligned in popular culture. They were disproportionately targets of misogynistic violence. They were mothers who lacked the means to care for their children as they would have liked, but had ties to the value placed on mothering across the African diaspora. Yet because they lacked a political identity and accompanying analysis to attach to these experiences, they couldn't articulate a collective identity politics to raise their concerns. None of their closest allies – black men in the Black Movement, or white women in the feminist movement, or socialists in organizations that advocated for workers' rights – would have the best interests of such women at heart as fervently as they themselves did (Carneiro 1995).

Latinidades marked one moment within a long struggle to acknowledge race, gender, class, nation, and sexuality as mutually constructing multidimensional aspects of Afro-Brazilian women's lives. It was simultaneously a celebration and a recommitment to continue the struggle. Yet as the premature death of Marielle Franco (1979–2018) suggests, building an Afro-Brazilian women's movement is neither easy nor finished. A black bisexual woman who grew up in a Rio de Janeiro favela, Franco was one of the most outspoken Brazilian activists and politicians of her generation. Elected to the City Council of Rio de Janeiro in 2016, she chaired the Women's Defense Commission and fiercely condemned police killings and violence against women. Her strong grassroots and social media mobilizing presence made her a highly effective advocate for the rights of black women, youth, and LGBTQ people. Her political assassination made her an icon of democratic resistance and of the struggle for social justice in Brazil and beyond. A champion of human rights, Marielle Franco's death and life remind us of the significance of intersectionality for movements for social justice.

Core Ideas of Intersectional Frameworks

Our three uses of intersectionality as an analytic tool – namely, how the FIFA World Cup illuminates intersecting power relations, the growing recognition of economic inequality as a global social problem, and how intersectionality unfolded within the black women's movement in Brazil – may seem quite different from one another. But together they shed light on six core ideas within intersectionality: social inequality, intersecting power relations, social context, relationality, social justice, and complexity. Just as these themes reappear, albeit in different forms, within intersectionality itself, they repeat in different ways throughout this book. We briefly introduce them here, develop them in future chapters, and return to them in Chapter 8.

First, each of the three cases discussed above sheds light on intersectional analyses of *social inequality*, albeit from very different vantage points. The case of FIFA World Cup football

contrasts the depiction of fairness on football's playing field with social inequalities of gender, race, nation, and class that characterize FIFA's business practices. In contrast, the case of how growing global inequality came to the attention of ISA and the Conference on Inclusive Capitalism emphasizes how intersectionality might inform different explanations for economic inequality. Philosophies of social democracy and neoliberalism that shape public policies have important effects on the economic inequality that characterizes social inequality. The Afro-Brazilian women's movement explores how social movements constitute important political responses to national patterns of social inequality, in this case, the intersections of racism, sexism, class exploitation, and national identity. Recognizing that social inequality is rarely caused by a single factor, intersectionality adds additional layers of complexity to understandings of social inequality. Using intersectionality as an analytic tool moves beyond seeing social inequality through race-only or class-only lenses and instead, understands social inequality through the interactions among various categories of power.

Second, these cases highlight different dimensions of *intersecting power relations* as well as political responses to them. The case of the FIFA World Cup illustrates how intersecting power relations are organized and operate in a social institution where the ideology of fair play masks significant power differences. This case introduces how intersecting power relations are to be analyzed both via specific intersections – for example, of racism and sexism, or capitalism and heterosexism – as well as across domains of power – namely, structural, disciplinary, cultural, and interpersonal. The case of global social inequality shows how intersectional frameworks that take power relations into account, especially those that analyze how nation-state power works with different philosophies of social democracy and neoliberalism, raise new questions about global social inequality. In contrast, the Afro-Brazilian women's movement emphasizes how everyday people organize to oppose intersecting power relations that harm them. By examining how black women in Brazil organized to resist multiple forms of social inequality, black women's activism illustrates how community organizing and grassroots involvement generated intersectional analysis and praxis.

These cases illuminate a third core theme of intersectional analysis, namely, the importance of examining intersecting power relations in a *social context*. Because analyzing intersectionality in a global social context is a strong theme of this book, we have selected cases that offer different lenses on intersectionality in a global context, taking care to highlight national contexts as well as particular contexts within them. Contextualization is especially important for intersectional projects produced in the Global South. Just as the women athletes from South Africa, Jamaica, and Nigeria encountered obstacles when

playing FIFA World Cup soccer, so scholars and activists working in nation-states of the Global South face difficulties in reaching wider audiences. We selected the case of the black women's movement in Brazil to illustrate how many of intersectionality's more prominent ideas reflect the specific concerns of a group within specific social contexts – in this case, black women within the Brazilian nation-state with a history of slavery and colonialism. Just as Afro-Brazilian feminism situates intersectionality within a Brazilian context, so too might other expressions of intersectionality require a similar contextualization. The analysis of the World Cup examined the global contours of intersecting power relations. The analysis of growing recognition of global economic inequality emphasizes the importance of nation-state policies and the social contexts of government institutions.

Fourth, these cases point to how *relationality* informs all aspects of intersectionality. Relationality embraces a both/and analytical framework that shifts focus from seeing categories as oppositional, for example, the differences between race and gender, to examining their interconnections. Relationality takes various forms within intersectionality and is found in terms such as "coalition," "solidarity," "dialog," "conversation," "interaction," and "transaction." But the terminology is less important than seeing how this shift in perspective toward relationality opens up new possibilities for intersectionality's inquiry and praxis. For example, regarding inquiry, the case of global economic inequality illustrates how class-only arguments may be insufficient to explain global social inequality, and that intersectional analyses that examine the relationships among class, race, gender, and age might be more valuable. Similarly, regarding praxis, the Afro-Brazilian women's movement illustrates how intersectionality emerged within coalition building for an intergenerational social movement.

Fifth, these cases highlight the *complexity* of doing critical intersectional analysis. Using intersectionality as an analytic tool is difficult, precisely because intersectionality itself is multifaceted. Because intersectionality aims to understand and analyze the complexity in the world, it requires intricate strategies to do so. Rather than proclaiming that complexity is important, we aimed to demonstrate through our case selection the multifaceted nature of intersectionality. Each of our cases is a highly abbreviated rendition of a far more complex intersectional argument. Starting with a well-known social institution (FIFA), or an important social problem (social inequality), or a seemingly invisible political phenomenon (black women's movement) involves incorporating ever more complex levels of analysis. Intersections of race and gender can identify the need for class analysis, or viewing intersections of nation and sexuality can highlight the need for other categories of analysis. This level of complexity is not easy for anyone to handle. It complicates things and can be a source of frustration for scholars, practitioners, and activists alike. Yet complexity is not

something that one achieves by using intersectionality as an analytic tool, but rather something that deepens intersectional analysis.

Finally, some commitment to *social justice* has historically informed much of intersectionality's critical inquiry and praxis. We selected these cases to introduce intersectionality because they all illuminate how intersectionality's use as a critical analytic tool is connected to a social justice ethos. What makes an intersectional project *critical* lies in its connection to social justice. For example, our analysis of global economic inequality illustrates how fostering social justice requires complex analyses of global economic inequality.

Yet because intersectionality's ties to social justice may not be self-evident, the need to pursue a social justice agenda as an essential dimension of intersectionality remains contentious. Many people believe that social ideals, such as the belief in meritocracy, fairness, and the reality of democracy, have already been achieved. For them, there is no global crisis of social inequality because economic inequality is the outcome of fair competition and fully functioning democratic institutions. Social inequality can exist without it being socially unjust. Our cases challenge this view, suggesting that FIFA reproduces social inequality in ways that are neither fair nor just. Social justice is elusive in unequal societies where the rules may seem fair, yet differentially enforced through discriminatory practices, the case of Brazil's racial democracy. Social justice is also elusive where the rules themselves may appear to be equally applied to everyone, yet still produce unequal and unfair outcomes: in social democracies and neoliberal nation-states, everyone may have the "right" to vote, but not everyone has equal access to do so, and not everyone's vote counts the same.

Our goal in this book is to democratize the rich and growing literature of intersectionality – not to assume that only African American students will be interested in black history, or that LGBTQ youth will be the only ones interested in queer studies, or that intersectionality is for any one segment of the population. Rather, we invite our readers to use intersectionality as an analytic tool to examine a range of topics such as those discussed here. In this chapter, we have introduced selected main ideas within intersectionality by using intersectionality as an analytical tool. In Chapters 2 and 3, we further examine intersectionality's analytical framework by introducing the distinction between intersec-tionality as a form of inquiry and as praxis and by tracing the emergence of these ideas. In Chapters 4 and 5, we return to the use of intersectionality as an analytical tool by showing its utility for analyzing global phenomena – specifically, human rights, reproductive rights, digital media, global social protest, and neoliberal state policies. In Chapters 6 and 7, we take up identity politics and critical education as two important issues that have shaped intersectionality as discourse.

Our concluding chapter revisits the challenges of using intersectionality as an analytic tool, as well as the varying forms that its core themes of social inequality, relationality, power, social context, complexity, and social justice can and might assume.

Notes

1. FIFA's legal troubles aside, the business of the World Cup goes far beyond the games themselves. Rather, as the scope of people who were indicted indicates, the World Cup is situated at the convergence of increasingly important global industries: sports and entertainment, global telecommunications and tourism, and the globalized World Cup paraphernalia industry. For example, the FIFA-approved official ball of the 2014 World Cup, Adidas Brazuca, with a price tag of US$160, was manufactured in the Forward Sports factory at Sialkot (Pakistan) by Pakistani women (90 percent of the workforce) who each made barely US$100 per month. After selling 13 million official World Cup match balls in 2010, Adidas made hundreds of millions of dollars.

2. In one case, Polish fans threw bananas at a Nigerian football player. The fans aren't the only problem – racial slurs among players are also an issue. For example, at the 2006 World Cup, France's Zinedine Zidane, a three-time winner of FIFA's world player of the year award, violated a rule of fair play by headbutting Italy's Marco Materazzi in the chest. Zidane, the son of Algerian immigrants, reported he was goaded by Materazzi's racist and sexist slurs against his mother and sister. Materazzi was kept in play while Zidane was ejected from what was to be his last ever World Cup match.

3. Despite the 2008 global financial crisis, by 2014 the richest 1 percent had increased its share of the world's wealth – from 44 percent in 2009 to 48 percent in 2014. In the US, the wealthiest 1 percent captured 95 percent of post-financial crisis growth after 2009, while the remaining 90 percent became poorer. In 2013, the combined wealth of the world's richest 85 people equaled the total wealth of the poorest half of the world's population, which accounted for 3.5 billion people (Oxfam 2014). More recently, these trends have shown no evidence of abating. By 2018, the wealth of the world's billionaires increased by $900 billion, an increase of $2.5 billion each day. In contrast, progress made in fighting extreme poverty, which is defined by the World Bank as an income of $1.90 per person per day, slowed down (Oxfam 2019).

4. In 2015, the median wealth (assets minus debts) of white households was 20 times that of black households and 18 times that of Hispanic households.

5. Black women fare worst according to a 2010 research report on wealth disparities between different racial groups in the US. Median wealth of single black women (including household-head single mothers) in the prime of their working years (ages 36 to 49) is only US$5, compared to US$42,600 for single white women of the same age – which is 61 percent of their single white male counterparts (Chang 2010).

2
Intersectionality as Critical Inquiry and Praxis

Far too much intersectional scholarship starts with the assumption that intersectionality is a finished framework that can simply be applied to a given research project or political program. Yet, as the cases of the FIFA World Cup, the ISA/World Conference on Inclusive Capitalism, and the black women's movement in Brazil suggest, the use of intersectionality can take many forms. Generalizing about intersectionality based on a particular case or one group's experiences in a particular social context risks missing the process of discovery that underlies how people actually understand and use intersectional frameworks. Intersectionality itself is constantly under construction and these cases illustrate different ways of using intersectionality as an analytic tool. Yet how is intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis organized to do this analytic work?

This chapter investigates critical inquiry and critical praxis as two organizational focal points for using intersectionality as an analytical tool. As a form of critical inquiry, intersectionality gained visibility in the academy when the term "intersectionality" seemed to be a good fit for scholarship and teaching that were already underway. In the 1990s, the term came into use both within and beyond traditional disciplines, as well as inside and outside academia. Initially, intersectional inquiry was inherently critical because it challenged existing bodies of knowledge, theories, epistemologies, methodologies, and pedagogies, especially in relation to social inequality. While intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry can occur anywhere, colleges and universities became important venues for disseminating intersectionality through scholarship, teaching, conferences, grant proposals, policy reports, and literary and creative works.

When used as a form of critical praxis, intersectionality refers to the ways in which people, either as individuals or as part of groups, produce, draw upon, or apply intersectional frameworks in their daily lives. In their families and jobs, as institutional actors within public schools, colleges and universities, and religious organizations, and as community leaders and grassroots organizers, everyday citizens draw upon intersectionality's ideas to guide their practice. Intersectionality's critical praxis can occur anywhere, both inside and outside academia. This book pays special attention to intersectionality as critical praxis because popular understandings of intersectionality underemphasize practices that make intersectional knowledge possible, especially those that involve criticizing, rejecting, and/or trying to fix the social problems that complex social inequalities engender. Critical praxis

also constitutes an important feature of intersectional inquiry – one that is both attentive to intersecting power relations and vital for resisting social inequality.

Within academia, faculty and students routinely overlook the power relations that make intersectionality as critical inquiry possible and legitimate in their scholarship and classroom practices. If they consider the theme of political praxis at all, they often treat politics as a topic of discussion, or as a silent background variable that has little influence on research design or on classroom practices. These assumptions relegate politics to areas outside academia and contribute to the fiction that higher education is an ivory tower unfettered by power relations. Activists drawing upon intersectionality as a core feature of their critical praxis do consider power relations and social inequalities as central to their work. Yet they may feel that intellectual inquiry, especially theoretical reflections on intersectionality, is a luxury they cannot afford. Some activists even reject social theory, failing to see how ideas themselves can move people to action.

Rejecting this false division between academics and activism, or thinking and doing, suggests that intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis can occur anywhere. Critical thinking is certainly not confined to academia, nor is political engagement found solely in social movements or community organizing. In lived experience, critical inquiry and praxis as organizational principles are rarely distinguished as sharply as presented here. Nonetheless, making this analytical distinction illuminates a core tension that lies within intersectionality: namely, when people imagine intersectionality, they tend to imagine one or the other, either inquiry or praxis, rather than seeing the interconnections between the two.

Bringing these two organizational principles of intersectionality into closer alignment reveals the synergy between them. A synergistic relationship is a special kind of relationality, one where the interaction of two or more entities produces a combined effect that is greater than their separate parts. In the case of intersectionality, the synergy between inquiry and praxis can produce important new knowledge and/or practices. Inquiry and praxis can each be effective without explicitly taking the other into account. Yet bringing them together can generate benefits that are greater than each alone. In future chapters, we use the term “intersectionality” as shorthand to reference this synergy between critical inquiry and practice within intersectionality. In this chapter, we highlight the distinction between these two organizational principles so that we can explore how they do and might work together in using intersectionality as an analytic tool. Our sense of intersectionality aims to sustain a focus on the synergy linking ideas and actions, on the interrelatedness of inquiry and praxis.

Intersectionality as Critical Inquiry

Intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry invokes a broad sense of using intersectional frameworks to study a range of social phenomena – for example, the organizational structure of football, the philosophies that shape global and national public policies, and the social movement activism of Afro-Brazilian women – across local, regional, national, and global social contexts. Intersectionality as critical praxis does the same, but in ways that explicitly challenge the status quo and aim to transform power relations.

Because intersectionality's growth and institutionalization over the past several decades have largely occurred within colleges and universities, this section focuses on intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry within academia. Students, teachers, scholars, and administrators often use the terminology of "study" to describe intersectionality, a term that conjures up images of scholars doing research within traditional disciplines and interdisciplinary fields. Yet this understanding may be too narrow for intersectionality's actual organization. Intersectionality also figures prominently within higher education's equity, diversity, and inclusion initiatives, thus getting transformed into an institutional goal. Many forms of student activism also draw upon intersectional frameworks. The important idea here is not to equate intersectionality with a traditional field of study – for example, an academic discipline or an interdisciplinary program. People take actions that are far broader than passively receiving knowledge or contemplating or even criticizing the world around them. Many people do intellectual work in media venues such as film, music, and digital media. Ideas circulating on the internet and other mediated platforms also find their way into scholarship within academia.

One way to get a sense of intersectionality within academia is to examine the actions and ideas of activist scholars and students who were involved in bringing race/class/gender studies into the academy.[1] In 2001, sociologist Bonnie Thornton Dill interviewed 70 faculty members from 17 colleges and universities in the US, many of whom had helped launch interdisciplinary programs on race/class/gender studies, about their perceptions of the core features and status of this emerging area of inquiry (Dill 2002, 2009). The conversations had two major focal points: defining, describing, and characterizing intersectional work, or what it means to work at the intersections; and exploring the organizational and leadership structures through which the work is done. Dill's subjects identify building institutional capacity as an important dimension of race/class/gender prior to the 2000s. Or, as Dill succinctly states, during this initial period of incorporation, "intersectionality … [was] the intellectual core of diversity work" (2009: 229).

Dill's own career trajectory reflects the synergy of critical inquiry and praxis at intersectionality's entry into academia. In her scholarship on women of color and their families (Dill 1988), she helped promote intersectional scholarship within family studies. Her leadership, along with that of Lynn Weber and Elizabeth Higginbotham, at the University of Memphis's Center for Research on Women of Color and of the South provided an important institutional home for race/class/gender studies in the 1980s (Collins 2007: 588–92). Her service in various organizational capacities helped establish the institutional infrastructure of intersectionality, for example, helping to build both women's studies and the Consortium of Race, Gender, and Ethnicity at the University of Maryland, and serving as president of the National Women's Studies Association. Given Dill's social location of actually working at the synergy of critical inquiry and praxis, her 2001 study provides an important starting point for tracing theoretical, epistemological, and political developments within race/class/gender studies, a precursor of intersectionality in the academy. This important project also sheds light on the meaning of "working at the intersections" for practitioners who spanned this period when movements for social justice extended into academia.

Dill's respondents remind us how hard it was to bring race, class, and gender scholarship to the forefront of academic life, during a period when colleges and universities were increasingly subject to neoliberal philosophies. They also acknowledge how intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry is indebted to this group of social actors:

> Over the last thirty years, the scholarship that laid the groundwork for what has come to be known as intersectional analysis has been pioneering work. It has been done in the face of indifference and hostility. Scholars engaged in building programs in women's studies, ethnic studies, and in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender studies have had their intellect, their scholarship, their professionalism, and even their sanity questioned. In more recent years, they have been attacked by agents in the destabilization of a perceived collegial university based on unitary principles of US cultural literacy. (Dill 2009: 229)

In this context, the views of these practitioners who carried race/class/gender studies into the academy provide an important window for tracking the entry and subsequent treatment of core themes within intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry. In her preliminary report of her interview findings, Dill concludes:

> [W]hat I take from these interviews is that work "at the intersections" is an analytical strategy, an approach to understanding human life and behavior rooted in the experiences and struggles of disenfranchised people. It is also an important tool linking theory with practice that can aid in the empowerment of communities and individuals. (2002: 6)[2]

Two themes encapsulate how scholars and activists in race/class/gender studies laid a foundation for intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry. Drawing from ties to social movement politics before moving into positions within higher education, they identified two facets of "working at the intersections," or, using the language presented in this book, adopting intersectionality as an analytic tool: (1) an approach to understanding human life and behavior rooted in the experiences and struggles of disenfranchised people; and (2) an important tool linking theory with practice that can aid in the empowerment of communities and individuals.

The first theme of working at the intersections consists of using the experiences and struggles of disenfranchised groups to broaden and deepen understandings of human life and behavior. Working at the intersections had many noteworthy effects on scholarship. For one thing, intersectionality catalyzed new interpretations of work (Browne and Misra 2003), family (Dill 1988; Naples 1996; Zinn 2010), reproduction, and similar core social constructs, and, in the process, criticized and/or revitalized entire areas of study (Dill and Zambrana 2009). For another, intersectional knowledge projects fostered new questions and areas of investigation within existing academic disciplines, especially in those fields that focus on the interconnectedness of academia and some aspect of the general public. Tracing the patterns of incorporation of race/class/gender studies generally, and intersectionality in particular, within the discipline of sociology illustrates this tendency (Collins 2007).

Several defining texts in the field of race/class/gender studies helped develop and/or use intersectional frameworks (Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1992; Sandoval 2000). Such texts make the case for intersectionality as an analytical strategy by showing the inadequacies of failing to consider race, gender, ethnicity, or other categories of analysis that are now routinely considered within intersectional scholarship. Feminist scholars in postcolonial studies found important theoretical insights in intersectionality that enabled them to assess the influence of continental poststructuralist philosophy on the field and use intersectional frameworks in ways that reflect colonial and postcolonial realities (Alexander and Mohanty 1997; McClintock 1995; Stoler 1995). More importantly, they did so by highlighting the experiences of blacks, women, Latinas, poor people, and other groups who had been neglected within existing scholarship.

Second, Dill's respondents identify working at the intersections as "an important tool linking theory with practice that can aid in the empowerment of communities and individuals." This theme resembles this book's focus on intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis. Intersectionality is not simply a method for doing research, but is also a tool for empowering people. This explains, in part, why academic disciplines that have been oriented to public engagement have shown a special interest in intersectionality. To varying degrees, scholars and practitioners in social work, criminology, public health, law, and education recognize that knowledge production in their respective fields cannot be separated from professional practices. These fields typically examine how their research practices, knowledge base, and professional practices mutually inform each other. Because they straddle scholarship and practice, academic disciplines with a strong clinical or applied focus have been especially interested in intersectional frameworks.

Intersectionality has been taken up within fields that already see theory and practice as interconnected. For example, intersectionality's close affinity with critical race theory and LatCrit theory highlights the ways in which scholars in policy-oriented fields have aimed to use intersection-ality to shape public practice (Matua 2010). Scholars such as Kimberlé Crenshaw, Mari Matsuda, Richard Delgado, Patricia J. Williams, Charles Lawrence, and Regina Austin, all of whom were at the forefront of critical race studies, brought a range of intersectional issues to this field. In the US, public policies concerning issues such as mass incarceration, voter suppression, ensuring the reproductive rights of poor women, discrimination against refugees and migrants, and differential funding for disaster relief have been challenged in the courts by scholars and practitioners who bring an intersectional sensibility to their work. Globally, the area of human rights law has formed a backdrop for a range of intersectional projects (see Chapter 4). The praxis orientation was and still is central to Crenshaw's work and reflects how a broader group of legal scholars and practitioners share social justice sensibilities (Crenshaw et al. 1995).

Similarly, because social work has a history not just of clinical practice but also of critical praxis (Addams 1994), this field of study has embraced intersectionality. Edited volumes within the field constitute an important starting point for developing those intersectional analyses (see, e.g., Lockhart and Danis 2010; Murphy et al. 2009; Sokoloff and Pratt 2005). The journal *Intersectionalities: A Global Journal of Social Work Analysis, Research, Polity, and Practice* describes its purpose as:

> to share knowledge and facilitate collaborative discourse amongst social work theorists, practitioners, educators, activists, researchers, and the community members they serve within local, regional and global contexts. The journal seeks to promote social justice by providing a forum for addressing issues of social difference and power in relation to progressive practice, education, scholarly inquiry, and social policy.

The expressed focus is to link intersectional analysis to the field of social work:

> The journal aims to underscore issues relating to oppression, privilege and resistance in society and social work. Of critical consideration are the ways in which intersections of age, disability, class, poverty, gender and sexual identity, madness, spirituality, geographical (dis)location, rurality, colonialism/imperialism, indigeneity, racialization, ethnicity, citizenship and the environment are enmeshed in processes of social justice and injustice.

The field of criminal justice also highlights how intersectionality's emphasis on critical inquiry and praxis informs understandings of domestic policies of mass incarceration and global policies of securitization (see Chapter 5). As a field that studies the penal system and trains people to work in it, criminal justice has a complicated and contradictory relationship with its many community, governmental, and corporate stakeholders. Criminal justice trains large numbers of people who manage penal institutions within a rapidly growing prison industry. For those working in criminal justice, these jobs may be the best available. The criminal justice system also administers public policies that signal the shift away from social welfare state policies that traditionally focused on rehabilitation, education, counselling, and job placement. Criminal justice is also on the frontline of enforcing more punitive public policies that are informed by neoliberalism and, increasingly, by right-wing populism (McCorkel 2013). Through its policies, its scholarship, and its funding ties to nation-states themselves, criminal justice is a very important site in which competing public policies of social welfare states, neoliberalism, and right-wing populism are produced and implemented. Using intersectionality as an analytical framework promises to provide important guidance to crim-inologists.

Education constitutes another so-called applied field – one grounded in a history of praxis – whose research and practice have been highly receptive to intersectionality's critical inquiry and praxis. We offer an extended discussion of this field in Chapter 7 that can only scratch the surface of the various ways that intersectionality informs critical educational scholarship as critical inquiry. Here, we point out that researchers in education tackle questions of how interactions between social inequalities of race, class, gender, sexuality, and ability shape educational experiences and outcomes of disenfranchised populations. Of special note, educational scholarship provides an important discourse on youth and young people. The

synergy linking scholarship and practice affects not just teacher training, curriculum design, and research on pedagogy for schools; it also shapes the many subspecialties within education scholarship.

Public health is an applied field with strong ties to medical research that has demonstrated a growing interest in how intersectionality's focus on complex social inequalities might shed light on health and illness (Schulz and Mullings 2006; Weber and Fore 2007). Because public health remains committed to improving the practices of healthcare, the challenge for this field lies in integrating intersectional frameworks into clinical practice as well as public policy. Simon Fraser University's Intersectionality-Based Policy Analysis (IBPA) initiative, housed at the Institute for Intersectionality Research and Policy, provides a significant example of these kinds of initiatives in health. The Institute aims to generate research with direct applicability to Canadian health policy (Hankivsky 2012).

Beyond these fields of study, since 2000, intersectionality's presence within academia, as well as its ever-increasing specialization and professionalization, has grown exponentially. Because interest in intersectionality has expanded in so many directions, many scholars and practitioners are unaware of the breadth of intersectional scholarship. Intersectionality's widespread scholarly reach and its effects on disciplinary traditions and boundaries is a vast subject. Here, we can only highlight the many forms that intersectional scholarship takes: books and dissertations that cover a broad range of themes,[3] anthologies and edited volumes for undergraduate courses and the general public,[4] peer-reviewed and scholarly journal articles, and a number of special issues of scholarly journals across various academic disciplines and interdisciplinary fields.[5] Scholars across many academic disciplines and interdisciplinary fields now use intersectionality as an analytic tool to rethink important social issues and institutions. There are now many different intersectional approaches, most tailored to the questions, histories, and pathways taken by various fields. There is no one intersectional framework that can be applied to each field. Rather, varying academic fields of study take up different aspects of intersectionality in relation to their specific concerns.

In some cases, intersectionality provides new directions for rethinking existing areas within a traditional discipline. Take, for example, the ways in which US sociology engaged with themes of race, class, and gender. Because American sociology developed in a political and intellectual context of race and gender segregation, the overall organization of the discipline, as well as the core themes and practices of its first hundred years, perceived race, gender, and class as different and seemingly unrelated axes of social division (Collins 2007). Sociological subdisciplines of class, race, and gender understood each area as distinctive and typically paid scant attention to one another. For example, if the study of marriage and the family was "covering" women, why should the subfield of race and ethnicity concern itself

with gender? If African American experience was studied within race, there was no need to include race as a major explanatory framework in either mainstream studies of social stratification or Marxist critiques of it. If the whiteness of immigrant groups was taken as the norm, the assumptions of whiteness that underlay the construct of US ethnicity need not be studied. Rather, class cleavages associated with varying levels of assimilation and upward social mobility could form the focus of investigation. As a result, these longstanding distinctions between sociological subdisciplines of class, race, and gender shaped their analyses of social inequality. Because the sociologists associated with stratification (class), race, and gender worked within specialized social contexts, this logic of separation affected their intellectual work. Thus, studies of stratification/class, with their emphasis on dominant understandings of work and occupations, largely reflect the widespread tendency to equate white male experiences with society overall. For race and ethnicity, questions of culture prevailed, especially concepts of assimilation drawn from the experiences of white ethnic groups. For gender, white women found themselves either restricted to the so-called helping profession of social work and/or were relegated to their so-called natural sphere of the home by studies of the family. Preoccupied with the level of interpersonal family dynamics, gender analyses remained contained by the language of social psychology and individual social interaction. Overall, the non-intersectional approach of each area limited its ability to consider the ways in which other areas might shape its distinctive concerns.

Intersectionality pushed the discipline of sociology to examine connections between race, class, and gender *within* sociology as well as its ties to other fields of study. By the 2000s, sociologists increasingly relied upon intersectionality as an analytic tool. For example, in her ground-breaking book, *Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor*, sociologist Evelyn Nakano Glenn (2002) provides an intersectional analysis of US citizenship. Yet the path to this work was not easy. Glenn describes how she cobbled together strands from different fields of study and intellectual traditions for her scholarship:

> As I struggle to formulate an integrated analysis of gender, race, and class, I have relied on a historical comparative approach that incorporates political economy while taking advantage of the critical insights made possible by poststructuralism. I use a social constructionist framework, which considers how race, gender, and class are simultaneously constituted in specific locations and historical periods through "racialized" and "genderized" social structure and discourse. I try to inhabit that middle ground … by looking at the ways in which race, gender, and class are constituted *relationally*. (1998: 32; italics added)

In this passage, Glenn provides a backstage look at the changing contours of what it meant to do intersectionality within social science. Her work synthesizes areas within sociology, bringing together sociological traditions of race, class, gender, and nation. But she also engages interdisciplinarity to strengthen her approach to race, class, gender, and nation. Drawing upon a "historical comparative approach that incorporates political economy," a decision that points her toward history, especially labor history and workers' rights, Glenn also takes advantage of the "critical insights made possible by poststructuralism," an area of social thought stressing discourse analysis and also rekindling interest in social constructionist frameworks, which dovetail with intersectionality's emphasis on power relations. Significantly, Glenn points to the practice of working relationally.

Interdisciplinary fields also draw on intersectionality, albeit differently, from one field to the next. For instance, scholars in critical disability studies use intersectionality to criticize how medical models within traditional disability studies rest on assumptions about whiteness, masculinity, gender, sexuality, and normality. Conversely, critical disability studies also criticize the absence or the perfunctory use of disability as a category that is often mentioned but far less often explored within intersectionality scholarship. This kind of critical dialog between these areas has the potential to enrich both. For instance, Nirmala Erevelles's work provides an original conceptualization of disability's entanglements with axes of power – a complex frame of relationality in which disability works as an ideological cornerstone for understandings of race, gender, and sexuality that Erevelles (2011) situates within global class relations and capitalist modes of production.

Similarly, queer of color scholars use intersectionality as an analytical framework to challenge both queer theory and intersectionality as fields of inquiry (Battle et al. 2002; Cohen and Jones 1999; Ferguson 2012). Here, intersectionality functions as an analytic tool that addresses queer theory's overemphasis on whiteness, middle-class experiences, and the concerns of people in the Global North, as well as its anti-identitarian stance. For queer and trans scholars of color, collective identities are not only politically strategic, but they are psychologically important for queer and trans people of color in a society with racist LGBTQ communities. Conversely, queer of color scholars also challenge the heteronormativity within intersectionality scholarship. This entails understanding how the term "queer" unsettles the very idea of normal behavior – "queer" hence becomes a set of actions, a verb, not something one is or has. This understanding of queer makes it difficult for dominant groups to normalize intersectionality, to assimilate it into "business as usual." In this sense, these thinkers "queer intersectionality" itself (Bilge 2012). Criticizing heteronormativity in intersectionality creates space for new questions about how power relations encompass sexuality and also for understanding how social hierarchies can be resisted.

Considerable attention within intersectional scholarship has been devoted to thinking through what kind of concept intersectionality is, yielding a range of interpretations and terminology.[6] One criticism of intersectionality is that this imprecise terminology fosters uneven outcomes. For example, the literature on intersectionality, methodology, and empirical validity (Bowleg 2008; Hancock 2007a, 2007b) is likely a response to the critique that intersectionality scholarship lacks a precise (Nash 2008) and diverse (McCall 2005) methodological approach.[7] But this lack of precision at this point in intersectionality's development may not be a bad thing. Intersectionality's critical inquiry reflects the ambiguities of a field in formation that is actively engaged in processes of self-definition.

Intersectionality as Critical Praxis

Teachers, social workers, parents, policy advocates, university support staff, lawyers, community organizers, clergy, graduate students, and nurses, among others, are frontline actors responding to social problems. Because they often have an up-close and personal relationship with violence, homelessness, hunger, illiteracy, poverty, sexual assault, and similar social problems, these frontline actors have a different angle of vision on how social inequalities shape social problems, and why social problems are not equally distributed across social groups. Focusing primarily on praxis, they typically want to solve problems, not just understand them. For these professionals, practitioners, and activists, intersectionality is not simply a heuristic for intellectual inquiry, but also an important intervention strategy for doing social justice work.

Intersectionality as critical praxis requires using the knowledge gained through practice to guide subsequent actions in everyday life. Problem-solving lies at the heart of intersectionality's praxis, and the kinds of social problems generated by intersecting systems of power lend themselves to knowledge developed via praxis. Praxis understands thinking and doing, or theory and action, as intimately linked and mutually informing each other. It rejects a binary conception that sees scholarship as providing theories and frameworks and relegates practice to people who apply those ideas in real-life settings or to real-life problems. Praxis-oriented knowledge – for example, professional practice of trained medical personnel or skills in social organizing – sees theory and practice as interconnected.

When it comes to intersectional praxis, scholarship has focused on the ways in which groups that are local, grassroots, and/or small-scale draw upon intersectionality to guide their actions. Solidarity politics, which includes coalition-building but is not limited to it, dovetails with intersectionality's core concept of relationality and reappears within intersectional scholarship on grassroots organizations. Take, for example, the work of the

Asian Immigrant Women Advocates (AIWA), a progressive community organization in Oakland and San Jose, California. In their historical account of AIWA, Chun et al. (2013: 917) provide a vibrant illustration of how women in this social movement use intersectional frameworks to grapple with interlocking forms of oppression. Organized to defend the interests of limited English-speaking, low-wage immigrant women workers, AIWA avoids political organizing that is structured along discrete ethnic origins and nationalities such as Chinese, Korean, or Vietnamese. They use intersectionality as a tool that allows members various entry points and ways of engagement. In doing so, AIWA promotes an understanding of identities as instruments to be forged and used strategically in complex and flexible ways (2013: 918). Their in-depth ethnographic and archival research reveals that the organization uses intersectionality principally in three ways: as an analytic framework to tackle the interlocking arenas of gender, family, work, and nation; as a reflexive approach for linking social movement theory and practice; and as a guiding structure for promoting new identities and new forms of democratic activity among immigrant women workers (2013: 920).

Other community-based organizations form networks or coalitions of like-minded groups, drawing upon intersectionality to shape the logistics of how they organize as well as the political agendas that they pursue. In *Dry Bones Rattling: Community Building to Revitalize American Democracy*, activist sociologist Mark Warren (2001) sets out to challenge conventional assumptions that religious intervention in politics can only mean efforts to impose a group's moral teachings on society. Warren follows the work of the Texas Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF), an interfaith and multiracial network of community organizers. Over two decades, the IAF worked to rebuild some of the most devastated communities. As Warren points out: "If these groups were simply religious advocates for the poor, they would not be very remarkable: America is full of advocacy groups, secular and religious. We lack not advocacy groups, but organizations in which people themselves participate actively in democracy" (2001: 4). This important network of citizens working within civil society expressed an intersectional analytic sensibility long before the term became fashionable. Also, the IAF network figured out a way to combine faith-based community building with nonpartisan political action, a combination that has made the network a premier experiment in reviving democracy.

Generations Ahead, a social justice organization dedicated to expanding the public debate on genetic technologies, also sheds light on the solidarity work that is part of intersectional praxis. From its inception in 2008 to its closure in 2012, Generations Ahead deployed an intersectional approach to political organizing to address the social and ethical implications of genetic technologies and reproductive genetics. It was one of the few organizations in the

US that worked with a diverse spectrum of social justice stakeholders – namely, reproductive health, rights and justice, racial justice, LGBTQ, and disability and human rights organizations. Organizing based on an intersectional analysis helped forge alliances between reproductive justice, racial justice, women's rights, and disability rights' activists to develop strategies to address reproductive genetic technologies (Roberts and Jesudason 2013: 313–14).

Groups such as the AIWA, the Texas IAF, and Generations Ahead illustrate how grassroots and community organizations draw upon intersectional frameworks as part of their critical praxis. These examples show different dimensions of how groups recognize the significance of building solidarity both within their own organization and between organizations. Well aware of the damage caused by single-issue politics on multiply oppressed populations or, conversely, the effects of a single issue on segments within a given community, intersectionality activists/scholars place difference and multiplicity at the core of their social justice praxis. Groups like AIWA draw upon intersectionality's theme of relationality to shape their internal politics. In contrast, groups such as the Texas IAF recognize that they need to generate new ways of engaging in multi-issue activism and coalitional work. Neither group simply emphasizes difference, but rather redefines it in relation to their praxis. Collectively, these examples illustrate how intersectionality has been important both for grassroots political mobilization as well as for broader social movements.

In other cases, people employed by governments, corporations, and universities, for example, use intersectionality as an analytical tool to shape the critical praxis of their organizations. Scholars and practitioners have drawn upon intersectional frameworks to try to influence public policies of government agencies (Manuel 2006). Simon Fraser University's IBPA initiative, mentioned above, illustrates this kind of enterprise in health research and policy. Seeking to produce research with direct applicability to Canadian health policy, the IBPA aims to make its materials accessible and relevant to stakeholders in health policy arenas. This entails the important work of translating ideas and facilitating collaboration among stakeholders. The IBPA developed a participatory process involving researchers, practitioners, and users of health services. Their mission statement illustrates the aspirations of social actors to bring intersectionality into the public policy arena: "IBPA provides a new and effective method for understanding the varied equity-relevant implications of policy and for promoting equity-based improvements and social justice within an increasingly diverse and complex population base" (Hankivsky 2012).

Human rights advocacy constitutes another vitally important arena for intersectionality as critical praxis. The ideas expressed in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights invoke understandings of intersectionality that promote social justice initiatives. Article 1

affirms that all human beings "are born free and equal in dignity and rights"; Article 2 states that everyone "is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status" (see Freeman 2011: 5). Yet, because the protected categories gain meaning both in relation to one another and within specific social contexts, a strictly legal statement cannot, by itself, deliver human rights. Because the critical ideas and critical praxis of intersectionality are aligned with the ethos of human rights, using intersectionality as an analytical tool potentially provides an important and critical lens for human rights initiatives (Blackwell and Naber 2002; Crenshaw 2000).

Colleges and universities constitute crucial, though often overlooked, sites where intersectionality as critical praxis occurs. Within higher education, rigid distinctions among administrators, faculty, and staff too often make it difficult for these multiple groups to collaborate to create the conditions that make intersectionality possible as a form of critical inquiry and praxis. The attention paid to intersectionality's scholarship and research often overshadows the importance of pedagogy, or how intersectionality is taught and learned, as an important site of intersectionality's critical praxis. Sociologist Nancy Naples's article "Teaching Intersectionality Intersectionally" (2009) provides an important analysis of the pedagogical implications of intersectionality. In response to the challenges of doing intersectional research, she designed a course that not only would introduce her students to the complexities of intersectional scholarship, but would also aim to do so by using an intersectional pedagogy. Naples's extensive experience with ethnographic research made her especially attentive to the process of planning her course and evaluating its trajectory. As she points out, "few scholars discuss how to place different intersectional approaches in dialogue with one another. In fact, I wish more scholars who assert an intersectional analysis for their work would make their methodology explicit" (2009: 573).

Naples also provides an important analysis of the links between methodology and praxis. She identifies Canadian feminist sociologist Dorothy Smith's emphasis on reflection, action, and accountability as offering one of the most powerful methodological insights for intersectional research. Naples sees in Smith's work an "intersectional feminist praxis" that foregrounds the ways in which activism or experience shapes knowledge, an insight that is often lost when theoretical approaches are institutionalized in the academy. It also reflects the feminist praxis that gave rise to the concept and acknowledges how theory develops in dialog with practice (Naples 2009: 574).

College classrooms may be the place where students first learn about intersectionality, yet their experiences in dormitories, dining halls, libraries, sporting events, and, for those who must work to pay for their education, jobs become the places where intersectionality is lived.

If the ideas of intersectionality hold little meaning for the practice of intersectionality in students' everyday lives, the legion of support staff within colleges and universities, from chief diversity officers to resident assistants in dormitories, have missed an important pedagogical opportunity for intersectional praxis. College administrators and support staff who implement policies for students or who work directly with them are teachers. College faculty who teach students are also frontline practitioners of intersectionality as critical praxis. Collectively, students, administrators, staff support, and faculty can use intersectionality as an important analytical tool to inform their critical praxis.

Thinking about intersectional pedagogy suggests that the distinctions between critical inquiry and critical praxis are rarely as clear-cut as people imagine them to be. When it comes to intersectionality, producing scholarship, especially scholarship that directly informs pedagogy, can constitute a form of intellectual activism (Collins 2012a). Advancing intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry requires building a base of undergraduate and graduate students who engage with core texts about intersectionality. In this regard, edited volumes, especially readers, are important because they "bundle" readings for students in ways that provide a road map for thinking about a field of study (Andersen and Collins 2020). As a parallel development, edited volumes draw upon variations of the term "intersectionality" and incorporate selected key articles to help shape this field of inquiry (Berger and Guidroz 2009). Core texts that explain the main concepts to undergraduates also make important contributions (Weber 1998). Patrick Grzanka's 2014 edited volume not only surveys intersectional scholarship, it also provides a framework suggesting a significant shift in intersectional projects that are honed within the kind of critical inquiry and praxis advocated by the participants in Dill's study.

The Synergy of Inquiry and Praxis

In Chapter 1, we briefly discussed how relationality constitutes a core theme of intersectionality that takes varying forms and uses many terms such as "coalition," "solidarity," "dialog," "conversation," "interaction," and "transaction." Because this core idea of relationality traverses much intersectional inquiry and practice, we make it central to this chapter and deploy it to conceptualize a synergistic relationship between inquiry and praxis as dimensions of intersectionality.

The remainder of this chapter contains two very different cases of intersectional synergy. The first examines how using intersectionality as an analytic tool has resulted in more complex understandings of violence. Because violence against women has been such a powerful catalyst for intersectionality itself, and because violence seems increasingly ubiquitous within a global context, intersectional analyses of this topic are not only

widespread but have also informed political activism and public policy. Using intersectionality as an analytic tool fosters a broader conception of how heterogeneous forms of violence contribute to social inequality and social injustice (Collins 1998b). Violence constitutes an important theme for seeing how the synergy between inquiry and praxis actually works within intersectionality.

The second case examines intersectional praxis in an unlikely location, namely, how economist Muhammad Yunus's pathway to developing a framework about microcredit and rural poor people suggests an intersectional way of working. This case is reminiscent of the Afro-Brazilian women's movement, where women advanced the ideas before the advent of the term "intersectionality." The term is not central to Yunus's approach to microcredit. Instead, this case shows how critical praxis enabled selected dimensions of intersectionality to unfold.

Violence as a social problem

Kimberlé Crenshaw's ground-breaking article, "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics and Violence against Women of Color" (1991), argues that intersectional inquiry and praxis are both needed to address the social problem of violence against women of color. Crenshaw's article tapped into a deeper sensibility about the need for new explanations about the shape and effects of violence against women of color that reached out to scholars and practitioners alike. Solutions cannot be found by imagining women as one homogeneous mass, or by painting men as perpetrators, or by focusing exclusively on individuals or state power as sites of violence. Solutions to violence against women remain unlikely if this problem is addressed through singular lenses of gender, race, or class. For example, gender-only lenses of male perpetrators and female victims, or race-only lenses that elevate police violence against black men over domestic violence against black women, show the limitations of non-intersectional thinking.

When it comes to violence, using intersectionality as an analytic tool demonstrates the synergistic relationship between critical inquiry and critical praxis. Three examples show how intersectionality shapes antiviolence initiatives. The organization of the One Billion Rising for Justice movement, our first example, illustrates how intersectional frameworks affect the social justice activities of ordinary citizens in many local settings. One Billion Rising for Justice is a global call to women survivors of violence and those who love them to gather safely in communities outside the places where they are entitled to justice – courthouses, police stations, government offices, school administration buildings, workplaces, sites of environmental injustice, military courts, embassies, places of worship, homes, or simply public gathering places. Women are encouraged to assemble at local

places, where they deserve to feel safe but too often do not. The movement calls upon survivors to break their silence by releasing their stories through art, dance, marches, ritual, song, spoken word, testimonies, and whatever way feels right. Launched on Valentine's Day 2012, the movement has grown and evolved.

In 2013, one billion people in 207 countries rose and danced to demand an end to violence against women and girls. Remarkably, the initiative has managed to sustain its high level of involvement, wedding local grassroots initiatives with global media. In 2014, the initiative focused on the issue of justice for survivors of gender violence, choosing the theme "One Billion Rising for Justice." In 2015, millions of activists in more than 200 countries gathered to "Rise for Revolution," calling for a system change whereby violence against women and girls would be unthinkable. In 2016, the call for change focused on oppressed women with an effort to bring national and international attention to their issues. In 2017 and 2018, the theme "Rising for Solidarity," resonated with the increased visibility of right-wing populism, and the threat it poses to women and girls. Significantly, One Billion Rising has consistently incorporated an intersectional analysis into its mission, its analysis of violence against women and girls, and its explanation of such violence.

The website and the day of action of One Billion Rising for Justice centers on the needs of women and girls, yet no one woman or category of women stands for the billion. Instead, by using the site and the day of action to draw together seemingly unrelated projects into a global imagined community, the site highlights the multiplicity of experiences that women have with violence as well as the innovative strategies that they use to resist it. One Billion Rising for Justice also sheds light on how violence touches everyone's lives; it sees the necessity of organizing all people in support of women. The actions involve women from diverse backgrounds and their loved ones and allies. This is not an exclusionary movement. It occurs in a global context where many different groups understand that freedom from violence is an important aspect of human rights.

The case of One Billion Rising for Justice also illustrates the power of the internet and social media as tools for organizing against violence in everyday life, as well as against hate speech in popular culture. Hate speech against women includes not just words, but a range of images, lyrics, gestures, and other forms of communication that collectively contribute to an ethos of violence. In the same way that hard core pornography is recognizable because it links sexuality to violence, so persistent media images of women as sexualized body parts in popular culture foster the abuse of women. But misogyny gains meaning in relation to other oppressions operating through race, religion, heterosexuality, class, and ability. Within black popular culture, for example, black women appear as targets of violence. This depiction works to desensitize viewers to the type of violence visited upon countless African

American women and to encourage African American men (and those who emulate them) that it is their right to engage in such conduct. Mass media depictions of violence against black people as entertainment resemble the violence depicted against women within hard core pornography.

The Center for Intersectionality and Social Policy Studies at Columbia University provides a second example of how the synergy between intersectionality's critical inquiry and praxis shapes antiviolence initiatives. Spearheaded by the actions of Kimberlé Crenshaw, the Center was founded in 2011 to foster a critical examination of how social structures and related identity categories such as gender, race, and class that interact on multiple levels result in social inequity. The first of its kind in the US, the Center serves an important role in facilitating intellectual dialog between innovative intersectionality scholars, developing cross-disciplinary research networks, integrating intersectional research and analysis into policy debates and social justice advocacy, and developing innovative academic programming and learning opportunities for law students at Columbia Law School and beyond.

The Center has served as the primary research support for the African American Policy Forum (AAPF) for both domestic and transnational affirmative action work. This think-tank connects academics, activists, and policymakers in the work of dismantling structural inequality and engaging new ideas and perspectives to transform public discourse and policy. The work of the AAPF promotes frameworks and strategies that address the bases of discrimination as they relate to the intersections of race, gender, and class.

Violence against black men and boys was an important catalyst for the AAPF's actions. The Forum soon learned that addressing violence required a more broad-based initiative and took the lead in analyzing My Brother's Keeper (MBK), President Barack Obama's racial justice initiative. Launched in February 2014, MBK aimed to address the problems of low achievement and lack of mentoring for young black and brown men, but it also excluded young women. For many, this exclusion proved how easy it is to overlook intermeshing oppressions that shape the life chances of women of color. In a spirit of solidarity with women, 200 black men signed an open letter to President Obama to express their concerns on the exclusion of black girls and women from the MBK. The signatories called for "an intersectional initiative" that would emphasize the "denunciation of male privilege, sexism and rape culture in the quest for racial justice." They argued that "the exclusion of girls and women from MBK will once again relegate Black girls and women to the space they have occupied for far too long in the journeys to racial and sexual equity – in the margins" (Thurman 2014).

Two weeks after the release of this letter, more than 1,000 women and girls of color signed a follow-up open letter addressed to the Obama administration calling for their inclusion in the MBK initiative. While praising "the efforts on the part of the White House, private philanthropy, social justice organizations and others to move beyond colorblind approaches to race-specific problems," the signatories expressed their dismay at the exclusion of women and girls of color from this critical undertaking. They argued:

> [A]ddressing the crisis facing boys should not come at the expense of addressing the stunted opportunities for girls who live in the same households, suffer in the same schools, and struggle to overcome a common history of limited opportunities caused by various forms of discrimination. We simply cannot agree that the effects of these conditions on women and girls should pale to the point of invisibility, and are of such little significance that they warrant zero attention in the messaging, research and resourcing of this unprecedented Initiative. ("Why We Can't Wait" 2014)[8]

The Center and the AAPF initiated a broad array of events that drew upon intersectionality to inform their efforts to educate the public, organize relevant constituencies, and affect public policy. The AAPF also released a series of publications for the general public. For example, their report, *Black Girls Matter: Pushed Out, Overpoliced and Underprotected*, makes policy recommendations to address specific challenges facing girls of color, including revising policies that funnel girls into juvenile supervision facilities; developing programs that identify signs of sexual victimization and assist girls in addressing traumatic experiences; advancing programs that support girls who are pregnant, parenting, or otherwise assuming significant familial responsibilities; and improving data collection to better track discipline and achievement by race/ethnicity and gender for all groups (Crenshaw et al. 2015). The Center also launched a series of hashtag initiatives that are linked to its programmatic initiatives, among them, #BreakingtheSilence, a series of national town hall meetings to raise public awareness about the issues facing black women and girls; #BlackGirlsMatter, a social media campaign that followed up on the *Black Girls Matter* report; #SayHerName, a broad-based effort to highlight police brutality against African American women; and #HerDreamDeferred, a series of events launched in relation to the UN Declaration of 2015 as the start of the International Decade for People of African Descent. Informed by the intersectional philosophy of its host center, these activities of the AAPF illustrate a synergy between inquiry and praxis.

A third case of an antiviolence initiative also reflects the synergistic relationship between critical inquiry and praxis. More radical antiviolence organizations, such as the INCITE! Women, Gender Non-Conforming, and Trans People of Color Against Violence group, call for considering institutionalized violence in all its forms to end violence against multiply

oppressed groups. In INCITE!'s words, they aim "to end all forms of violence against women, gender non-conforming, and trans people of color and their communities." Their organization consists of local grassroots chapters and affiliates across the US that work on police violence, reproductive justice, media justice, and similar political projects. Significantly, they use a framework of analysis and action called "dangerous intersections":

> Underlying our work is a framework we call dangerous intersections. That means women, gender non-conforming, and trans people of color live in the dangerous intersections of sexism and racism, as well as other oppressions. … Movements against sexual and domestic violence have been critical in breaking the silence around violence against women. But as these movements are increasingly professionalized and de-politicized, they're often reluctant to address how violence operates in institutionalized ways and against oppressed people. INCITE! recognizes that it is *impossible* to seriously address sexual and intimate partner violence within communities of color without addressing these larger structures of violence (including militarism, attacks on immigrants' rights and Indigenous treaty rights, the proliferation of prisons, economic neo-colonialism, the medical industry, and more). So our organizing is focused on places where state violence and sexual/intimate partner violence intersect. (INCITE! n.d.).

There are far more grassroots organizations like INCITE! than web-based projects like One Billion Rising or policy advocacy organizations like the AAPF. The locally committed praxis of INCITE! means that its analysis may be more radical and its financial situation more precarious, which creates specific challenges of sustaining the organization over time such that it can engage work against all forms of violence. INCITE! maintains a web page that continues its initial mission; its policy statement ties to its grassroots practice and the challenges it faces resonate with those of other local grassroots organizations that we take up in future chapters.

The One Billion Rising movement, the AAPF's public policy initiatives, and INCITE!'s grassroots organizing agree on the need to address violence and draw upon intersectionality to inform their actions. But the synergy of inquiry and praxis pursued in these cases differs dramatically. One Billion Rising is a global clearinghouse of a multitude of projects – it needs support for its coordinating effort – the particular projects that make up its global network are local, regional and must find ways to fund themselves. Because its network is so large, local projects can drop out or join it without much effect on its overarching mission. One Billion Rising illustrates the benefits of web activism as a way of sharing ideas, but its limitations in shaping public policies within and across nation-states point to the limitations of web activism as the sole mechanism for antiviolence initiatives. In contrast, the AAPF

focuses on public policy. To carry on its task of influencing public policy, it must ensure substantial financial and institutional support. Its publications, social media campaigns, and town hall meetings are national devices intended to educate and organize the public to support antiviolence initiatives. Yet institutional support can come with institutional strings from universities, philanthropies, and government funders who not only ask how their money is being spent, which is understandable, but also may try to interfere in the internal governance or orientations of the financed entity. Grassroots organizations such as INCITE! subsist under more precarious financial and political conditions, but their marginality also brings distinctive features to their critical work. Notable differences of opinion surrounding the question of violence also permeate understandings of antiviolence, which provide a useful window for observing the synergy between intersectionality's critical inquiry and praxis.

In Chapter 1, we argued that power relations are to be analyzed both via their intersections, for example of racism and sexism, as well as across domains of power, namely structural, disciplinary, cultural, and interpersonal. Violence can be analyzed both via how it traverses intersecting systems of power and by how it is organized across domains of power. Across varying social contexts, the use or threat of violence has been central to power relations that produce social inequalities. An intersectional analysis reveals not only how violence is understood and practiced within discrete systems of power, but also how it constitutes a common thread that connects racism, colonialism, heteropatriarchy, nationalism, and ableism. By questioning how forms of violence within separate systems might in fact be interconnected and mutually supporting, intersectionality's analytical framework opens up new paths of investigation. Because violence has long been a topic of concern for feminists, antiracist organizers, scholars, community organizers, and practitioners across multiple fields of study, intersectional inquiry and praxis offer a more robust understanding of violence.

Finding intersectionality in unlikely places

The work of Nobel Prize-winning economist Muhammad Yunus is not typically seen as connected to intersectionality. Yet his approach to working with poor people in rural areas and his scholarship that advances a new way of conceptualizing and remedying poverty have potential implications for intersectionality's critical praxis. Yunus is known for creating a microfinance model of microcredit that offers poor people access to tiny loans. Significantly, his alternative banking system not only helps poor people; it also provides a critique of specific aspects of capitalism. Yunus acknowledges that "capitalism is in serious crisis," and he identifies the crises in food, energy, and the environment as having a host of immediate

economic and physical causes. He contends: "[T]hey all have one thing in common. They all reflect the inadequacy of the current economic system. In each case, we confront social problems that cannot be solved solely by the free market as it is currently understood" (2009: 6). Pointing to the major upheaval of the 2008 collapse of large sectors of the global financial system, he states: "[O]ne thing is clear. The financial system has broken down because of a fundamental distortion of its basic purpose" (2009: 6). Furthermore:

> [P]overty was not created by the poor, but is rather a result of the socioeconomic system we have designed for the world … reliance on flawed concepts explains why the interactions between institutions and people have resulted in policies that produce poverty, rather than alleviate it, for so many human beings. The fault of poverty therefore lies with the top of society, with policymakers and academics. It does not reflect any lack of capability, desire, or effort on the part of the impoverished. (2007: 20)

That's a thumbnail sketch of the main ideas of his scholarship on poverty. We recognize that feminist critiques of Yunus's approaches to poverty raise important points. Yunus is neither a Marxist social thinker, nor a feminist critic, nor an antiracist scholar. Within prevailing practices of categorizing thinkers to engage with their ideas, he does not fit squarely. His rejection of a core framing assumption of capitalism makes his praxis quietly radical.

Our concern is less with the substance of Yunus's Nobel Prize-winning economics, or with the scaling up of his ideas in a global context, but rather with how the synergy of critical inquiry and critical praxis shaped his novel approach to the challenges poor people faced in rural areas. We wondered what kind of critical praxis led Yunus to follow this particular line of inquiry. Many people study rural poverty, yet poverty was not Yunus's area of scholarly expertise. Many policymakers set out to remedy poverty stemming from the global economic inequalities that we discussed in Chapter 1, yet this was not Yunus's primary goal. He did not start out within existing interpretive frameworks of intersectionality; he did not advance a gendered analysis of global capitalism and the feminization of poverty. Nor did he engage with capitalism in the same terms as Marxist political theorists. So how did he end up with a novel approach to poverty?

In a transcribed version of a talk he delivered at the City University of New York, Yunus (2014–15) describes how he became involved in his project of microcredit for the poor. Instead of approaching poverty via standard scientific research methods – i.e., by identifying questions and arguments within existing theoretical literature, framing hypotheses, and then "testing" them in the field (on poor people) – Yunus started by paying attention to poverty around him in rural Bangladesh. He describes how his work began:

> It was not because I was doing a lot of research or that I was a serious faculty member … The circumstances in which I was in Bangladesh, in that university, in that situation, kind of forces you to do something. The situation was so terrible around me, around the campus, around the country. So you feel the desperation of the situation which pushes you into doing something … the university where I was teaching was located right next to villages … so you see the terrible conditions. It's a beautiful campus, but right outside, a terrible village. (2014–15: 87)

Yunus asked himself: "Can I make myself useful to one person, even for a day?" This small question sparked what sociologist C. Wright Mills (2000) describes as the "sociological imagination" as the synergy of biography, history, and society. By beginning small and working from the bottom up of seemingly insignificant things, Yunus was able to think outside the box of prevailing economic theory and reframe his understanding of why people in rural areas are poor. He did not abandon mainstream economic theory but, rather, bracketed it by trying to view the world as poor people saw it. Informed by a new angle of vision gained by this practice, Yunus was able to generate new ideas and strategies that aimed to help the poor.

Yunus began doing little things for the villagers near his university and, in the process, began to understand village life and the life of the people. This up-close and personal, bottom-up perspective convinced him that loansharking within the village contributed to keeping poor people poor. A trained economist, Yunus knew that loansharking was far bigger than this one village and that it not only occurred within Bangladesh but was a global problem (see, e.g., Bales 1999). Helping poor people under these conditions presented a seemingly unsolvable theoretical and political puzzle. Yunus describes his moment of discovery: "Suddenly, it came to my mind that I could do something! And it was a very simple idea, and I went right on ahead. The idea was: Why don't I lend the money so that people can come to me? Then they don't have to go to loansharks. Why just go on shouting and writing articles about loansharking? I can do something by lending my money" (2014–15: 87).

This strategy of lending his own money to villagers, trusting that they would pay him back, flew in the face of conventional economic theory and practice. Yet the villagers did pay him back. As he lent the returned money to new borrowers, he realized that he could no longer cover the loans with his own money. Poor people who were economically more stable due to microcredit they received, initially from Yunus and subsequently from one another, became lenders to others who needed microcredit. His approach to banking followed principles that were dramatically different than those of traditional banking. It organized poor people to fund one another and reconfigured relationships among lenders and borrowers. His initial

loans grew into the Grameen Bank, a village bank created in 1983 that had, as of 2017, about 2,600 branches across Bangladesh serving 97 percent of the country's villages and 9 million borrowers (97 percent of whom are women). Significantly, the bank is owned by borrowers. Yunus describes how the Grameen Bank's philosophy differs from conventional banks:

> Conventional banks require collateral, that's a big catch. You have to have lots of money to get lots of money from a bank. On the very first day we said forget it. If you're asking for collateral you are not going to reach poor people because those are the people who don't have anything. So we reversed the whole thing; we don't ask for collateral. So how do you do that? We build a relationship between the people and the bank … the entire bank is based on trust. (2014–15: 88)

Yunus's philosophy of how he went about growing what eventually became a global initiative illustrates a synergy between a stance of critical praxis and critical inquiry. His decision to act, his bottom-up approach to inquiry, complemented his knowledge as a trained economist. Yunus's approach also led him toward intersectionality, but not in traditional ways. His initial project was to find ways to help poor people within existing capitalist frameworks. But this impetus spurred connections between class and gender: "I just looked at the conventional banks … Once I learned how they did it, I just went ahead and did it the opposite way. And it worked … they go to the rich; I go to the poor; they go to men; I go to women; they go to the city center; I go to the remote villages" (2014–15: 88). Moreover, because he didn't see poor people in essentialist terms, namely, as a generic poor person, or a generic woman, he was receptive to the multiple, intersecting identities of those who responded to his project. The use of the categories of class, gender, and region did not precede his project, but rather emerged from within it, with their utility tested in how they worked. Yunus came to use categories of class, gender, and location not just to explain existing problems, but to solve them.

Yunus cannot be easily categorized within any one body of scholarship or any prevailing methodology. His unique analysis and praxis bear further investigation for intersectionality scholars as they touch on relevant themes for intersectionality. For one thing, Yunus engaged in a form of activist research without needing an activist research framework or an activist researcher identity for guidance. His training within economics predisposed him away from direct action. Yet his actions over a 30-year period of working with the Grameen Bank and its related social businesses resemble features of activist research traditions that seemingly had little influence on his project.

Activist scholarship is known by many names, among them, action research, participatory action research, collaborative research, engaged research, and public intellectual. In his introduction to the edited volume, *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods*

of Activist Scholarship, Charles Hale (2008) argues that research and political engagement can be mutually enriching, and he offers a wide range of disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives on how the two have been brought together. As he points out, "the essays gathered here are intended to till a field, not to fill a container" (2008: 3). His survey of the field yielded a large number of works of the container variety – attempts to stake out definitional ground and then establish rules, procedures, and best practices, often in the tone of "how-to" manuals. In contrast, the challenge of his edited volume is to "provide a general mapping of how people think about and practice activist scholarship, while leaving the research process fully open to contradiction, serendipity, and reflexive critique" (2008: 3). The range of essays in the volume details the heterogeneity of approach and theme that falls under the heading "activist research."

Interestingly, the case of the Grameen Bank and its effectiveness in addressing rural poverty also resemble the principles of participatory action research (PAR), which entails systematic, empirical research in collaboration with representatives of the population under investigation, with the goal of action or intervention in the issues or problems being studied. PAR draws on the work of critical theorists such as Paulo Freire (1970), who stress the importance for oppressed people to interrogate and intervene in the conditions of their oppression. PAR reflects epistemological assumptions that authentic understandings of social problems require the knowledge of those directly affected by them. Local knowledge is essential to all stages of PAR, and outside researchers, from a university for example, are not experts but collaborators, who, like their local co-researchers, bring particular skills and knowledge to the research process (Brown and Rodriguez 2009: 1). There is no evidence that Yunus was aware of PAR or saw it as guiding his work. But the idea of working with poor people who define their problems, implementing remedies that work (taking action), and evaluating action by its results (improving poor people's lives as a worthy goal) permeate this case.

The Grameen Bank project resembles some of the classic dimensions of PAR and differs from others. For example, most PAR projects often focus on multiply disenfranchised populations and have explicitly political aims. Yunus worked with a multiply disenfranchised population, yet, while the project had important political implications, its initial goal was not explicitly political. Microcredit does not fit within the prevailing frames of what makes social action political, yet its outcomes had political impact. Similarly, Yunus was a co-partner in working with poor rural women. Because research was not the primary goal but rather simply a part of the process of helping poor people, this form of activist research could just as easily be described as research-informed activism. The synergy is the strength in the formation of the Grameen Bank.

Next, co-researchers can be involved in many different stages of the PAR process. As Brown and Rodriguez explain:

> Local coresearchers then have an essential role in the conceptualization, design, and implementation of the study, which can change based on factors like the needs of the population being studied, the findings, or the outcomes of the actions. Thus, the research process is more organic and dynamic than in conventional research, where the research design is predetermined and fixed. (2009: 2)

Comparing PAR to more traditional research methodology identifies some methodological challenges it faces, namely, criticisms that PAR is methodologically unspecified and overly optimistic (Brown and Rodriguez 2009: 4).

Yet the key feature distinguishing PAR from more traditional research pivots on understandings of action. Action, campaigns, or influencing policy, for example, should bring about some positive change that is relevant to the study's objectives and findings, to the context in which action occurs, and to the needs, interests, and ways of knowing and communicating of people who participated in the study. The effectiveness of the intervention, which is informed by the data, is a vital dimension for evaluating PAR's validity (Brown and Rodriguez 2009: 4). Here the Grameen Bank points to action within a sustained trajectory over a long period of time. This is not the episodic action of one study that uses PAR as a method, works briefly with disenfranchised people, then moves on to other methods to study poverty. Instead, Yunus's work with the Grameen Bank constitutes a methodology, a way of working at the synergy of inquiry and praxis that potentially enriches both and is relevant for intersectionality scholars.

What Does It Mean to Be Critical?

Our discussion of intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis raises an important question: what does it mean to be critical? As used in this book, the term "critical" means criticizing, rejecting, and/or trying to fix social problems that emerge in situations of social injustice. This meaning is drawn from twentieth-century social movements for equity, freedom, and social justice. People who were involved in social movements for anticolonial liberation struggles, women's rights, racial desegregation, and sexual freedom knew that their ideas and actions mattered. Within the specific historical setting of a desegregating and decolonizing world, being critical required a self-reflexivity of thought, feeling, and action about one's own practice, as well as openness to similar projects. Contemporary scholars and practitioners who are drawn to intersectionality often express similar sensibilities toward social inequalities and the social problems they engender. They seek analyses of

social issues that do not merely describe the world, but that take a stand. Such projects typically criticize social injustices characterizing complex social inequalities, imagine alternatives, and/or propose viable action strategies for change. The diverse critical projects described in this chapter reflect this critical sensibility.

Although this book understands intersectionality as a critical endeavor, it is not universally understood and practiced in this way. When it comes to intersectionality, it is especially important to remain mindful of the ways in which thinkers and practitioners are being critical. Surprisingly, some projects invoke intersectional rhetoric in defense of an unjust status quo, using intersectional frameworks to criticize democratic inclusion. They can use intersectionality as an analytic tool to justify social inequality. For instance, Jessie Daniels's study of white supremacist literature illustrates the way in which it identifies the connections among women, blacks, Jews, "mud people," lesbians, and various forms of mixing as the root cause of the declining fortunes of white men (Daniels 1997). Within white supremacist discourse, black men purportedly lead good white women astray, often through sexual seduction. This interracial sexual contact effectively ruins white women, yet enhances the status of black men. The "mud people," or mixed-race individuals who result from these unions, present a tangible reminder of the blurring of taboo racial boundaries. Lesbians, who are assumed to be Jewish, push their feminist values onto white women. As a result, as depicted in white supremacist literature, the mixing of races, genders, sexualities, and religions contributes to the fall of white men from places of economic and political superiority (Daniels 1997; Ferber 1998). Ironically, intersectionality as an analytic tool is deployed not as a tool for democratic inclusion, but rather to justify racial, ethnic, gender, and sexual segregation and social inequality. This example suggests that if white supremacist discourse can find a way to deploy intersectional arguments, equally contentious projects such as white nationalism, right-wing populism, and fascism may do so as well (Stanley 2018).

Using the term "critical" is also not necessarily the same as being progressive. These terms are often conflated, leaving the impression that we already know what critical means before we use it. Being progressive (or conservative for that matter) does not mean carrying a toolkit of preset "critical" beliefs from one situation to another, and mechanically applying them. This can foster a dogmatic criticality that borders on policing ideas. Instead, whether specific social actions are in fact critical is measured not through abstract ideological formulas (be they conservative, progressive, liberal, or radical), but rather by how ideas are used within specific historical and social contexts. In 1968, African American activist Fannie Lou Hamer criticized the racially segregated politics of Mississippi by demanding her right to vote; she paid dearly for her actions. By standing up to racial injustice, she lost her home,

was beaten, and jailed. We forget that in 1968 Mississippi, African Americans who tried to exercise their citizenship rights to vote were taking not just progressive, but radical action. Their actions did not need an ideological academic stamp of approval. We would do well to remember that scholarship and practice that claim the language of intersectionality and critical should reflect a synergy of inquiry and praxis.

Notes

1. Our approach to intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry draws on French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's notion of fields of power within schools and other social institutions (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977). Intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry takes various forms across academic disciplines, academic institutions, and national contexts. Within the US, for example, intersectionality is differently organized, taught, and valued in elite liberal arts colleges and within community colleges. The faculty and students in these institutions have differential access to resources that shape the content and the form of their engagement with intersectionality. An expansive notion of intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry sees intersectionality as heterogeneously organized across different colleges, universities, and other sites of knowledge production.

2. Dill continues: "Finally it is a theoretical perspective that insists on examining the multi-dimensionality of human experience" (2002: 6). We do not develop this theme in this book but point out that race/class/gender scholars understood their work as being a theoretical perspective.

3. The volume of books and PhD dissertations addressing intersectionality is also a good indicator of scholarly vitality. The variety of topics is broad and, of this writing, is growing rapidly. Intersectional frameworks are deployed within the following areas: queer/trans of color theory; critical disability studies; critical native studies; queer diaspora/migration studies; critical ethnic studies; transformative justice; reproductive justice; critical prison studies; intimate partner violence; ecological disasters; human rights; juvenile delinquency; restorative and transformative justice; globalized labor markets; media representations; digital and social media; voice, agency and political resistance; critical pedagogy; social change; and identities. We wish we had sufficient space to present this burgeoning scholarship, which promises to shape intersectionality's future directions.

4. Edited volumes or anthologies constitute the most common form of published books. Since 2000, several edited books using the term "intersectionality," as well as varying combinations of the terms "race," "class," "gender," "ethnicity," "sexuality," and

"dis/ability" in their titles, have been published. These volumes expand substantially the areas of inquiry and application of intersectional frameworks not only by making intersectionality converse with various fields and topics, but also by engaging intersectionality to tackle an array of social phenomena across the globe. Given the impossibility to render justice to the depth and breadth of this literature in such a limited space, we abstain from providing titles.

5. The number of scholarly journals publishing special issues on intersectionality has been steadily increasing. In the last decade, they have reached, along with greater content specialization, a wider geographic scope and linguistic plurality (with special issues published in other languages than in English). Interested readers can easily find these special issues through database research.

6. Scholars refer to intersectionality as a perspective (Browne and Misra 2003), a concept (Knapp 2005), a type of analysis (Nash 2008; Yuval-Davis 2006), a methodological approach (Steinbugler et al. 2006), a research paradigm (Hancock 2007b), or a measurable variable and type of data (Bowleg 2008). The latter also understands intersectionality as something we personally "experience." Such conceptualization of intersectionality underpins the use of a host of narrative methods, like autobiographies, autoethnographies and ethnographies (both personal and collective), that are frequent in intersectionality scholarship.

7. Because there has been such a vacuum in scholarship that explicitly examines how intersectionality affects research methodology, Leslie McCall's (2005) taxonomy of intersectional categorization has received considerable attention within intersectionality scholarship. Looking beyond intersectionality's mainstream, however, yields other epistemological insights. Postcolonial Chicana feminist scholar Chela Sandoval (2000) contends that methodology is not politically impartial, proposing instead a "methodology of the oppressed." As discussed in Chapter 2, activist scholarship raises new questions for intersectionality and methodology (Hale 2008).

8. This letter led to an intense Twitter campaign with the hashtag #WhyWeCantWait – referring to the 1964 book by Martin Luther King Jr. that grew out of his "Letter from a Birmingham Jail" (McClain 2014).

3
Getting the History of Intersectionality Straight?

The histories that most people learn in school typically agree upon points of origin, key figures who played important roles, and noteworthy events that fostered some important outcome. Students take exams that test them on the so-called facts and write term papers on their meaning. These authoritative versions of history may be widely accepted, yet their straight-line renditions of history typically include some groups at the expense of others and emphasize certain experiences over others. People are taught to treat these histories as universal, yet these authoritative histories typically represent partial views of the world from the perspective of dominant groups. For example, for years, the authoritative narrative of US history focused on the ideas and actions of propertied white men, leaving out everyone else. Certainly, including people of color, women, LGBTQ people, poor people, and undocumented people was an improvement, but correcting the dominant history was not enough. Instead, writing and rewriting American history reveals more complexity, multiple entanglements, and many intersecting individual and group narratives. What appeared to be straight was far from it.

Intersectionality's history cannot be neatly organized in time periods or geographic locations. Tying authors to particular decades and schools of thought, far from being neutral, divides history into periods, which often leads to oversimplified explanations. Instead, this chapter asks, how do certain histories about intersectionality's origins become authoritative at the expense of others? What kinds of intellectual and political work do these legitimate accounts achieve in academic and activist settings? What does not getting the history of intersectionality straight tell us about how power relations influence intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis?

Raising these questions from the outset, we stress that our aim is not to set the history of intersectionality straight. This chapter begins in the decades stretching from the late 1960s to the early 1980s, a period of social movement activism in the US that catalyzed many of the main ideas of intersectionality. Intersectionality's core ideas of social inequality, power, relationality, social context, complexity, and social justice were formed within the context of social movements that faced the crises of their times, primarily the challenges of colonialism, racism, sexism, militarism, and capitalist exploitation. In this context, because women of color were affected not just by one of these systems of power but by their

convergence, they formed autonomous movements that put forth the core ideas of intersectionality, albeit using different vocabularies.

Many contemporary scholars either ignore or remain unaware of this period, assuming that intersectionality did not exist prior to its naming in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Instead, they point to African American legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw's "coining" of the term as a foundational moment for intersectionality. Crenshaw's work is vital, yet we take issue with this view that intersectionality began when it was named. Choosing this particular point of origin erases the earlier period in which the synergy between intersectionality's critical inquiry and critical praxis was more pronounced and facilitates intersectionality's reframing as just another academic field. During the 1990s, the period when intersectionality became institutionalized within higher education, its institutional incorporation was neither smooth nor straight. Often conceived within some narratives as the seeming advent of intersectionality, the 1990s make sense in relation to the immediate decades that preceded them. These decades also established a context for intersectionality's subsequent global reach.

Intersectionality and Social Movement Activism

The 1960s and the 1970s constitute important decades for the elaboration of the core ideas of intersectionality. In the late 1960s, women of color engaged with the ideas and practices of the civil rights, Black Power, Chicano liberation, Red Power, and Asian American movements from within racially and ethnically segregated neighborhoods. Within these movements, women of color were typically subordinated to men, despite their titular equality with them, which constituted a different problem from those they experienced with racial, ethnic, and class segregation. Importantly, the intellectual production and activism of black, Chicana, Asian American, and indigenous women were not derivative of the so-called second-wave white feminism, but were original in their own right (Roth 2004; Springer 2005). During this period, black feminists in the US created their own political organizations, using the epithet "black feminist"; and Mexican American feminists articulated a political subjectivity as Chicana and formed an autonomous Chicana feminist movement (Arredondo et al. 2003; Garcia 1997a, 1997b).

During the 1970s, African American women expressed their ideas in political pamphlets, poetry, essays, edited volumes, art, and other creative venues within these social movements, and also involved themselves in local, grassroots community initiatives, developing, over time, intersectional sensibilities. Because African American women had not only participated in but also assumed leadership positions within the civil rights and Black Power movements, they saw the importance of testing ideas within political contexts.

Conversely, they used what they learned in social movements to frame analyses of social inequality. For example, although separated from Afro-Brazilian women by geography, linguistic difference, and different national histories, African American women understood that addressing the oppression they faced could not be solved by race-only, or class-only, or gender-only, or sexuality-only frameworks (Collins 2000).

The core ideas of intersectionality appeared in several key texts of black feminism. For example, *The Black Woman*, edited by black feminist author and essayist Toni Cade Bambara (1970), stands out as a ground-breaking publication that, using a variety of formats, assembled the ideas of African American women from diverse political perspectives. Collectively, the essays point out how black women would never gain their freedom without attending to oppressions of race and class and gender. Written for the general public, as well as for academic audiences, the fact that the volume was published at all constitutes a significant break with a politics that kept black women silent and represented by others. Despite its title, which represented the naming conventions of the times, there was no groupthink among the contributors to *The Black Woman*. Instead, this volume can be seen as an important, albeit overlooked, intersectional text that illustrates how intersectionality incorporated both inquiry and critical praxis.

Frances Beal's essay "Double Jeopardy: To Be Black and Female," published in 1969 as a pamphlet (Black Women's Manifesto), distributed by New York's Third World Women's Alliance, and reprinted the following year in *The Black Woman*, is a signature publication from this period. Beal lays out an intersectional argument to explain black women's lives. She starts with a powerful critique of capitalism and refers to racism as its "afterbirth" (1995 [1969]). Her approach is systemic: her double critique of patriarchy within the Black Power movement and of racism in the white women's liberation movement also criticizes capitalism. Beal's choice of words, the double jeopardy of race and gender, does not leave out capitalism, but intentionally situates it on a different plane. Foreshadowing contemporary intersectional scholarship, her analysis of intersectionality examines racism, sexism, and capitalism as social processes (see Hong 2008: 101). Beal's analysis of black women's life experiences, conditions, and subjectivities is firmly based on a conception of identity that is strongly associated with structural forces. She argues:

> It is idle dreaming to think of black women simply caring for their homes and children like the middle class white model. Most black women have to work to help house, feed and clothe their families. Black women make up a substantial percentage of the black working force and this is true for the poorest black family as well as the so-called "middle class" family. … Black women were never afforded any such phony luxuries. Though we have been browbeaten with this white image, the reality of the degrading and dehumanizing jobs that were relegated to us quickly dissipated this mirage of "womanhood." (1995 [1969]: 147)

Beal is clearly aware of the dirty work of domestic service and agricultural labor that black women have been forced to do because of their location within the social relations of race, gender, and class, and she builds her argument on this foundation.

Interestingly, despite Beal's contribution to black feminism as well as to the idea of intersecting oppressions, her ideas remain neglected within most narratives of intersectionality's history. Instead, the Combahee River Collective's (CRC) "A Black Feminist Statement," originally written in 1977, appears within histories of intersectionality that acknowledge social movement influences on intersectionality (CRC 1995 [1977]). The CRC statement lays out a comprehensive framework that permeated black feminist politics for years to come. Reflecting many of the ideas of Beal's pamphlet, this text focuses on how systemic oppressions of racism, patriarchy, and capitalism interlock. Unlike Beal's analysis, the CRC statement also includes heterosexism and places more emphasis on homophobia.

The context for CRC's formation is important for understanding the significance of the statement. Individual African American women had been expressing black feminist sensibilities for some time. But none had CRC's media audience nor social movements as a social context. For example, previously enslaved Sojourner Truth's "Ain't I a Woman?" speech, delivered in 1851, is a benchmark for intersectional sensibilities. Truth was an abolitionist and a feminist, yet she delivered her most famous speech, extemporaneously, to an audience of white women. She aspired to be included within feminism, yet the venue in which she delivered her most famous speech contributes to a longstanding perception among black women that feminism is primarily for white women. Anna Julia Cooper, whose brilliant book *A Voice from the South: By a Black Woman of the South* (1892) has been reclaimed by black women as a core text of black feminism, had neither a community of black feminist intellectuals nor a social movement that could transcend the late nineteenth-century politics of respectability. She developed an analysis of black women's experiences that saw intersecting oppressions of race, class, gender, and sexuality, but lacked the resources to make her voice heard (see May 2007).

But CRC was different – not only was it a collective, a community of black feminists, but it developed its intersectional analysis in the context of social movements for decolonization, desegregation, and feminism. A small group of black lesbian socialist feminists, among them Barbara Smith, Demita Frazier, Beverly Smith and Margo Okazawa-Rey initially formed the collective in 1974 as the Boston chapter of the National Black Feminist Organization (NBFO). Seeing how homophobia within the NBFO limited that organization, the group recognized the gap between their own radical political vision for social change and that of the NBFO. They broke off from the parent organization and organized politically as radical socialist black lesbians. Barbara Smith's reflections describe the political and psychological value of autonomous organizing:

> Combahee was really so wonderful because it was the first time that I could be all of who I was in the same place. That I didn't have to leave my feminism outside the door to be accepted as I would in a conservative Black political context. I didn't have to leave my lesbianism outside. I didn't have to leave my race outside, as I might in an all-white-women's context where they didn't want to know all of that. So, it was just really wonderful to be able to be our whole selves and to be accepted in that way. In the early 1970s, to be a Black lesbian feminist meant that you were a person of total courage. It was almost frightening. I spent a lot of time wondering if I would ever be able to come out because I didn't see any way that I could be Black and a feminist and a lesbian. I wasn't thinking so much about being a feminist. I was just thinking about how could I add lesbian to being a Black woman. It was just like no place for us. That is what Combahee created, a place where we could be ourselves and where we were valued. A place without homophobia, a place without racism, a place without sexism. (Barbara Smith interview, in Harris 1999: 10)

Truth and Cooper were people of courage, yet in the absence of widespread collective black activism, neither could find CRC's space of freedom.

From the CRC's perspective, the fact that NBFO "did not interrogate heterosexism as an oppressive force in black women's lives" (Springer 2005: 130) and the qualms about the alleged influence of Black lesbians within the organization (210–11) contributed to the necessity of a separate organization. The CRC statement clearly conveys a view of sexuality as a system of power (heterosexism) that is part and parcel of interlocking systems of oppression, and not an add-on: "A combined anti-racist and antisexist position drew us together initially, and as we developed politically we addressed ourselves to heterosexism and economic oppression under capitalism" (CRC 1995 [1977]: 234). Smith has a sophisticated analysis of capitalism, a fact that is evident in the statement itself.

Because authoritative histories of intersectionality mostly start in the 1990s – i.e., 15 years after the CRC statement – they exclude important ideas that were laid out in this key text of intersectionality. For example, the statement is the first document to frame identity through an intersectional lens and to present identity politics as a vital tool of resistance. Significantly, CRC's understanding of identity politics is built upon "the multilayered texture of black women's lives" (1995 [1977]: 235) that framed the experiences that black women gained by their placement within intersecting power relations. Identity politics politicized a shared structural position through inquiry and praxis:

> This focusing upon our own oppression is embodied in the concept of identity politics. We believe that the most profound and potentially most radical politics come directly out of our own identity, as opposed to working to end somebody else's oppression. … sexual politics under patriarchy is as pervasive in Black women's lives as are the politics of class and race. We … find it difficult to separate race from class from sex oppression because in our lives they are most often experienced simultaneously. We know that there is such a thing as racial-sexual oppression which is neither solely racial nor solely sexual. (1995 [1977]: 234)

This comprehensive perception of identity politics advanced by the CRC resonated with identity politics as expressed by indigenous women. For example, Kanien'kéha (Mohawk) scholar, lawyer, and educator-activist, Patricia Monture-Angus argues:

> Some Aboriginal women have turned to the feminist or women's movement to seek solace (and solution) in the common oppression of women. I have a problem with perceiving this as a full solution. I am not just woman. I am a Mohawk woman. It is not solely my gender through which I first experience the world, it is my culture (and/or race) that precedes my gender. Actually, if I am object of some form of discrimination, it is very difficult for me to separate what happens to me because of my gender and what happens to me because of my race and culture. My world is not experienced in a linear and compartmentalized way. I experience the world simultaneously as Mohawk and as woman. It seems as though I cannot repeat this message too many times. To artificially separate my gender from my race and culture forces me to deny the way I experience the world. Such denial has devastating effects on Aboriginal constructions of reality. (1995: 177–8)

Contemporary renditions of identity politics generally miss the fact that the identity politics articulated in the CRC statement, and, more generally, expressed by women of color within social movements, are collective and structural. As the following excerpt makes clear, structural analysis is central to the CRC's understanding of the compound nature of the oppressions they encounter:

> We are actively committed to struggling against racial, sexual, heterosexual, and class oppression and see as our particular task the development of integrated analysis and practice based on the fact that the major systems of oppression are interlocking. … The synthesis of these oppressions creates the condition of our lives. As Black women we see Black feminism as the logical political movement to combat the manifold and simultaneous oppressions that all women of color face. … We need to articulate the real class situation of persons who are not merely raceless, sexless workers, but for whom racial and sexual oppression are significant determinants in their working/economic lives. (1995 [1977]: 232, 235)

The analysis is not only structural, pointing to race, gender, sexuality, and class oppression, but also integrated. By using such terms as "interlocking," "manifold," "simultaneous," and "synthesis," the analysis treats oppression as resulting from the relational operations of major systems of oppression that form a complex social structure of inequality. The CRC also emphasized crafting integrated analytical and political tools in order to combat interlocking systems of oppression. The key ideas encapsulated in the statement operate on two fronts: theory and politics. Theory is needed, but cannot be the end point, for there are political needs and struggles. The experiences that emerge from political struggles can catalyze an enriched conceptual vocabulary for understanding intersecting oppressions, yet unexamined experience is also not enough. The synergy of ideas and actions is important. In this regard, the "we" of the statement foreshadows the "we" within subsequent anthologies by women of color. The more expansive "we" of collective identity politics, "is not a homogeneous subjectivity, but a collective space that accounts for the particularities of location" (Norman 2007: 112).

Given the historical discrimination against women of African descent, it is tempting to grant African American women ownership over the seeming discovery of the then unnamed intersectionality. However, in the US, African American women were part of heterogeneous alliances with Chicanas and Latinas, indigenous women, and Asian American women. Though their experiences and the social movements they joined and organized took different forms, these groups were at the forefront of raising claims about the interconnectedness of race, class, gender, and sexuality in their everyday life experiences, as well as how intersectional analyses were central to their political aspirations.

Multiple narratives of intersectionality

Examining how black, indigenous, and women of color (BIWOC) in the US approached the task of their own empowerment within and across different racial/ethnic communities and in different national contexts demonstrates varying patterns of how race, class, gender, and

sexuality were negotiated in the context of social movement politics. For example, African American women and Chicanas confronted the task of incorporating gender into prevailing race/class arguments of black and Chicano nationalist movements, as well as incorporating race and class into a feminist movement that advanced gender-only arguments. In this context, intersectional analyses concerning race, class, gender, and sexuality were honed within and across multiple social movements.

Chicanas were engaged in similar struggles to those of African American women for intellectual and political empowerment within the confines of social movement politics that emphasized questions of colonialism and nation (Blackwell 2011). Both Chicana and African American feminism came of age during the same decades – the 1970s and early 1980s – from within grassroots activist movements and, in the case of Latina feminism, in the work of Chicana writers; as a result, a similar impetus is expressed by both groups toward intersectionality. As with African American feminism, Chicana/Latina feminism too laid a foundation for the emergence of intersectionality (Zinn and Zambrana 2019).

The work of Gloria Anzaldúa remains central to the emergence both of Latina feminism and of intersectionality. As AnaLouise Keating points out, Anzaldúa is generally recognized as a "Chicana lesbian-feminist" author, but Anzaldúa described herself more broadly as being within borderland space, namely, on the thresholds between multiple collectivities. Note the intersectional sensibilities that Anzaldúa expresses when she locates herself in relation to the multiple communities that claim her:

> "Your allegiance is to La Raza, the Chicano movement," say the members of my race. "Your allegiance is to the Third World," say my Black and Asian friends. "Your allegiance is to your gender, to women," say the feminists. Then there's my allegiance to the Gay movement, to the socialist revolution, to the New Age, to magic and the occult. And there's my affinity of literature, to the world of the artist. What am I? *A third world lesbian feminist with Marxist and mystic leanings*. They would chop me up into little fragments and tag each with a label. (Keating 2009: 2)

Anzaldúa found a way to position herself within multiple political projects without rejecting the people who were central to those projects. By claiming borderland space, she helped create the conditions for a broad, robust understanding of intersectionality. Her classic volume *Borderlands/La Frontera* (1987) not only influenced Chicana cultural theory; it remains an important core text for studies of race, class, gender, and sexuality. And her work on mestiza consciousness, nepantla (in-between space), and relationality became important sources of inspiration for the next generation of radical feminist and queer of color scholars and activists and their engagement with intersectionality.

Like Anzaldúa, other Chicana/Latina feminists also demonstrated a commitment to working collectively within political communities as part of their intellectual and political work. In this way, their ideas and actions catalyzed their work on intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis. In the early 1980s, Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa edited *This Bridge Called My Back*, an important collection of the writings of radical women of color with different ethnic, racial, and colonial experiences (black, Chicana and Latina, indigenous, and Asian American feminists). Like other pioneering anthologies by radical feminists of color of the 1980s, it incorporates articles, essays, testimonials, poetry, and artwork (Moraga and Anzaldúa 2015 [1983]).[1]

This tradition of collective work, bringing together the writings of feminists of color from different ethnic, religious, linguistic, and racial backgrounds, as well as different sexualities and gender identities, persists, for example, in the volume edited by the Latina Feminist Group, founded in 1993, *Telling to Live: Latina Feminist Testimonios* (2001). This anthology illustrates the vision forged by radical feminists of color of the 1970s and 1980s who sought to foster cross-movement dialogs and engage creatively with their differences (class, religious, ethnic, racial, linguistic, sexual, and national differences – or different combinations of them), rather than muting them for the sake of unity. As Aurora Levins Morales puts it, they rely on a conception of "women of color" that "is not an ethnicity. It is one of the inventions of solidarity, an alliance, a political necessity that is not the given name of every female with dark skin and a colonized tongue, but rather a choice about how to resist and with whom" (Latina Feminist Group 2001: 100). Through their *testimonios* (testimonies, or life stories), the contributors reclaim and regenerate the tradition of knowledge-building based on their lived realities, politicizing their identities and fostering dialogic possibilities with other subordinated knowledge traditions. As the collective authors point out in the introduction to the anthology, *"testimonio* has been critical in movements of liberation in Latin America, offering an artistic form and methodology to create politicized understandings of identity and community" (Latina Feminist Group 2001: 3).

Creating university courses and programs that grew from social movement activism also played a noteworthy role during intersectionality's formative decades. For example, the University of California at Berkeley and San Francisco State University were important social locations for the emergence and structuring of Asian American feminism. The launching of the first Asian American journal, *Asian Women*, in 1971, originated from the efforts of Asian American women enrolled in college courses. Besides Moraga and Anzaldúa's *This Bridge*, which included works of Asian American feminists, two other anthologies published in the late 1980s were important for the formation of Asian American feminism: *Making Waves* (AWUC 1989) and *The Forbidden Stitch* (Lim and Tsutakawa

1989), which brought together the writings, including short stories, poems, and artwork, of Asian American women from different ethnic and national backgrounds, specifically, Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Korean, Vietnamese, and Indian. Other noteworthy examples include Esther Ngan-Ling Chow's 1987 article that invokes "cross-pressures" faced by Asian American women and highlights the importance of a multiple lens; the article examines lived realities of Asian American women as part of organizing Asian American feminism. Lisa Lowe's 1991 essay on heterogeneity, hybridity, and multiplicity provides an original conceptualization of Asian American differences. In the 1990s, Asian American feminism also developed affinities with transnational feminisms. These ties were valuable for questioning the taken-for-granted treatment of categories of nation, nation-state, and nationalism within early intersectional thinking.

Indigenous feminisms have been particularly noteworthy in denaturalizing the legitimacy of colonial nation-states and white settler societies. Indigenous feminist consciousness, as an acquired political standpoint, is not dissociated from questions such as those of indigenous sovereignty and the respect for treaties. The nexus of power they face includes colonialism as well as patriarchy, white supremacy, and poverty. Importantly, indigenous feminisms center anticolonial practice within their organizing as well as in their discourses. They often express the aim of decolonizing the colonized mentality (interpersonal domain of power), which is captured in the anthology *Unsettling Ourselves* (Unsettling Minnesota 2009). This decolonial work offers a counter-history of feminism to dominant narratives. Contesting dominant feminist frameworks that divide feminism into "waves," indigenous feminists argue that they did not appear suddenly during the third wave in order to bring diversity into mainstream feminism. As Andrea Smith, feminist scholar, activist, and co-founder of INCITE!, aptly posits:

> This periodization situates white middle-class women as the central historical agents to which women of colour attach themselves. However, if we were to recognize the agency of indigenous women in an account of feminist history, we might begin with 1492 when Native women collectively resisted colonization. This would allow us to see that there are multiple feminist histories emerging from multiple communities of colour which intersect at points and diverge in others. This would not negate the contributions made by white feminists, but would de-center them from our historicizing and analysis. (2009: 159)

Indigenous/Native studies scholars were also at the forefront of efforts to bring sexuality and queer theory into the field of indigenous studies but, unlike other critical conversations between theories/fields, theirs were particularly articulated with questions of indigenous sovereignty and oriented toward unsettling or queering settler colonialism (Driskill et al.

2011; Rifkin 2011). Needless to say, the spirit presiding over such theoretical dialogs that nourish emergent queer indigenous studies is deeply infused with radical relationality (LaDuke 1999) and resonates with several core components of intersectional thinking.

Black women, Chicana and Latina women, Asian American women, and indigenous/Aboriginal/Native women have distinct histories, yet their activist and intellectual work has also been shaped by ongoing collaboration among these groups. These distinctive social movements by BIWOC developed systemic understandings of oppression and also focused on personal life experiences that privileged an individual and collective identity politics. For instance, in 1970, the Black Women's Alliance of New York City, in collaboration with the Puerto Rican women's movement, launched the Third World Women's Alliance. They used the term "Third World" to display their solidarity with ongoing anticolonialist and anti-imperialist struggles and their opposition to the Vietnam War, a sensibility that Gloria Anzaldúa (1987) expresses in her work on the borderlands. In their newsletter, named *Triple Jeopardy* and subtitled *Racism, Imperialism, Sexism*, they clearly identify "capitalism as the context for the triple jeopardy countenanced by women of color," and address the components of triple jeopardy "as systems, not individual identities, oppressions, or experiences" (see Aguilar 2012: 421).

Because of where they were situated and because many of them had migrated from different places within the British Empire, women of color or "racialized" women in Britain faced a different set of concerns from their counterparts in the US. They also founded an autonomous social movement forged around blackness as a coalitional political identity; in this context, "black" merged black African, South Asian, and Caribbean experiences of domination (Bryan et al. 1997 [1985]; Mirza 1997). One of the most decisive influences on black women's politics in Britain, the Organization of Women of Asian and African Descent (OWAAD), active between 1978 and 1983, was organized "on the basis of Afro-Asian unity" that the use of the term "black" strived to forge into a coalitional political identity. This did not come without difficulties: internally, it meant finding ways of working with and through differences between women of African and Asian descent who were situated differently in relation to former colonial powers. As Beverley Bryan, Stella Dadzie, and Suzanne Scafe, all veterans of the OWAAD, have made clear: "When we use the term 'Black', we use it as a political term. It doesn't describe the skin colour, it defines our situation here in Britain. We're here as a result of British imperialism, and our continued oppression in Britain is the result of British racism" (1997: 43). Despite their commitment to women's empowerment, the OWAAD also explicitly rejected the term "feminism": "We are not feminists – we reject that label because we feel that it represents a white ideology. In our culture the term is associated with an ideology and practice which is anti-men. We don't alienate men because

they put down Black women, because we recognize that the source of that is white imperialist culture."

By the late 1970s and into the 1980s, the core ideas in social movement settings began to develop a shared vocabulary, or signifiers of intersectionality. One of the earliest vocabularies of intersectionality is "jeopardy" – for example, Beal's (1995 [1969]) discussion of the double jeopardy of race and sex in the context of capitalism. Subsequent variations include "triple jeopardy" in the work of Beverly Lindsay (1979) and in activist publications like the aforementioned newsletter of the Third World Women Alliance (see Aguilar 2012), and "multiple jeopardy" in the work of Deborah King (1988). Lindsay argues that the concept of triple jeopardy, namely, the interaction of sexism, racism, and economic oppression, constitutes "the most realistic perspective for analysing the position of black American women; and this perspective will serve as common linkage among the discussions of other minority women" (1979: 328), such as Indigenous/Native American, Chicana, and Asian American women. Lindsay aims to find a common ground to foster collaboration among women of color. Working within sociology, King uses an array of noteworthy terms such as "multiplicative effects," "interactive oppressions," and "nexus" – a set of synthetically linked elements – which help her avoid the pitfalls of additive approaches and pave the way for the metaphor of intersectionality. There are many other signifiers of intersectionality in these formative years. We have already described CRC's use of terms such as "interlocking systems of oppression," "simultaneous," and "manifold" to describe what Patricia Hill Collins would later call "the matrix of domination" (2000). Our close reading of selected intellectual works from black and indigenous women and women of color during intersectionality's formative years uncovers its truly original combination: a way of interconnecting personal experiences and structural analyses of interlocking oppressions without skirting the meaning of life experiences, multiple identifications, and political communities.

Intersectionality's Institutional Incorporation in the Academy

In the 1980s and 1990s, social movements went into abeyance, with political protest taking on different forms (Taylor 1989). Activism persisted, although not in the forms it had taken in the 1960s and 1970s. In the era of visible social movements, people took to the streets and engaged in social protest such as marches, boycotts, press conferences, and demonstrations. They demanded changes in schools, housing, employment, healthcare, and policing. One important issue across social movements concerned how social institutions not only excluded many social groups from jobs, schooling, and housing, but also discriminated

against people when they were included. Much of this political activity occurred outside these major political institutions, often linked to a demand for fairness through inclusion.

In contrast, in the 1980s and 1990s, social institutions responded to these criticisms of exclusion by recruiting formerly excluded people. Whether willingly or under court order, schools and employers sought to remedy the discriminatory practices that upheld social inequality. One outcome was that political activists moved inside those same institutions, often recruited by the same businesses, schools, and government agencies whose exclusionary practices they had protested. People got elected to political office, found jobs at social service agencies, and moved into administrative positions in hospitals, schools, and government agencies. Moreover, these same people were often tasked with fixing the very problems of exclusion that they had identified within social movement settings.

Within colleges and universities, this transition from visible social movement politics to institutional incorporation had important implications for intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis. Many African American women, Latinas, Asian American women, women from indigenous groups, and poor and working-class white women who had been involved in social movement activism found themselves inside the very same institutions that had formerly excluded them. During the 1980s and 1990s, individuals from formerly excluded groups entered colleges and universities as graduate students, instructors, assistant professors, university staff, and administrators. Far more women from these historically excluded groups remained outside social institutions, demonstrating the need for ongoing grassroots social justice projects outside academia.

Not all these political actors brought social movement sensibilities and experiences with them into academia. But many did. Women of color and their allies carried with them into the academy ideas such as the multiplicity of oppressions, the importance of identity politics, and the significance of structural transformation that shaped their understanding of institutional incorporation. Like the women in Dill's study of race, class, and gender scholars (see Chapter 2), these groups brought a sensibility of "working at the intersections" with them. In essence, social movements themselves may have moved into abeyance, yet this constituted a strategic political shift (Taylor 1989).

Had social movements not fought for the inclusion of women and people of color in colleges and universities, conceptions of intersectionality advanced by social movement actors were unlikely to have emerged within academia. Alice Walker, Angela Davis, Nikki Giovanni, Barbara Smith, and other important figures within black feminism and intersectionality had experiences with social movements. Gaining access to academic positions enabled African American women directly to bring ideas from black feminist politics with them into the academy through the multiple projects of black feminism, race/class/gender studies, ethnic

studies, and Chicano studies. Major works by African American women that established the groundwork for what came to be known as intersectionality included June Jordan's *Civil Wars* (1981), Audre Lorde's classic volume *Sister Outsider* (1984), and Angela Davis's ground-breaking volume *Women, Race and Class* (1981). In works such as these, one can see how black women's intellectual production contained an explicit analysis of the interconnectedness of race, class, gender, and sexuality as systems of power that were explicitly tied to varying social justice projects catalyzed by their involvement in social movement politics (Collins 2000). The corpus of Gloria Anzaldúa's work (1987) was also immensely important during this period of incorporation, providing important categories of analysis such as mestiza consciousness and nepantla (in-between space).

When black and Latina feminists and political actors from similar social movements entered academic environments, they not only brought ideas that were honed in social movement settings. They also encountered academic norms that were antithetical to many of these views. Ideas from social movement settings, such as the significance of social inequality as an important subject of study, attending to interconnected power relations, and the value of social justice as an ethical framework, simply did not match prevailing norms of bona fide scholarship. When black feminism, Chicana feminism, and similar social justice initiatives became incorporated into the academy, their primary focus on social justice, which had been taken for granted within social movement politics, could no longer be assumed. Within social movement settings, the CRC, for example, had no need to make a case that social justice mattered – they began their analysis with this assumption. In contrast, institutional incorporation for race/class/gender studies meant defending the social justice and political sensibilities of heterogeneous social movements within an academic context with its own conventions concerning politics and ethics.

The initial naming of the field as race/class/gender studies reflected the unstable relationships among various social movements, each of which was engaged in trying to figure out its relation to the other, now occurring within colleges and universities. By this expansion into the academy, "race/class/gender" found itself fighting for space and legitimacy within prevailing academic politics. As academic incorporation progressed, the strategies and arguments associated with race/class/gender studies shifted. Survival within academia meant recasting the dynamic, messy politics associated with social movements into race/class/gender studies as a more recognizable field of academic study. Initially, race/class/gender studies and similar interdisciplinary projects aimed to transform the academy (Dill et al. 2009; Parker et al. 2010). Yet, over time, it became apparent that institutional transformation would be easier to imagine than to achieve.

This interim phase of race/class/gender studies in the 1980s confronted the dilemma of holding fast to forms of critical inquiry and praxis honed within social movements and, at the same time, adhering to the norms of academia. Race/class/gender studies also confronted new challenges in the academy. First, colleges and universities staunchly resisted the incorporation of such programs. Recall Dill's observation that incorporation was "done in the face of indifference and hostility. Scholars engaged in building programs in women's studies, ethnic studies, and in lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender studies have had their intellect, their scholarship, their professionalism, and even their sanity questioned" (Dill 2009: 229). Second, the relations between various study programs were far from harmonious. The various new fields of study often inherited distinctive histories and bodies of scholarship explaining social inequality, and the concept of race/class/gender challenged these approaches. Some of the early attempts at coalition building within the academy faced the intellectual and political challenges of trying to work across the boundaries that separated these fields. For example, Zinn et al.'s classic article "The Cost of Exclusionary Practices in Women's Studies" (1986) analyzes some of the issues of intersections of race and gender within women's studies. How would this field with the placeholder name of race/class/gender negotiate these far-reaching, dynamic, and often contested concerns?

Finally, could race/class/gender studies continue its intellectual growth without some sort of common framework? How would the emerging area of sexuality studies and similar interdisciplinary endeavors interface with race/class/gender studies? The name "race/class/gender studies" raised additional concerns, as did the diminished attention to class analysis within US disciplines as well as calls to integrate nation, ethnicity, and ability into the growing field. How might race/class/gender studies distinguish critical projects drawing on social movement sensibilities from those that did not?

Using the term "intersectionality" to rename the field of race/class/gender studies seemingly addressed these challenges. A new umbrella term might enable coalition building among the exponentially growing and often competing segments within the field. Renaming the field might also help legitimate the kind of scholarship produced within these areas by making it more compatible with academic norms of discovery, authorship, and ownership.

As already stated in the previous section, prevailing stories of the emergence of intersectionality routinely claim that Kimberlé Crenshaw "coined" the term "intersectionality," in her *Stanford Law Review* article "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color" (1991). Like law students and legal scholars who helped launch the field of critical race studies, Crenshaw was ideally positioned to write this particular article. She was familiar with social movements both inside and outside academia. Her grounding in law provided an expansive

view of law both as a site of repression and as a site of social justice. She also saw the possibilities offered by the so-called linguistic turn within social theory in the 1990s. Legal arguments are narratives, a particular kind of storytelling that links the cultural domain of power to structural power relations.

Because "Mapping the Margins" is most often cited as the point of origin for intersectionality, it constitutes a pivotal document in marking the translation of understandings of intersectionality emanating from black and Chicana feminism and similar social justice projects, and understandings of intersectionality within academia. Yet a close reading of the article serves to bridge understandings of intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis honed within social movement settings and intersectionality as a legitimate field of academic inquiry. Stated differently, Crenshaw seemingly "coined" the term "intersectionality," but her ground-breaking work actually did far more than this. "Mapping the Margins" identifies an important marker that shows not only intersectionality's growing acceptance in academia, but also how this acceptance subsequently reconfigured intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis.

Several features of Crenshaw's article foreshadow subsequent focal points within intersectionality, some of which have been warmly embraced, others of which remain points of contention within the field (Collins and Chepp 2013; Collins 2019). First, she focuses on the experiences of women of color, a devalued group from the perspective of academia, as well as within broader US society. She argues that the experiences of women of color are important in and of themselves, but become especially significant in understanding and remedying important social issues. She also recognizes that the term "women of color" rests on a solidarity that has to be constructed and not assumed. Crenshaw works within the tenets of standpoint epistemology, acknowledging that experience matters, not simply in incorporating the experiences of individual knowers, but also in seeing women of color as differentially placed as knowledge creators (see Collins 1998a: 201–8). Distinctive angles of vision and challenges accompany differential social locations, a theme developed via Crenshaw's attention to the different experiences that women of color have with domestic violence. All discourses come from a particular standpoint, yet those of women of color are often obscured.

Second, Crenshaw places herself within her narrative where she self-identifies as a "black feminist." Via this move, she signals a particular epistemological stance for scholars, especially scholars of color, who engage in black feminism, race/class/gender studies, and/or intersectional knowledge projects. Experience and embodied knowledge are valorized, as is the theme of responsibility and accountability that accompanies such knowledge.

Third, Crenshaw argues that the needs of women of color cannot be met by looking at one category of analysis. Her innovation lies in building her argument from the ground up from the experiences of women of color and then showing how multiple systems of power are inseparable in the ways they impact their lives. Mutually constructing systems of power produce distinctive social locations for individuals and groups within them. In this case, women of color's multiple identities position them differently within complex social inequalities than white men or white women.

Fourth, Crenshaw's article expresses a social justice ethos that assumes that more comprehensive analyses of social problems will yield more effective social actions in response. Why write this article on women of color and violence at all, if not to provide some insight for social justice initiatives?

Fifth, Crenshaw's article contains an emphasis on relationality. By introducing the term "intersectionality," she questions the nature of the relations between and within the entities that are intersecting. She draws from the ideas of women of color developed in actual social movements who came to see that this issue of relationships was crucial – it was not enough to have a common enemy; rather, they had to figure out patterns of interconnectedness. Crenshaw's argument carries this nuance in that she includes several groups under the umbrella category "women of color," with attention to the specificities and commonalities of their experiences with domestic violence. Because they had to figure out how various individuals and social movements might work together, this attentiveness to relationality and its significance for coalitional politics is significant.

To sum up: "Mapping the Margins" (1) identifies several main ideas of intersectionality that reappear across intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry, for example, relationality, power relations, and social justice; (2) demonstrates how to use intersectionality as an analytic tool; and (3) marks an important transitional moment within intersectionality's history. In other words, it shows what persisted, what became muted, and what disappeared (Collins 2015, 2019).

Crenshaw's "coining" of the term did therefore turn out to be a pivotal moment for intersectionality, but not in the way that is currently understood within an emerging canon of intersectionality's history. Across numerous journal articles, one sees the same language of "coining" repeated verbatim. These practices not only routinely neglect the writings and activities of many people who came before Crenshaw, but they also misread the full extent of Crenshaw's arguments. They also ignore her subsequent work, which has advanced intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis (see, for example, our discussion of Crenshaw's work with the AAPF in Chapter 2 and her involvement with global human rights in Chapter 4). Crenshaw builds upon the ideas of the CRC not only to name intersectionality,

but also to: (1) draw links between individual identity and collective identity; (2) keep a focus on social structures; (3) theorize the power relations of violence against women of color to highlight the structural, political, and representational dynamics of power; and (4) remind readers that the purpose of intersectional scholarship lies in its contributions to social justice initiatives. Crenshaw is clearly advocating for intersectionality as a social justice construct, not as a theory of truth disconnected from social justice concerns. Yet this aspect of her work is increasingly neglected.

"Mapping the Margins" may have been so well received, in part, because it demonstrated the ability to position the sensibilities of social movement politics and its commitment to social justice initiatives in relation to the growing significance of postmodern and poststructuralist analyses within the late twentieth-century academy. Crenshaw thus spoke to two primary audiences within academia. First, her work spoke to activists and scholars whose social movement sensibilities embraced the social justice ethos of intersectionality, for example, race/class/gender scholars and those in the emerging field of critical race studies. Second, the poststructuralist, narrative dimension of her analysis was also well received by scholars who saw the value of narrative traditions and truth-telling. Crenshaw's piece thus aimed to challenge academic norms. Yet, for many of its readers, it also fit comfortably within them.

Crenshaw's article provides a useful snapshot of an important moment of transition for contemporary canon formation when intersectionality as an ostensibly novel construct traveled into academia and had to adapt to its new social context. Ironically, as the structural contours of social movement politics of the 1960s and 1970s receded into the past, intersectionality's incorporation into the academy in the 1990s seemingly uncoupled it from its social justice moorings and overshadowed its understandings of critical praxis. Intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis shifted from bottom-up knowledge projects, reflected in Crenshaw's ability to draw from grassroots politics, to top-down knowledge projects whose structural contours were increasingly shaped by the theoretical frameworks and normative practices of academia.

Intersectionality's academic incorporation has taken many forms and has fostered new debates among scholars. Take, for example, the issue of intersectionality's connections to gender and feminism. In the US, where there is a tradition of critical race theory, intersectionality has evolved more holistically, not exclusively as a gender theory, which also has a bearing on how scholars take up issues of gender and social class. To provide but one example, Hurricane Katrina (in 2005) catalyzed considerable scholarship that drew upon intersectionality to explain why this seemingly natural disaster had such a disproportionate impact on poor and black people. The majority of scholars emphasized its links to class and racial politics, pointing to government action or inaction as significant in explaining deaths

and other outcomes (Hartman and Squires 2006; Johnson 2011). Gender was often a dimension within this analysis, but not a determining feature. But as it became apparent that women and children faced special challenges, such as being forcibly relocated to cities far from their families, or attending new schools, the gendered nature of this disaster became more visible. What initially began as a focus on race and class, expanded to incorporate issues of gender. Moreover, as so-called natural disasters become an increasingly common global phenomenon, intersectional scholarship on Hurricane Katrina provides a foundation for subsequent work on how the effects of climate change are differentially felt across categories of race, class, gender, age, and geographic location.

Intersectionality does important intellectual work in relation to broader social issues such as disaster research and climate change primarily because its flexible framework allows for multiple relationships among categories. The aforementioned incorporation of race, class, nation, and gender emerged over time, and this way of working, by adding categories of analysis, builds complexity into intersectionality. Yet intersectionality also remains strongly associated with women and gender studies, to the point where some people assume that a gendered analysis is a required dimension of intersectional scholarship. Faculty and students in women's and gender studies programs have been standard-bearers for advancing intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis in academia, a fact that has been important for intersectionality's academic visibility and impact. Just as the relationship between intersectionality and critical disability studies and queer of color scholarship remains an ongoing site of negotiation, so too is the relationship between intersectionality and women's, gender, and sexuality studies. When Kathy Davis, a prominent feminist thinker, published an article titled "Intersectionality as a Buzzword: A Sociology of Science Perspective on What Makes a Feminist Theory Successful" (2008), intersectionality was categorized as a form of feminist theory. But is this accurate?

The ways in which intersectionality is tied to gender are neither obvious nor smooth. This is especially true in Europe, where it has become a cliché to declare intersectionality the brainchild of feminism (Bilge 2013). Take the call for papers from the *Italian Review of Sociology* for its special issue on intersectionality (March 2016). The call presented intersectionality as follows: "The notion of intersectionality has been present in international debate for at least twenty years, but only in recent times has this concept spread beyond the field of gender studies where it was originally elaborated." This understanding of intersectionality's trajectory misreads its origins within the field of race/class/gender studies as intersectional because it grappled with the relationships between race and class and gender. What is notable is that these sociologists acknowledge the potential of intersectionality for disciplinary sociology provided that its analytical range

is extended beyond their perception that it is limited to gender studies: "The idea of intersectionality represents nowadays an important analytical device in sociological theoretical debate and research not only in gender studies and discrimination, but also in the investigation of social stratification and social agency."

The patterns of how intersectionality's critical inquiry have been taken up within the academy also continue to raise important definitional debates concerning what counts as intersectionality (Collins 2015). A renewed focus on methodology constitutes one outcome of these definitional debates within intersectional scholarship. Students, faculty, and scholars who aim to use intersectionality as an analytic lens wonder whether the methods they are using are in fact "intersectional." For graduate students and researchers, the core question concerns how intersectionality can be conceptualized within a particular research design that is simultaneously attentive to the core ideas of intersectionality and that makes a good faith effort to deploy intersectionality as an analytic tool in the face of such uncertainty.

These definitional debates are far from benign because they speak to what counts as intersectional scholarship and to what criteria determine what counts (Collins 2019). Seemingly simple questions can foster major controversies. For example, does gender always have to be present for intersectional scholarship to be intersectional enough? Does race always have to be included? Does a study that uses more categories, for example, class and sexuality and age and ethnicity, provide a superior approach than a study that uses fewer categories? In what ways, if any, should intersectional scholarship embrace seemingly political goals, for example, decolonizing knowledge by decolonizing methodology (see Tuhiwai Smith 2012). There are no one-size-fits-all answers to these thorny questions. Yet because intersectionality as a form of critical praxis is attentive to how power relations shape knowledge, it provides guidance on how to ground these broader theoretical concerns.

What's in a Name?

When the term "intersectionality" began to be used in the 1990s, it seemed to be a good fit for this emerging form of the critical inquiry and praxis that worked in border spaces between social movements and academic politics. Yet naming also raised a new challenge that was associated with straightening intersectionality's history. Contemporary renditions of intersectionality's past increasingly bypass altogether the heterogeneous forms that intersectionality took during the period of social movement politics. Instead, they confine themselves to locating a point of origin in the early 1990s within the academy, typically by identifying Crenshaw as intersectionality's foremother, and then constructing a straight-line narrative from that point of origin. Intersectionality seemingly didn't exist until it was

discovered by academics and named and legitimated within academia. Via institutional amnesia that rewrites history, entire categories of people who were central to intersectionality's inception become erased from the intersectional canon.

What might explain intersectionality's patterns of incorporation in the academy, especially its rapid reception after it got a name? One would think that during the pivotal decades where neoliberalism gained legitimacy, an increasingly market-oriented university would not welcome women's studies, race/class/gender studies, black studies, ethnic studies, and similar projects that criticized the academy. Paradoxically, the opposite happened. Through incorporation, universities effectively suppressed the transformative and potentially disruptive dimensions of these critical projects (Bilge 2014).

Here, looking at the varying ways in which intersectionality can be critical, as discussed in Chapter 2, becomes important. Some scholars see intersectionality as a tool for critical intervention and use it as an analytic tool to facilitate important institutional changes within their universities and related social institutions. For example, Canadian sociologist Olena Hankivsky (2012) supports "diversity mainstreaming," arguing that integrating intersectionality into all stages of health policy formation fosters holistic equality in health policymaking processes. Likewise, in assessing an Equality and Diversity Mainstreaming program in Northern Ireland, Barbara Bagilhole (2010) argues that intersectionality is useful for avoiding prevailing gender-first approaches. Some scholars argue that intersectionality would benefit from a better disciplinary integration, for instance sociology of stratification (Walby 2007; Yuval-Davis 2011b). Others, more skeptical about the positive outcomes of institutionalizing intersectionality, have suggested that incorporation depoliticizes and co-opts intersectionality (Erel et al. 2008). Yet many scholars see institutionalization as a complex issue that should be tackled with caution.

Other scholars point out specific problems with intersectionality's institutional incorporation. Some claim that the forms of black feminism and intersectionality that are increasingly institutionalized within the academy are no longer critical enough (Alexander-Floyd 2012; Bilge 2013, 2014). Yet such criticism does not imply that counter-histories, such as the one presented here that connects intersectionality to social movements, romanticize intersectionality's pre-institutional period as if it were unaffected by power's operations of capitalism and the state.

We make no effort to resolve these tensions, but point instead to certain strategies that might help. In this chapter, we offered a critical reading of intersectionality's history by claiming at the outset that there is no one legitimated story. We also presented a critical reading of intersectionality's legitimated history that shows the effects of how what's missing shapes contemporary understandings of what intersectionality is becoming. For

instance, the close readings presented here of Beal's race and gender analysis as embedded in capitalism, the robust identity politics as holistic social justice praxis advanced in the works of the CRC, and Crenshaw's understandings of intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and practice all illustrate how different histories of intersectionality might foster different contemporary understandings of what intersectionality is. In this chapter, we have examined lesser-known texts precisely because their framing assumptions are being lost to a new generation of intersectionality scholars and practitioners. In many cases, people are simply unfamiliar with the works from this period prior to naming of intersectionality, in part because their history of the field begins with Crenshaw's coining of the term, and in part because intersectionality itself has grown so exponentially.

The fundamental dilemma of institutional incorporation lies in the tension between aiming to bring about institutional transformation, yet recognizing how working for social change from within changes us. In his discussion of institutionalization of cultural studies in the academy, Stuart Hall asks an important question:

> [W]hat happens when a field … defined as a political project, tries to develop itself as some kind of coherent theoretical intervention? Or to put the same question in reverse, what happens when an academic and theoretical enterprise tries to engage in pedagogies which enlist the active engagement of individuals and groups, tries to make a difference in the institutional world in which it is located? (1992: 284)

Intersectionality's institutional incorporation also requires attending to both continuities and breaches between the ways that intersectionality has been understood and practiced at different stages of its development in different national and institutional contexts.

What difference can and does intersectionality make in higher education? How is intersectionality itself changed when it tries to change the institutional practices of the academy? Like other forms of critical inquiry and praxis that initially cast a critical eye on academia, intersectionality confronts the ongoing challenge of being disciplined by normative academic practices (Bilge 2014). Put another way, within the neoliberal university, intersectionality has been invited to settle down within, instead of unsettling, the established frames of knowledge production and dissemination. Does this shift represent a seemingly successful absorption of intersectionality that suppresses its initial social justice commitment? Or does it reflect the strategic choices of social justice-oriented knowledge projects and producers that have found new ways to survive within an increasingly conservative academy?

Notes

1. In 1973, activist writer Dorinda Moreno edited an anthology of Chicana feminist writings, and in 1976 and 1977, Marta Cotera published two major monographs on Chicana feminist thought and movements. The publication in the early 1990s of two anthologies, one edited by Gloria Anzaldúa (1990) and the other by Norma Alarcón and colleagues (1993), along with works such as Irene Blea's (1991), contributed to the shaping of intersectionality as an analytical and political orientation within Chicana and Latina feminist thought. See also Alma Garcia's historical studies (1997a, 1997b); Zinn and Zambrana (2019).

4
Intersectionality's Global Reach

The beginning of the new millennium marked an important milestone for intersectionality's global reach into a transnational social context wherein intersectionality circulates and is used as both an analytical and a political tool. The ideas of intersectionality have been taken up within several important global projects. Across the globe, various groups drew upon intersectional frameworks to address many of the social issues introduced thus far in this volume, among them, global social inequality and violence, as well as important new global initiatives.

Take, for example, how intersectionality is increasingly deployed within a broad-based, heterogeneous constellation of global environmental justice projects, as well as in the growing body of research on climate change and environmental issues.[1] In the new millennium, the effects of climate change on the environment have become increasingly recognized as an important global issue across disparate societies and populations. Concern for the environment is one of the top issues for youth, catalyzing, for example, a protest movement by high-school students in Europe. Moreover, the range of projects that fall under the umbrella of climate change and the environment is exponentially growing. In some cases, intersectionality converges with already existing initiatives – as in the case, for example, of ongoing political projects in the US against environmental racism that examine how environmental factors have shaped health disparities of black and poor people living near power plants, highways, and oil refineries, where air pollution and other environmental hazards are excessive (Bullard 1994). Focusing on women of color expands this environmental framework to one of environmental justice, thereby highlighting the centrality of gender and influencing the emergence of ecofeminism (Taylor 1997).

To develop further intersectionality's deployment in scholarship on the environment, we can turn to a case of "natural disaster." In the US, Hurricane Katrina, in 2005, was a watershed moment in disaster studies, demonstrating the connections between the built environment, social inequalities of race, class, and region, and inadequate government responses to this catastrophic event. Since that storm, the growing consensus has been that extreme weather events such as hurricanes, wildfires, and flooding disproportionately fall on multiply disadvantaged groups such as impoverished black people. In essence, the field of disaster research has shifted toward a conception that denaturalizes "natural disasters." Significantly, the field of critical environmental justice studies seems especially aligned with

many of intersectionality's premises and core ideas. Indeed, the critical environmental approach draws heavily on intersectionality when it views "racism, heteropatriarchy, classism, nativism, ableism, ageism, speciesism (the belief that one species is superior to another), and other forms of inequality as intersecting axes of domination and control" (Pellow 2018: 19). Because critical environmental justice projects encompass the oppression of humans and nonhumans, as well as attention to animals and animal rights in a global context, they offer potentially rich dialogs with intersectionality.

Intersectionality's engagement with critical analyses of climate change and the environment speaks to how its ideas travel in a global context. This chapter explores three important patterns of intersectionality's engagement within ongoing and newly emerging global initiatives that, like the environmental justice movement, leave an increasingly broad footprint on the planet. First, intersectionality has long been involved in the global public policy arena via its longstanding ties to human rights agendas. Intersectionality aligns with UN policy prescriptions for equal rights and antidiscrimination as laid out in the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As we saw in Chapter 2, Article 1 of the Declaration affirms that all human beings "are born free and equal in dignity and rights," and Article 2 states that everyone "is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status." Groups have used this framework to raise awareness about human rights violations and to petition for legal redress. In this sense, the human rights framework has provided an important legal framework for social justice projects. But the cumulative cases also raise ongoing questions concerning how human rights policy can be interpreted and implemented. Laws can promise rights that inform public policies, but breathing life into such policies involves action. Intersectionality has been central to thinking through this relationship between human rights policy and human rights practice.

Second, intersectionality has also been aligned with global reproductive justice projects, as well as their companion projects of reproductive health and reproductive rights. Here we conceptualize reproductive justice as a global public health project that centers on the well-being of women, children, and families. Globally, questions of maternal and child health are central to the well-being of many countries, with the issue of maternal and child mortality as a major public health concern. Yet, because class, race, sexuality, ability, age, religion, ethnicity, and citizenship status inform access to information and healthcare services, intersectionality provides an important interpretive framework for reproductive justice initiatives. Moreover, because questions of sexual autonomy, pregnancy, childbearing, and

childrearing fall most heavily on women and girls, this group has been at the forefront of diverse reproductive justice initiatives within different national settings.

Finally, intersectionality has traveled into digital media and now has a global digital footprint. New ICTs have changed the terrain of intellectual production and political action for individuals, nation-states, businesses, and social movements. Digital media now serves as a crucial platform for communication about human rights, reproductive justice, and similar endeavors that are important for intersectionality – and intersectionality itself has become a hotly debated topic on the Web. Digital media has also provided venues for spreading fake news and interfering in democratic elections, and has been implicated in some of the most egregious acts of violence. The rapidly growing reach of digital media raises important questions concerning how intersectionality has and might use such platforms.

Intersectionality and Human Rights

The preparations for the 2001 UN World Conference Against Racism (WCAR) in Durban, South Africa played an important role in intersectionality's engagement with human rights venues. In May 2000, the first UN Preparatory Committee, which took place in Geneva, included representatives from Brazil, India, Portugal, the UK, Israel, Guatemala, Philippines, Mali, and Uganda. Following this meeting, references to intersectionality in the international arena became increasingly common. For example, in December 2000, the Citizen's Conference Against Racism and the Preparatory Intergovernmental Meeting of the Americas, which took place in Santiago, Chile, also preparing for WCAR, introduced intersectional frameworks into UN human rights agendas. Other groups also prepared for Durban by commissioning background papers, some of which contributed to intersectionality's dissemination in UN human rights venues. For example, a background paper commissioned by the International Gay and Lesbian Human Rights Commission analyzed intersectional oppression in relation to race and sexuality.

The Geneva planning committee invited Kimberlé Crenshaw to present a position paper and organize a training workshop in preparation for WCAR, and her involvement in the planning process heightened intersectionality's visibility within global human rights venues. Crenshaw's background paper (2000) was crucial for the history of intersectionality because it marked:

> the inclusion of intersectional theory, research, and politics at the highest levels of international diplomacy. Though it may be an overstatement to call this "mainstreaming," because the uptake of Crenshaw's recommendations have been mixed, the consideration of intersectionality at the level of the UN and in more than rhetoric signifies an undeniable degree of political legitimacy and recognition for the movement. Furthermore, Crenshaw's work for the UN (among other human rights and social justice organizations) embodies key tenets of Black feminists' original configuration of intersectionality as an activist project for social transformation. (Grzanka 2014: 16–17)

By 2000, the core elements of intersectionality were already present within the international human rights arena (Yuval-Davis 2006). The importance of the 2001 meeting in Durban for intersectionality's global engagement cannot be overstated. Imagine some 10,000 delegates from all around the world, with women in the majority, learning about each other's struggles. Representatives from the South African landless movement, the Dalit and Adivasi struggles in India for the rights of lower castes, indigenous movements, and the Intifada, the Palestinian uprising against the Israeli occupation, all attended. These representatives brought multi-issue frameworks that reflected the complexity of their lived experiences and political struggles. Whether or not the term "intersectionality" was used, or whether some other terms captured its essence, the ideas of intersectionality gained a global platform for dissemination and development.

The full title of the conference, *The United Nations World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance*, was itself historic. The term "related intolerance" linked racism to its intersections with poverty, gender discrimination, immigration, and homophobia. After decades of struggle to gain recognition for the gendered impacts of racism, xenophobia, and violence, this meeting was the first UN-sponsored conference against racism to include this term (Blackwell and Naber 2002: 240).

Feminist activism for women's rights, as well as feminist preparations for the 2001 WCAR and the activities of the conference itself, were important in heightening interest in intersectionality within UN circles (Grzanka 2014; Yuval-Davis 2006). WCAR could build on prior UN conferences on the status of women. For example, the Beijing Declaration at the Fourth World Conference on Women (1995) constitutes one of the earliest translations of the idea of intersectionality, though not the term, into UN language. The declaration asks governments to "intensify efforts to ensure equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms for all women and girls who face multiple barriers to their empowerment and advancement because of such factors as their race, age, language, ethnicity, culture, religion or disability or because they are indigenous people" (UN 1995). In

many countries, in particular those with substantial racial/ethnic diversity, preparations among women's organizations for WCAR drew more attention to internal differences and tensions, as well as to the exclusions of dominant strands of feminism prevailing in the country. The Afro-Brazilian women's movement was engaged in a longstanding effort to grapple with the competing perspectives of the Black Movement and the mainstream Brazilian feminist movement of white women (Carneiro 2002). The Afro-Brazilian movement developed its own expression of black feminism that advanced important ideas about intersectionality as inquiry and critical praxis. Other local, regional, and national women's groups that were engaged in similar projects could share their experiences at the conference. These movements aimed to address the social problems associated with global social inequality. They recognized the particular constellations of power relations of race, class, gender, sexuality, religion, age, ability, and citizenship categories in their specific social contexts. And this recognition enabled many of them to negotiate the political differences that separated them. The Afro-Brazilian women's movement was not unusual in this regard, but it does provide a closer look inside the political projects of groups as they prepared for WCAR. The process enabled feminists around the globe to examine how race, gender, and poverty were human rights concerns and to mobilize intersectionality across an array of UN venues (Falcón 2012, 2016).

Despite these differences, or perhaps because of them, the preparations for the conference paid off. Article 119 of the NGO Forum Declaration at the 2001 WCAR included a definition of an intersectional approach to discrimination:

> [It] acknowledges that every person be it man or woman exists in a framework of multiple identities, with factors such as race, class, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, age, disability, citizenship, national identity, geo-political context, health, including HIV/AIDS status and any other status are all determinants in one's experiences of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerances. An intersectional approach highlights the way in which there is a simultaneous interaction of discrimination as a result of multiple identities.

This statement marked a watershed moment for intersectionality's global visibility. Yet the gains of Durban were larger than its declarations and official documents.

Regardless of ideological perspective, for example, the philosophies of social democracy, neoliberalism, and, increasingly, the challenges of right-wing populism, government apparatus constitutes a primary site where human rights policies and practices are differentially implemented. Incorporating intersectionality into an overarching global human rights framework gave nation-states a clearer mandate to revisit their equality policies and practices. Nation-state policies in Europe illustrate these connections. In 2000,

the European Union (EU) adopted legally binding directives about discrimination on the grounds of race and ethnicity, as well as of age, disability, sexual orientation, and religion (Krizsan et al. 2012: 2). The adoption of these new directives fostered the spread of a new institutionally integrated approach to discrimination.

Across Europe, different national bodies use intersectionality as an analytic tool to shape their public policies concerning equality. In the UK, the incorporation of gender, race, disability, sexuality, religion or belief, and age into equal opportunity and diversity legislation led to the creation of a new single equality body for Great Britain (England, Scotland, and Wales) (Bagilhole 2010). The adoption of new directives prompted equality policy reforms in many countries – some of them creating new equality bodies that would enforce legislation on all prohibited grounds of discrimination. The British Equality and Human Rights Commission, for example, began gathering under one roof efforts to challenge discriminations based on gender, race, disability, age, religion or belief, sexuality, and transgender status. Policy analysts often looked to intersectionality as an institutional model to address multiple or complex inequalities. Thus, mainstreaming intersectionality was a significant step forward within the equality policy arena because it helped avoid the dominant single-issue, gender-first approach (Bagilhole 2010; Hankivsky 2007).

Despite the implications of this legal framework, other European countries have been far less diligent in developing policies and/or in following UN guidelines. Moreover, the rise of far-right movements within EU countries presents a considerable challenge to following such guidelines and implementing them via public policy. In recent years, many European countries have seen far-right populist parties and movements develop into major political players. These self-styled Euroskeptics reject both the EU antidiscrimination framework and the idea of the EU itself (e.g., the UK's Brexit), or they simply flout, like in Hungary, EU guidelines, opening the door to more troubling human rights violations. Within and beyond electoral politics, many of those movements advance rhetoric and practices reminiscent of fascism (Stanley 2018). This shifting political context points to the challenges of interpreting and implementing human rights policies.

A Closer Look: Intersectional Frameworks and Human Rights Policy

The policy prescriptions of the UN's trajectories and the national policies of EU nation-states show how intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis is being negotiated on the macrolevel of analysis. But putting teeth into policies and legislative mandates requires thinking through how people try to contextualize intersectional frameworks within

national, regional, and local settings. Here we present a closer look at one of many meetings within a global human rights context at which grassroots activists, academics, and lawyers tried to figure out how to use intersectionality as an analytical framework.

In 2013, approximately 25 people with expertise in law, advocacy, and academia assembled in a conference room at the Center for Reproductive Rights at Columbia University's Law School, invited to attend a one-day working symposium on "Intersectionality in the Inter-American Human Rights System" (IAHRS). The talent around the table was remarkable, including representatives from organizations such as Wangki Tangni, created to serve the needs of the Miskito community in Nicaragua, Disability Rights International, Amnesty International, Programa de Acción por la Igualdad y la Inclusión Social (Colombia), as well as from law school programs such as the International Women's Human Rights Clinic at the City University of New York Law School, the Human Rights in the US Project, and the Center for Gender and Sexuality Law projects at Columbia University Law School.

The meeting itself was convened by Tracy Robinson (Jamaica) and Rose-Marie Belle Antoine (St Lucia), two elected commissioners representing the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR). Robinson and Antoine were responsible for specific areas that would help IACHR monitor compliance of nation-states covered by the Organization of American States (OAS) with inter-American human rights treaties. The Commission was often the first point of contact for petitioners who might pursue human rights claims before the court. As rapporteurs to IACHR assigned to different areas of interest, the two commissioners supervised different human rights venues. Robinson oversaw activities dealing with women's rights, as well as the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, and intersexed persons. Antoine served as rapporteur for claims dealing with the rights of Afro-descendants and indigenous peoples and against racial discrimination. Working independently, Robinson and Antoine concluded that many human rights claims did not fall squarely into any one of their four areas. Both commissioners recognized that the ways that gender, sexuality, race, and ethnicity were understood within the courts limited their ability to bring redress for human rights violations. They decided to work together; the meeting was one step in that process.

Robinson opened the meeting by identifying three important themes that would help commissioners to be more effective in addressing human rights issues. First, she pointed to the need for more efficient tools for identifying discrimination. In a world where petitions for human rights violations could be brought under various categories, it was difficult to conceptualize what discrimination meant. When discrimination is legally framed either by sex, gender, or race, how does one best serve people who bring claims that touch on more than one ground of discrimination? Second, she identified the need for better assessments

of pain, suffering, and injury. What types of pain and suffering are appropriate for bringing a human rights claim? In what ways do questions of human dignity matter? A third issue concerned the search for appropriate reparations and remedies to victims of human rights abuses. What are nation-state responsibilities if harm has been documented and suffering has occurred?

Robinson and Antoine recognized the limitations of a strictly legal statement of human rights, and that the protected categories gained meaning through continuing to develop both intersectional frameworks and their effects on praxis, for example, remedies for people who are harmed. The meeting attendees were charged with the task of analyzing how intersectionality's emphasis on the ways in which axes of social division work together and influence one another might shape human rights. How might intersectionality contribute to better conceptualizations of discrimination, suggest ways to address the damage done by intersecting oppressions, and provide guidance for remedies or redress for human rights violations?

As the day unfolded, participants engaged with Robinson's questions, primarily by discussing specific cases shedding light on various dimensions of intersectionality and human rights. In sessions devoted to gender and sexuality, to gender and race, ethnicity, and migration, and to gender and indigenous people, participants presented actual cases that revealed recurring core themes such as violence, the threat of violence, variations of state violence, and denial of human dignity. Human rights violations had occurred against women who were raped, against children who were removed from their families by state action, and against indigenous people who were displaced from land. Vulnerability was not an absolute category; whereas women were central to the cases selected for presentation, it was clear that the generic category of woman obscured more than it revealed. Specifically, some women were more vulnerable than others if they were indigenous, black, poor, and young. Because the categories of ethnicity, race, economic status, and age did not line up pristinely, they were neither equivalent nor interchangeable.

The cases under consideration showed the importance of the human rights court for global social justice, as well as the challenges of using intersectional frameworks within this global legal setting. Intersecting systems of power were implicated in shaping both the lives of people who had experienced human rights violations and the court decisions as remedies for those violations. For example, the 2005 case of *Dilcia Yean and Violeta Bosico v. Dominican Republic* claimed human rights violations for two girls of African descent who were rendered stateless by the Dominican Republic's citizenship policies. Born in the Dominican Republic to mothers who were also Dominican Republic natives, the girls had Haitian fathers and Haitian maternal grandfathers. The Dominican government rejected the

mothers' efforts to register their daughters' birth certificates – a hardship, because most things in the Dominican Republic, such as attending school, marrying, and accessing cellphone contracts, require proof of citizenship. Because no domestic remedies existed in Dominican courts, the case came before the international court. The court also sought guidance concerning three cases that involved the rape of young girls: *Rosendo Cantú et al. v. Mexico* (1994–2001), *Fernández Ortega et al. v. Mexico* (2001–10), and *Ana, Beatriz, and Celia González Perez v. Mexico* (2002–10). These cases identified a pattern of violence targeting indigenous peoples during the militarization of Guerrero and Chiapas in Mexico. Recognizing that compensating individual victims was not enough, two of the cases granted significant reparations at community level.

The complexities of cases such as these indicated the challenges of thinking through the connections of intersectionality and human rights law. Analyzing these connections requires: (1) determining how varying interpretations of intersectionality have different implications for government obligations regarding human rights; (2) examining the different ways that intersectionality has been applied in human rights practice; and (3) specifying how intersectionality can and should be reflected within the IAHRS (through decisions, reports, recommendations, and remedies ordered by the Inter-American Court and the IACHR). These ideas obviously could not be developed in one day, but the fact that the meeting was held at all underscores intersectionality's utmost importance for global human rights.

Several features of the meeting highlight some connections among human rights policies, state-based equality policies, and intersectionality's potential contributions. First, intersectionality has expanded beyond the civil rights framework to a human rights framework that looks both to issues in a transnational context as well as to the implementation of human rights policies within nation-states. This progression is apparent in Crenshaw's own work, from her early articles on intersectionality (1989, 1991) to her position paper for the Durban conference (2000). The human rights community has supplemented civil rights advocacy that petitions the nation-state for redress with human rights advocacy that appeals to international and intergovernmental organizations such as the Hague International Criminal Court.

Second, this deepening discourse of intersectionality and human rights potentially sharpens analyses of how human rights violations are connected to global social inequalities catalyzed by intersecting systems of power as well as the social problems they engender. Advocates for citizenship rights, reproductive justice, the exploitation of child labor, mass incarceration and prisoners' rights, environmental justice, and migrants' rights can claim the ethical

protection of the UN Declaration of Human Rights and pursue remedies in organizations such as the IACHR.

Third, a significant feature of efforts to develop human rights initiatives informed by intersectionality concerns incorporating intersectionality's critical praxis. The symposium was an example of critical praxis grounded in collaboration. The meeting affirmed the need for collaborative work that takes seriously the points of view of multiple stakeholders on a particular social issue. This is why examining the specific social context of the 2003 IAHRS symposium is so important – the social actors around the table recognized the complexities of collective social harm, as well as the limitations of their own ability to remedy harm. As leaders of advocacy organizations, legal scholars, and community organizers, they collaborated in order to see how multiple points of view could produce results.

Finally, this case exemplifies intersectionality's emphasis on social justice. People who work on violence against women come to grasp that solutions cannot be developed by seeing women as a homogeneous group, or by focusing either on interpersonal relations or on state power as sites of violence. Because human rights-based frameworks can come with their own sets of problems, such as placing too much reliance on judicial processes or seeing social injustice as an individual versus a collective matter, having conversations among differently positioned people fosters a richer understanding both of human rights and of intersectionality.

Thus, intersectional analyses help illuminate important global trends in the matters of social justice, understanding intersecting power relations, and human rights. Stated differently, intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry cannot flourish by separating itself from its critical praxis.

Intersectionality and Reproductive Justice

Since their inception, reproductive justice projects have been intertwined with intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis. In 1994, a caucus of black feminist grassroots activists introduced the term "reproductive justice" at a pro-choice conference in the US. As community organizers, members of the caucus saw bringing about structural change as essential for reproductive justice. The idea of reproductive justice quickly spread in a global context whereby UN support for human rights spoke to the needs of multiple groups. Loretta Ross, one of the organizers of reproductive justice in the US, describes the synergy between US black feminists and women of the Global South concerning the idea of reproductive justice:

> At the September 1994 Cairo International Conference on Population and Development, we fortified our initial analysis developed three months earlier by heeding women of the Global South who used the human rights framework to make stronger claims for sexual and reproductive autonomy, emphasizing the dialectic between individual and group rights. (2017: 293)

Both sets of actors recognized the interconnectedness of human rights and women's rights, as well as the relations between individual and group rights. In doing so, they brought a social justice sensibility into a reproductive justice framework.[2]

Reproductive justice initiatives focus on three interrelated dimensions of human rights: (1) the right to have a child under the conditions of one's choosing; (2) the right not to have a child, by using birth control, abortion, or abstinence; and (3) the right to parent children in safe and healthy environments free from violence by individuals or the state. While this framework addresses the human rights of all women, it was clear that global social inequalities meant that women and girls both in the US and transnationally could not claim their universal human rights. As Dorothy Roberts points out, introducing a social justice framework "repositioned reproductive rights in a political context of intersecting race, gender, and class oppressions" (2015: 79). The term "justice" brings power relations into both the rights-based discourse of civil rights in the US and the broader discourse of human rights in a global context. The reproductive justice framework signaled a significant shift within the US context that moved beyond advocating for reproductive rights. The emphasis was on "how women of color, themselves, addressed reproductive issues through their own organizing and community-based research that relied on intersectional analysis to strengthen grassroots coalitions, not legal advocacy" (Luna and Luker 2013: 338).

The terms "reproductive justice," "reproductive health," and "reproductive rights" are often used interchangeably, but they mean different things. They reflect different constituencies, analyses, and strategies. The core premise of *reproductive health* is that people have the right to reproduce and should have the freedom to decide if, when, and how often to do so. Reproductive health initiatives help people access information and reproductive services, including contraception and care during and after childbirth. Because poor people, women of color, and other disadvantaged groups often live in communities, regions, and national settings that lack healthcare services, they experience more reproductive health problems. For example, higher rates of maternal and infant mortality, lack of access to contraception services, and barriers to accessing basic healthcare services are all factors contributing to women's health. Ensuring reproductive health has long been a central pillar of the women's health movement.

Reproductive rights encompass efforts to ensure that people have the legal and political ability to make choices concerning their sexual and reproductive lives. The distribution of reproductive rights or lack thereof is related to differential public policies of different national, regional, and local governmental units. In the US, for example, the pro-choice movement in the 1980s advanced a reproductive rights agenda that focused on creating laws and enforcement mechanisms ensuring that women would have a legal right to reproductive healthcare services. Within US jurisprudence, public engagement with reproduction has occurred within the framework of reproductive rights, with access to safe and legal abortion framing a binary discourse that has been distilled into slogans of "pro-choice" and "pro-life." These debates intensified after 2016 in the context of the growing power of far-right populism within US electoral politics both on the national and state level. Reproductive rights debates, which had and continue to have a disproportionate impact on regulating the reproductive freedom of young women of color, African American women, indigenous women, and poor women, increasingly affect all women and girls.

Struggles for reproductive rights are necessary, but they also have limitations. Because legal strategies require lengthy court battles and legislative changes, they are slow. They also rely on the expertise of professionals, primarily lawyers, and legal cases to maintain this focus on protecting reproductive rights for women and girls. They also need health policy researchers whose scholarship is vital to legal cases. Moreover, legal victories expanding the reproductive rights of women and girls consistently encourage countermobilization, guaranteeing that "further time and resources are spent maintaining the rights that had previously seemed secure" (Luna and Luker 2013: 336). While essential and well-meaning, these rights-based strategies can marginalize those whom they claim to help. As Roberts points out:

> for too long, the rhetoric of "choice" has privileged predominantly white middle-class women who have the ability to choose from reproductive options that are unavailable to poorer and low-income women, especially women of color. The mainstream movement for reproductive rights has narrowed its concerns to advocate almost exclusively for the legal right to abortion further distancing its agenda from the interests of women who have been targets of sterilization abuse because of the devaluation of their right to bear children. (2015: 79)

In the US context, the very framework of reproductive justice that emerged in the 1990s was in response to the limitations of framing the needs of women and girls primarily through the lens of reproductive rights.

Highlighting the dynamic relationship between the law, social movements, and academic scholarship, *reproductive justice* is a broader construct than either reproductive health or

reproductive rights. Recognizing the importance of health services to good health, reproductive justice sees ensuring the physical, spiritual, political, economic, and social well-being of women and girls as part of reproductive health. Recognizing the necessity of legal protections, reproductive justice aims to turn formal human rights into substantive reproductive rights. Social institutions, especially governments, are obligated to ensure that social conditions facilitate the reproductive rights of women and girls. This can mean attending to environmental issues of housing, access to clean water, food security, air pollution, and environmental hazards of living near industries that foster poor health.

The social problem of sexual violence illustrates how different interpretive frameworks of reproductive justice, reproductive health, and reproductive rights illuminate different dimensions of ongoing initiatives to ensure reproductive justice for women and girls. As we discussed in Chapter 2, intersectionality's commitment to critical inquiry and praxis provides an important framework for more expansive analyses of violence against vulnerable populations. Whether access to sexual information, contraceptives, and the full range of health services, the right to decide on when to become sexually active and the forms that sexuality assumes, or policies that unjustly privilege and/or penalize forms of sexual expression, sexuality is a critical issue within all three reproductive frameworks. Violence often accompanies efforts to discipline the sexual choices of women and girls with cultural norms marshaled to defend such disciplinary practices. Sexual freedom rests on interpersonal relations that do not disempower women and girls. When it comes to sexual violence, focusing on one framework over others is a step in the right direction, but only by developing a comprehensive agenda to address sexual violence can real change occur. Only collectively can they focus on addressing oppression, poverty, and economic status, the lack of social support for women and girls concerning access to reproductive information and services, legal systems that offer neither legal protections nor services, and cultural stigmas against women and girls who are survivors of rape and incest.

From their inception, reproductive justice initiatives have embraced an expansive, inclusive approach to the rights of women and girls that reflects and contributes to intersectionality's emphasis on intersecting power relations and social justice. For example, reproductive justice advocates identify body politics as a central pillar of women's lives that is a core dimension of reproductive justice. The reproductive justice framework includes sexual freedom and bodily autonomy, making the material consequences of embodiment visible as part of intersecting power relations. Social issues such as the sexualization of the bodies of young girls, efforts to regulate the femininity of female athletes, sexual harassment in the workplace, pornography within mass media, and rape all point to the ways in which women's bodies are viewed and policed across different cultural settings.

Reproductive justice advocates have challenged the traditional body politics that foster gender norms that have contributed to disparities in women's reproductive health, reproductive rights, and access to reproductive justice. Highlighting the distinction between biological sex and socially constructed gender enabled reproductive justice advocates to challenge biological conceptions of gender and expand perceptions of femininity and masculinity. Reproductive justice frameworks could include the experiences of people who were not biologically defined as women and girls, but who experience reproductive oppression (Ross 2017: 291). Specifically, transmen, transwomen, and gender nonconforming individuals become part of the protected population in need of reproductive justice. This framework of body politics is inherently intersectional in that intersecting power relations of gender, race, age, ability, ethnicity, sexuality, and class use bodies to organize and explain social inequalities. Reproductive justice advocates were part of a broader movement to redefine body politics in the direction of social justice.

While reproductive health and reproductive rights advocates defended the integrity of individuals and individual bodies, reproductive justice advocates additionally identified and defended the bodily integrity of groups and communities as an important dimension of reproductive freedom. The expansive understanding of reproductive justice, whereby people had the right to parent children in safe and healthy environments free from violence by individuals or the state, highlights the significance of communities and groups within reproductive justice initiatives that are informed by intersectional analyses. This more expansive group-based reproductive justice framework enabled advocates to censure some of the more egregious practices of governments that target poor people, racial/ethnic groups, undocumented groups, disabled people, and indigenous groups. For example, bringing cases before the Human Rights Court concerning the rape of young girls during militarization in Mexico illustrates the significance of seeking group-based remedies to group-based problems. In such cases, individual girls suffered sexual violence, and entire communities of indigenous peoples were also wounded. As Ross points out:

> [E]xternal control over other people's reproduction is a tool of domination and oppression, as described by the United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide because it can be characterized as "imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group, and forcibly transferring children of the group to another group." (2017: 292–3)

An intersectional analysis of reproductive justice highlights the interconnectedness of seemingly separate social justice struggles concerning gender, race, class, sexuality, ethnicity, ability, and nationality. Historical and contemporary forms of eugenics – for example, the forced sterilization of indigenous women in Canada, and as practiced on

colonized populations, on Puerto Rican and black women in the US, on incarcerated women, on women on welfare, and on disabled women – and the enforced separation of children from their families and communities, for example, among indigenous people in Australia, Canada, and the US – inform one another. Struggles for reproductive justice may take many forms, but collectively they are part of a broader, increasingly global conversation.

Despite the connections among frameworks of reproductive health, reproductive rights, and reproductive justice, it is important to point out that reproductive issues are prioritized in different ways in different countries. Women and girls may face similar challenges in gaining reproductive justice, reproductive health services, and the legal protections that ensure their right to do so, but the particularities of histories mean that reproductive advocacy and activism are differently inflected in different settings. These differences are directly related to how race, class, gender, sexuality, agility, and age affect the rights and services and seeming obligations of women. Health discourse and public policy strive to deal with common challenges, but each place has its own unique struggles.

Legacies of slavery, colonialism, and imperialism, as well as the contours of anticolonial struggles, have impacted both cultural norms within individual national states and the infrastructure that is available to deliver healthcare services. These national histories shape how the constellation of issues of reproduction are understood and addressed within distinctive nation-states. The latter not only have distinct trajectories in relation to social democracy, neoliberalism, and far-right populism, but also hold disparate cultural views on gender, femininity, and masculinity, and, as a result, on the status of women and girls. They also have dramatically different resources with which to foster the reproductive health within their borders. Reproductive justice may be an important framework as a critical response to the reproductive rights discourse in the US, but understanding the contours of reproductive justice in a broader, global context requires a more nuanced understanding of national, regional, and local differences. In this sense, intersectionality brings an important set of conceptual tools for analyzing state power, public health policies, and health outcomes.

Reproductive Justice and the Global South

Questions of reproductive health, rights, and justice fall more heavily on younger generations, as they enter, move through, and exit childbearing years. Thus far, we have discussed women and girls and their central position in reproductive justice initiatives, but it is important to point out that young men and boys are also affected by questions of reproductive justice. Moreover, when it comes to reproductive health, rights, and justice, 90 percent of the world's young people live in Africa, Latin America, and the developing

countries of Asia. Women and girls from these regions who are nearing, or have already reached, childbearing age constitute a sizeable proportion of young people, suggesting that, when it comes to reproductive justice, much more attention needs to be focused on them, as well as on women and girls in the Global North who live in conditions similar to those of the disadvantaged classes of the Global South.

Focusing on both those who live in the Global South as well as on the political units in which they live brings a different lens to questions of reproductive justice. The term "Global South" is more than a geographic location, a physical place that houses histories of colonialism, slavery, racism, and imperialism. These histories shape the power relations within nation-states of the Global South where most youth live, but also the power relations of nation-states within the Global North that historically have benefited from these systems. We recognize that there is tremendous heterogeneity among national histories and public policies of the many nation-states that make up the Global South. Here, we highlight a few selected cases, not as representative of these larger issues, but rather as windows onto some of the dimensions of reproductive justice in a global context – specifically, how contextualizing reproductive concerns in particular social contexts, in this case national public policy contexts of nations of the Global South, inform reproductive justice concerns.

The range of reproductive issues across the 54 nation-states that comprise continental Africa is immense. The varying histories, governments, ethnic groups, and populations belie the easy use of terms such as "global" or even "Global South." In the aftermath of the UN's 57th session of the Commission on the Status of Women, which took place in March 2013, Grace Adofoli, then an intern with the National Women's Health Network, analyzed how frameworks of reproductive health, reproductive rights, and reproductive justice were differentially prioritized across national settings. Her experiences as an African woman offered a distinctive perspective on reproductive justice issues across such disparate national histories and settings: "Africa has 54 countries and countless tribes, traditions, cultures, and languages – but people tend to group Africa into one category and discount its diversity. Hence, in the African context, efforts to advance Reproductive Justice, Reproductive Health, and Reproductive Rights will vary depending on the specific country" (Adofoli 2013).

Adolfi points out that, in some countries with ongoing military action – for example, Sudan and Congo – major reproductive and sexual health issues encompass combating violence against women, protecting women from rape, and providing access to clinics in times of conflict and war, while countries with more stable governments – for example, Zambia and Ghana – stress reducing the high rates of maternal mortality. Adofoli (2013) explains why all three focal points may be needed, but why some take precedence over others:

> All of these efforts fit into the larger framework of women's reproductive justice, rights, and health. From a rights perspective, it is important to pass laws that defend women who have been abused and encourage stern prosecution of abusers … policies are needed to expand women's access to services (like contraception and abortion) that help them avoid unplanned pregnancies and STIs. Providing reproductive health services that cater to women's needs enables them to act upon the best decisions about their bodies. *Each community and country must determine which issues are most significant to them and where they want to put their energies*. (Italics added)

More detailed work on specific national contexts, as well as on women from varying ethnic and religious contexts, is needed. In this regard, comparing the reproductive decisions of women in South Africa and Zimbabwe provides a reframing of reproductive justice in ways that focus on women's agency within two different national contexts. As neighbors, these two countries have both common and differing social histories and very different legislation concerning abortion. The decision to have an abortion takes different forms in the two national contexts, thereby shedding light on reproductive decision-making (Chiweshe et al. 2017).

Unlike the conflation of diverse African nation-states into an imagined Africa, India is one nation-state that houses 25 percent of the world's population within its borders. India's population policies have generated a voluminous literature on reproductive justice that examines the connections between development, population, and social inequalities. When anticolonial resistance intensified in India, as well as in other colonies, the idea of reproduction as a threat to the racial order increasingly permeated discourses of overpopulation and development. "Population growth in India, as elsewhere, was now explicitly constructed in dominant development discourses as a geopolitical threat" (Wilson 2018: 92). The intertwined nature of overpopulation as a problem for developing countries ostensibly could be remedied by state action to control the size of the population. These connections between overpopulation and development set the stage for population control policies across many nations, with India's size and history making its efforts more prominent than others.

Kapana Wilson's critical analysis of India's reproductive policies brings together many dimensions of a reproductive justice argument and also illustrates the workings of intersectionality as an analytical framework. Ironically, the same September 1994 Cairo International Conference on Population and Development that fostered transnational collaboration among reproductive justice advocates marked a different moment in reproductive public policy in India. Prior to the conference, population control was more overt, with China, India, and nation-states with growing populations defining

overpopulation as an obstacle to development and to population policies for reaching targets to reduce their populations. The “one-child” policy in China stands out as a massive undertaking within an extremely large country. Forced sterilization and similarly punitive policies were encouraged for the good of the state. At the 1994 conference, the Indian government claimed to have abandoned population control targets, but remained committed to policies targeting “undesirable” populations. But since that conference, goals have focused on contraceptive use and choice, finding ways to encourage and measure services.

This shift in population policy is less overt and seemingly more humane, primarily because it reflects neoliberal norms of choice as a marker of individual freedom. Despite the illusion of choice, coercion remains a prominent feature of India’s population control policies, with forced sterilization supplementing injection and implant devices as central to public policy. After 2012, rather than forced sterilization, India aimed to get 48 million more women to use contraception. Yet the contraceptive choices available to different groups of women and girls, as well to men, differ according to which groups are seen as contributing to overpopulation. Although opposed globally by a wide range of reproductive health and women’s rights activists and scholars, hormonal injectable and implantable contraceptives have emerged as the primary contraceptive options in India.

These reproductive policies fall unequally on different groups of women and men, such that particular bodies become “marked as ‘disposable’ for intervention and regulation” (Wilson 2018: 91).[3] For example, cultural representations target the Muslim community, perceived as having high population growth rates that threaten the state. Representations in the cultural domain of power are one thing. Exercising disciplinary power through public policies that target specific groups illustrates the workings of structural state power within efforts for population control:

> [T]he population control initiatives of the Indian state, in partnership with global capital, can also be understood as directed at particular sections of the population who are constructed in the dominant discourses of development as superfluous to capital accumulation and therefore legitimately subject to multiple forms of displacement and dispossession. This is particularly the case with the targeted sterilization of women in Adivasi (indigenous) communities who live on mineral-rich land and are viewed as obstacles to it exploitation by corporate capital. (Wilson 2018: 98)

Wilson argues that neoliberal policies of capitalism increasingly complement and perhaps supplant longstanding government efforts that explicitly identified overpopulation as a problem for the state. Specifically, the history of family planning, population control, and

development were intertwined in ways that mobilized Hindu nationalist arguments that promoted caste endogamy (intra-caste marriage) that defined Dalits, Adivasis, and oppressed castes as unfit to reproduce. Such ideology was embedded in India's post-Independence "family planning" policies (Wilson 2018: 93).

Intersectionality and reproductive justice praxis

Intersectionality's focus on coalition building as an important dimension of praxis also lies at the heart of reproductive justice initiatives. Loretta Ross identifies the connection between intersectionality, praxis, and reproductive justice activism: "Praxis is a term most often used by oppressed groups to change their economic, social, and political realities through social justice actions based on theoretical reflections. Reproductive justice praxis puts the concept of reproductive justice into action by elaborating the connection between activism and intersectional feminist theory. Activists intentionally employ a complex intersectional approach because the theory of reproductive justice is inherently intersectional, based on the universality and indivisibility of its human rights foundation" (2017: 287). Themes of coalitional politics characterize the praxis of reproductive justice activism. Ross's analysis focuses on reproductive praxis, arguing that this generated theory that is informed by and informs intersectionality. For example, The SisterSong Women of Color Reproductive Justice Collective, founded in 1997 by Luz Rodriguez, then director of the Latina Roundtable on Health and Reproductive Rights, has had an important influence on the contours of reproductive justice activism in the US.

Patricia Zavella's study of coalitional politics between two very different grassroots organizations that defeated a local anti-abortion ballot initiative in Albuquerque, New Mexico, illuminates how reproductive justice advocates draw upon intersectional frameworks (Zavella 2017: 509). Young Women United (YWU) and Strong Families of New Mexico (SFNM), organizations with very different constituencies, joined forces to defend reproductive justice. This was a successful campaign within a polarized political climate that managed to pull together organizations and constituencies that typically were not seen as having common interests.

Two things stand out in this example. First, the organizers found common ground for their coalition by working together to generate a new interpretive framework for abortion. Assumptions that YWU and SFNM held different and polarized perspectives on abortion, the former in the "pro-choice" camp and the latter in the "pro-life" camp, had to be abandoned. Finding common ground meant developing a new framework that drew on the broader framework of reproductive justice and that recognized the heterogeneity of experiences and interests among the groups represented by the two organizations. In this

case, they reframed the campaign not in terms of pro-life or pro-choice, but within a reproductive justice frame of respecting the women of Albuquerque. Their "Respect ABQ Women" campaign enabled them to identify a commonality that could also accommodate the differences among the women in their respective groups. They did not reframe women as victims, but focused on their strengths, offering a framework that was more familiar to communities typically assumed to be opposed to reproductive justice. "By crafting a strengths-based campaign, directly collaborating with faith-based activists, and centering spiritually meaningful discussions related to abortion, these reproductive justice activists demonstrated that inclusion and spirituality are central to reproductive justice" (Zavella 2017: 528).

Second, the Respect ABQ Women campaign provides an up-close and personal view of the creative tensions of coalitional politics even when they are informed by intersectionality. This single local case shows how much work is involved within coalitional politics and why that work matters so much. The success of the campaign, according to Zavella, was the result of "cross-sectoral work … [that] incorporates organizations and individuals with different foci, skills, constituencies, and perspectives, broadening the outreach. Cross-sectoral work also meant working with various communities normally not directly involved in supporting women's right to access abortions, such as those involved in faith-based activism" (2017: 523). With an issue so polarizing as abortion, these organizers had to acknowledge differences among their constituencies on common issues. This case of coalitional politics involved substantial face-to-face interaction among people who lived in the same area and who were exposed to a common experience. The commonalities linking reproductive justice and intersectionality were not abstractions – people in this specific social context were able to share experiences, stories, and points of view as part of the process of community mobilization. In this context, coalitional politics that was informed by intersectionality was potentially easier to conceptualize and implement because these two frameworks share so much.

This case suggests broader issues in the possibilities and constraints of reproductive justice as praxis. Many advocates of reproductive justice point to the possibilities of intersectionality as a way of organizing people who are not adequately served by reproductive health or reproductive rights advocacy. For example, pointing to failures across the US political spectrum, Dorothy Roberts analyzes the dangers to poor women and women of color in the US of uncritical support of the reproductive rights agenda:

> [A] reproductive justice framework can attract support from tens of thousands of women alienated by the mainstream agenda – poor and low-income women, women of color, queer women, women with disabilities, and women whose lives revolve around caregiving. In addition, the movement's social justice focus provides a concrete basis for building radical coalitions with organizations fighting for racial, economic, and environmental justice, for immigrant, queer, and disabled people, and for systematic change in law enforcement, health care, and education. (2015: 81)

The success of the Respect ABQ Women campaign provides evidence for this point of view.

At the same time, there are significant challenges to the kind of coalitional politics suggested by intersectionality. Theoretically, coalitions are a good idea, but how in practice do groups and communities keep them going? The success of the Respect ABQ Women campaign in a challenging legal and political climate is laudable. Yet grassroots initiatives such as this raise an important set of questions concerning the durability of coalitions. As Zavella points out:

> [T]hese coalitions are contingent and are based in particular struggles, which means they may not endure. While the high stakes pressured members of the coalition to collaborate closely, the differences in goals, constituencies resources, culture and race could undermine their ongoing solidarity. The intensity of the campaign allowed for little reflection at the time. (2017: 524)

Local politics seems to provide the most optimistic view of lasting coalitions, as people organize around specific concerns in their local communities and build organizational infrastructures that can sustain their involvement. Scaling up from the local to ever greater geographical abstractions changes the terms of the coalitions that are possible. And moving into digital space creates new sets of issues for coalitional politics that are informed by intersectional frameworks, as well as for intersectionality itself.

Digital Debates: Intersectionality and Digital Media

Today, digital and social media constitute one of the most vibrant scenes of intersectionality, in which a new generation of activists, artists, and scholars debate its intellectual and political significance. Such platforms facilitate intersectionality's global reach, building networks of activists, scholars, elected officials, lawyers, and grassroots organizers who advance a range of social justice projects. New ICTs have been a game changer for both individuals and social movements. Digital environments have come to play an increasingly prominent role in mediating issues of public concern, not only by providing the platforms on which public debates occur, but also by enabling the interactive shaping of their topics and dynamics. The development of Web 2.0 and the spread of applications that go beyond the

display of static content foster interactive communities of users who can add, edit, and update content. By transforming the practices and blurring the boundary between producer and consumer, the rise of digital and open media has opened up new spaces for public engagement.

Not surprisingly, a term as visible and contentious as intersectionality has become the object of heated debates in digital and social media. A cursory review of the literature on the use of intersectionality in digital environments and cultures shows how intersectionality is mobilized both to examine and counter various digitally mediated phenomena related to social justice issues. Such literature also encompasses scholarly endeavors to elaborate digital intersectionality theories (see Tynes et al. 2016) and opens up new areas of inquiry such as "Black Twitter" (Sharma 2013) or "Intersectional Black Feminist Technology Studies" (Noble 2016). These studies cast light on previously unaddressed issues, such as intersectional biases in digital structures – for instance, how the algorithms of search engines like Google shape intersecting oppressions (Noble 2018) and how discriminatory designs of digital applications amplify white supremacy (Benjamin 2019b). Algorithmic decision-making, which is based on historical data, can mean that a black person may be refused an apartment because the system looks at, for example, how many people were evicted in the neighborhood over the previous 10 years, and that "when your landlord does a credit check, if you're black and it says there were historically huge amounts of evictions [in a black community], then you may not get the apartment" (Mutale Nkonde, qtd in Lynn 2019). Attending to the breadth and depth of this burgeoning literature would require a book for itself – and those books do exist already (see Nakamura 2002; Nakamura and Chow-White 2011; Noble 2016; Noble and Tynes 2016; Benjamin 2019a, 2019b).

This literature reveals tremendous diversity in how the focus on intersecting power relations of race, class, gender, sexuality, age, ability, and nation sheds light on the demographics of who uses digital media and toward what ends. It also reveals the significance of social context in framing digital debates that are simultaneously local and global. From the alternative historiographies of digital humanities through an intersectional lens (Risam 2015), to online dating sites and applications (Niessen 2016), to digital entrepreneurship (Wing-Fai Leung 2019), to Romani women's transnational intersectional activism through, among others, digital and social media (Corradi 2018), to the grooming of disaffected young men via online chatrooms and social media outlets by white supremacist or jihadist extremists, to gender-based violence and harassment in online games cultures, an array of digitally mediated phenomena can be, and are indeed, examined through increasingly sophisticated interpretations and applications of intersectional analytical frameworks.

Moreover, this literature also theorizes how race, gender, and similar categories permeate digital space.

Intersectionality's noteworthy digital presence, particularly on social media, undoubtedly shows how digital users, from a range of experiences and across multiple settings, understand it differently, and interpret and use it for a variety of political ends. Here we examine intersectionality's global reach through digital media by a close look at three areas: (1) intersectionality and online feminist publics; (2) intersectionality and digital violence; and (3) digitally networked social movements, especially those that focus on racial justice and decolonial activism.

Intersectionality and online feminist publics

Intersectionality's increasing and often contested visibility on social media provides important opportunities to examine intersections of class, race, coloniality, sexuality, gender, caste, and age in action. Certainly, intersectionality has outstanding, even dizzying, social media presence among young people – or, to borrow the title of a *Ms* magazine article: "Social media minds the intersectional gap" (August 16, 2013). By increasing young women's participation in digital feminist activism and media-content production, new innovation and communication technologies have transformed feminism.

Digital media, especially social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and YouTube, create online feminist publics and play an important role in introducing new generations of girls and young women to feminism, changing thereby the profile and the average age of feminists. In an article titled "Is the '4th Wave' of Feminism Digital?" Ragnar Jónsson (2013) contends that digital media, including the blogosphere, digital news media, and social media platforms, have entirely changed "the operations, economics, communications, readership, outreach and presentation of feminism."

Yet questions remain of who among digital feminist activists has access to major social media outlets, who is authorized, and who is disenfranchised as divisive, or elitist, or unhelpful to the feminist cause. Given the potential influence of intersectionality on online feminist publics, it is important to understand how the concept is taken up by scholars and activists working in and on digital cultures across the world, what they do with intersectionality online, and how this shapes the way in which women and girls encounter feminism.

During the expansion of online feminist publics, until the early 2000s, digital feminism was largely perceived as a set of practices launched by an "educated, white, upper-middleclass, English-speaking, culturally sophisticated readership" within digital media, with references to the intersection of gender and race "exceedingly rare within both cyberfeminist practices

and critiques of them" (Fernandez et al. 2003: 21). Digital feminist debates largely assumed that "'gender' is a unified category, and by implication, that digital technologies mean the same thing to all women across differences of race, class, and sexuality (Daniels 2009: 103). This assumption facilitated keeping racialized power dynamics in place.

More recently, this perspective has come under scrutiny, mostly by the steady online presence of feminists of color who have become the key advocates and developers of intersectionality. The popularity of digital magazines – and especially of blogs run by feminists of color – shows the vitality and relevance of intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis for the social justice projects advanced by women, queer/gender nonconforming and trans persons of color. Feminists of color are not only online, but have also drawn upon intersectionality to analyze how digital space is central to reproducing intersecting power relations. In her important and timely book, *Algorithms of Oppression*, Safiya Umoja Noble defines a new area, which she calls Black Feminist Technology Studies, as "an epistemological approach to researching gendered and racialized identities in digital and analog media studies, and it offers a new lens for exploring power as mediated by intersectional identities" (2018: 171).

Yet the resistance, even downright hostility, which some white feminists express toward intersectionality taps a backlash against the presence of women of color in digital space and their ability to use intersectionality as an analytical and political tool. Such delegitimizing is all the more significant in a context of the rise of the far right on digital platforms and its specific targeting of intersectionality. Some white women see intersectionality as sowing disunity within feminism, identifying it as a cause of feminism's so-called toxic wars. Others accuse intersectionality of being an elitist concept, and misprepresent it as an "esoteric theory" that is too abstract and abstruse for those outside the ivory tower, and that it is harming, not helping, feminism. Ironically, this criticism is made mostly by young white feminist urban middle-class bloggers and is diametrically opposed to white feminist academics' criticism of intersectionality – namely, that it is not a "mature theory," and that it should be "elevated" theoretically (Bilge 2013, 2014). By means of these strategies, white feminists devalue intersectionality for its lack of theorizing and for its excess of theorizing, the first argued by disciplinary feminists in the academy and the latter by (self-declared) "popular" digital feminists.

Such digital misrepresentations of intersectionality as a tool for privileged women of color foster divisive framing within feminism that reverses the positions of privileged and subordinated people within the feminist movement. No longer disenfranchised, black women and women of color become the oppressors of less educated white women via their alienating word – intersectionality – or rely on a flawed identity politics whose

intersectional politics undermine feminism. Significantly, these digital debates concerning intersectionality reenact the old patterns of exclusion within preexisting political groups – patterns that were at the heart of the advent of black feminist intersectionality in the late 1960s and 1970s, namely, the lack of race consciousness in mainstream feminism, the lack of gender consciousness in African American social movements, and the lack of attention to heterosexism within mainstream black feminism.

Flavia Dzodan (2011), author of the feminist slogan "My Feminism will be Intersectional or It will be Bullshit!" – which went viral – sheds a much needed light on such white feminist moves undermining intersectionality. She documents how a tactic of "rejecting the term, not the concept" has become common among white digital feminists, particularly gatekeepers. By rejecting the term "intersectionality," these feminists strip black women and women of color of their conceptual tools and reinforce cultural cloning – "speak our language, use our words" – which also keeps white feminist issues/vocabularies at the forefront of digital feminist concerns:

> At the core of this rejection of the word but not "the concept" is a rejection of knowledge produced and developed by Black women and other Women of Color. Since in the face of overwhelming evidence these white feminists cannot deny that racism is alive and kicking, then they will do the next best thing: deprive us of the use of words that help us explain how we are uniquely affected by these power structures…. at the core of this denial resides an erasure of our tools, the very fabric of the theories and knowledge that explain our lives … "Use our words because otherwise our issues will not be front and center." (Dzodan 2014)

In this context of white feminist criticisms of intersectionality, black feminist bloggers launched Twitter hashtags that went viral.[4] Several of these hashtags aimed to denounce white feminist complicity with racism, heteropatriarchy, and misogynoir in black male-led social movements, and the insufficient attention given in black communities to violence against black women and girls. Clearly, the reasons for launching these hashtags resemble those of the CRC and Afro-Brazilian women to ground a movement in collective identity politics.

As these cases illustrate, social media-savvy young feminists of color increasingly use intersectional frameworks to challenge various forms of the intermeshed oppressions they face. For many contemporary black feminists, intersectionality has become "the primary tool through which we articulate our understanding of how social inequalities are created and sustained, a key concern being that such an analysis should become normative practice for the wider movement rather than a niche concern of a minority constituency" (Okolosie

2014: 90). Social media, particularly Twitter and the feminist blogosphere, play an important role by providing platforms for feminists of color who hitherto rarely had access to larger audiences. Gaining popularity on social media can also enhance the careers of these black feminist bloggers, helping them publish in more traditional venues.

Regrettably, controversies around intersectionality among digital feminists that play out in Europe and North America tend to overshadow what is happening elsewhere. The diversity and vitality of digital feminist publics that engage with intersectionality across the world often get lost within the inordinate attention to the Global North. Perhaps this is because the scientific literature is still to develop a systematic critique of whiteness in contemporary digital feminist activism in the Global North (Daniels 2016). This lack is particularly palpable in digital feminist controversies around intersectionality, which underscore feminist fault lines that divide along racial lines, although they masquerade occasionally as class divisions.

Around the globe, women who experience multiple oppressions develop online communities that, in varying ways, use intersectionality as an analytical tool: from Afro-Brazilian women bringing intersectionality to a colorblind maternal rights digital activism (Medrado and Muller 2018) to Dalit-Bahujan social media activists fighting caste oppression and its intersections with gender and patriarchy in India (Patil 2017) and striving to build anticaste online spaces through innovative use of YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram (Harad 2018), to #EndRapeCulture campaigns initiated by women students across South African campuses.

Intersectionality and digital violence

Another area for intersectional analyses concerns digital violence, especially how ICTs enable, trivialize, and exacerbate offline forms of abuse, hate, and discrimination. A study conducted by Amnesty International and Element AI, a global artificial intelligence software product company, suggests that, despite the vitality of Black Twitter as a site of black feminist activism, Twitter can also be a toxic place for women, especially for women of color. Women of color (black, Asian, Latinx, and mixed-race women) are 34 percent more likely than white women to be targeted by abusive tweets, while the level of harassment and hate they endure on Twitter is exponentially worse: they are 84 percent more likely than white women to be mentioned in abusive or problematic tweets (Amnesty International 2018a). Testimonies collected within this project, called “Troll Patrol,” provided evidence, through a damning sample of graphic hate messages, of the extent of intersectional digital violence endured on Twitter by women and trans of color (Amnesty International 2018b). Digital violence targeting, in particular, black feminists has served to bolster the careers of

polemists who have often been defended by influential white feminists, and has become a blueprint for further misogynistic and far-right attacks via false accounts, like in the case of Gamergate (Donovan 2019).

Scholarly scrutiny has exposed the various ways digital abuse is imbued with intersecting power relations: it is not only those who are most frequently the targets of digital abuse who are at the intersection of several forms of oppression such as racism, sexism, and transphobia, but also in addition, the perpetrators themselves may be intersectional offenders – for example, misogynist stalkers who are also domestic abusers and/or far-right racists. There are significant intersections between antifeminist and racist digital violence: antifeminist and far-right activists both fight against the alleged decline of (white) masculinity and Western civilization, and they put the blame for this on women, racial and ethnic minorities, and the left. In a coedited volume, *Online Othering: Exploring Digital Violence and Discrimination on the Web* (Lumsden and Harmer 2019), contributors argue that "online othering is intersectional," and they deploy intersectionality to tackle the complexity of digital violence by examining the construction and execution of online abuse via examples such as the far right and men's rights activists, as well as the experiences of victims and their resistance against various forms of digital violence like revenge porn and hate speech.

Scholars and activists alike challenge the discourses of neutrality and freedom of speech through which social media platforms free themselves of any liability with regard to digital violence they enable in their environments, and press governments for regulations that would hold them accountable as publishers, not just platform providers. These challenges may also serve to expand how violence is understood or how racism is studied. For instance, some scholars proposed the concept of "platformed racism" to apprehend social media platforms as "amplifiers and manufacturers of racist discourse," as well as to describe "the modes of platform governance that reproduce (but that can also address) social inequalities" (Matamoros-Fernández 2017: 930). In investigating how social media platforms rearticulate new forms of oppression and violence, many studies examine both their material politics (from their design to their business model, technical assets, and flaws) and their specific entrepreneurial and user cultures.

If digital technologies boost progressive social movements fostering intersectional agendas and solidarities, they also embolden far-right populist movements that recruit through digital platforms and mainstream racist, sexist, and homophobic views. In fact, evidence shows that right-leaning movements benefited from the digital turn more than left-leaning movements, because they have more money and a more hierarchical structure, which maximizes efficient digital communicational strategies (Schradie 2019). When it comes to

hate speech within digital platforms, one important issue concerns the ways in which online violence breeds violence offline. Violent acts that are perpetrated by white men, either indiscriminately as in school shootings, or against targeted groups such as Jews, Muslims, black people, Latinx, LGBTQ people, and women, are predominantly explained as individual pathologies rather than as structured patterns of violence. A case in point is the pervasive narrative of the "lone wolf." From Quebec City to Christchurch, New Zealand, mosques have been attacked and Muslims murdered by "lone wolf" terrorists in recent years. In each case, their online radicalizing has been documented, which refutes the prevailing lone wolf script and draws critical attention to an internationally networked white supremacist terrorism. Robust evidence exists showing that the perpetrators of terrorist actions were avid followers of the alt-right through the digitally mediated far-right discourse that glorified previous attacks. Yet this correlation between white terrorist actions and the exponential increase of online white supremacist speech remains overlooked in a context of the normalization of white supremacism (repackaged as white nationalism), wherein white hate speech is condoned in the name of free speech and legitimated by Twitter feeds of high-level government officials. In other words, white hate speech, not hate speech in general, seemingly has a free pass.

Globally, the rise of the far right not only cuts across class divisions as the basis of support for political parties, but also enrolls considerable segments among societal majorities, i.e. those with more power, around nationalism nativist against minority others, be they immigrants, refugees, Muslims, or Latinos (Holmwood 2019). In this context, understanding the ways digital platforms contribute to normalizing violence against those deemed as posing problems to the national body politic is a pressing issue of public concern. Intersectional frames shed much needed analytical light on, for instance, the way in which the alt-right builds efficient and transnationally linked online communities by drawing on an array of us/them repertoires that are intersectionally constituted and propagates an intersectionality of hate.[5] Intersectional analyses of digital violence are needed, in our present moment, more than ever.

Digitally networked social movements and social justice activism

When it comes to digitally networked social movements, it is crucial to avoid the pitfall of equating them only with social justice-oriented movements and repeating thereby the techno-optimism, which has long informed the research agenda in technology studies and media studies. This dominant position views the internet as an intrinsically progressive and democratizing force, given the supposed ease and accessibility of digital activism, although the evidence shows otherwise. The prevailing celebratory narrative about the internet being

“a revolutionary leveling force that is reshaping activism, particularly following the rise of social media” (Schradie 2019) overlooks the simple fact that conservative forces have more money, which is what it takes, along with technological capital, to build and sustain online publics. Instead of reinvigorating participatory democracy and building a more inclusive and egalitarian marketplace of ideas, Schradie’s empirically informed study shows that digital activism did not level the playing field; instead, it “has simply ended up reproducing, and in some cases intensifying, preexisting power imbalances” in the continuity of the historical reality that “communications tools that seemed to offer new voices are eventually owned or controlled by those with more resources” (2019: 7, 25). As we observed in the section above on digital violence, digitally networked right-wing movements are far-reaching, globally interconnected, and intersectional. The time has now come to criticize persisting techno-optimistic bias within media studies and take seriously how the digital playing field is tilted in favor of conservatives and capital whereby the corporate world wields inordinate power within digital environments (Smyrnaios 2018). Right-wing movements use digital media as a potent tool to recruit and rally their supporters and draw on intersectional identity positions – as being discriminated against as white, cis, male, etc. – all while attacking social justice-oriented intersectional digital activists. These are important topics we leave to others, as they are beyond the immediate scope of our book. We now turn to digital activism that is oriented toward social justice and consider briefly how intersectional analytical and political sensibilities shape its various instantiations.

Intersectional analyses of race, indigeneity/coloniality, gender, class, and sexuality figure prominently within digital social justice activism. Through the use of digital networks, local grassroots politics, community organizing, and broader social movements, historically disenfranchised communities use intersectionality in innovative and meaningful ways. The use of digital technologies in social movement politics and organization has been robustly studied, in recent years, from a variety of theoretical angles and empirical groundings (see, e.g., Earl and Kimport 2011; Bennett and Segerberg 2013; Castells 2015; Tüfekçi 2017), but often with the aforementioned techno-optimistic bias. Within this scholarship, a growing body of work focuses on intersectional social media activism (see, e.g., Bonilla and Rosa 2015; Theocharis et al. 2015; Brown et al. 2017; Elliott et al. 2017) and brings together social media and social movements research with intersectional lines of inquiry and analytical sensibilities.

Intersectionality constitutes an important, multipurpose frame of analysis for understanding youth activism in which digital and social media figure prominently. In a study drawing on semistructured interviews of Latino lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer undocumented youth, Veronica Terriquez and colleagues reveal the multiple

usages of intersectionality by activists as a collective action frame that functions as: "(1) a diagnostic frame to help activists make sense of their own multiply-marginalized identities; (2) a motivational frame to inspire action; and (3) a prognostic frame that guides how activists build inclusive organizations and bridge social movements" (2018: 260). Other authors focus more specifically on youth's digital activism to unpack political socialization and activism of a generation of "digital natives" (Elliott et al. 2017).

Intersectional lines of inquiry are also found, whether the term itself is used or not, in studies focusing on how different national social justice movements can inform one another. Philip Howard and Muzammil Hussain examine the complex role of the internet, mobile phones, and social networking applications in the Arab Spring, and explain the spreading of revolts across countries largely by the fact that "digital media allowed communities to realize that they shared grievances and because they nurtured transportable strategies for mobilizing against dictators" (2013: 3). Many studies tackle the entanglements between digital activism and digital capitalism, and the contradictions between digitally mediated social justice activism and the digital capitalism of new information technologies they rely on (Barassi 2015), as well as the role of digital technologies in racial justice and decolonial activism such as the student protests #RhodesMustFall and #FeesMustFall in South Africa (Bosch 2017; Khan 2017). Together, these studies identify the the centrality of digital technologies to social justice activism.

Notes

1. See, among others, the 2018 special issue of *Environmental Sociology*, "Intersectional Environmental Justice," in particular the editorial introduction by Malin and Ryder and also Ducre's article, which develops a specifically black feminist take on intersectionality. See also Kaijser and Kronsell (2014) for a deployment of intersectionality in climate change research, Buechler and Hanson (2015) for an edited volume on women, water, and global environmental change that bridges feminist political ecology, intersectionality, and environmental justice frameworks, and Olofsson et al. (2016) for the development of an intersectional climate risk approach in environmental sociology.

2. Dorothy Roberts's *Killing the Black Body* (1997) and Silliman et al.'s *Undivided Rights* (2004) have been two of the most referenced books in the reproductive justice movement.

3. Wilson cites two news stories from 2016 and 2017 that examine how Dalit and Adivasi women have protested these coercive population policies. Each event expressed opposition to a set of ideas that has been mainstreamed by the Indian state for much

longer, namely, the assumption that the fertility of poor women constitutes an obstacle to India's development, and that mass sterilization programs comprise a reasonable state-sanctioned response to this developmental threat. As Wilson contends: "Coercive sterilisations in India are a form of violence against those marked by the intersections of gender, caste, class and community, perpetrated by the state and transnational actors … Although a long-term feature of Indian policy, this violence has been extended and intensified … within a framework of neoliberal economic policies and patterns of global capital accumulation" (2018: 91).

4. Examples include #SolidarityIsForWhiteWomen started by Mikki Kendall, #BlackPowerIsForBlackMen initiated by Jamilah Lemieux, and, most prominently, #BlackLivesMatter initiated by black queer feminists Alicia Garza, Opal Tometi, and Patrisse Cullors, as well as the #MeToo movement initiated by another black woman, Tarana Burke. The latter has become global, as evidenced by its widespread use by women activists, in particular students, from China to India, to the Middle East, to North and sub-Saharan Africa, with its local inflections – for instance the hashtag movement #Masaktach ("I won't be silent") in Morocco.

5. Some examples illustrate this intersectional constitution of us/them tropes that are so instrumental to far-right populists. Take, for instance, the "people," which assured electoral successes in national elections in both the US (presidential election, 2016) and the UK (Brexit referendum, 2016). The "people" was a composite construct combining working classness and whiteness. While the victory of far-right leaders has been framed as a "working-class revolt" to "take back the country," an intersectional lens reveals its deeply entrenched racialized logic. An intersectional composition also characterizes the intensity of hatred that is directed by far-right Republican loyalists in the US at people of color, women, Muslims, and immigrants. For example, in 2019, freshman Democratic congresswoman Ilhan Omar – a 37-year-old hijab-wearing Somali-born black Muslim woman, and a frequent critic of US imperialism – has been targeted by political opponents.

5
Intersectionality, Social Protest, and Neoliberalism

In 2015, without much coverage by international media, the Spanish government adopted the Citizens' Security Law, which allowed police unprecedented discretionary powers over freedom of association and protest. The new law imposed fines of up to US$650,000 for unauthorized demonstrations near transportation hubs or nuclear power plants, and up to US$30,000 for activities during protests such as filming, photographing police, or failing to show ID. The law also cracked down on simply gathering without authorization in front of universities, hospitals, and other government buildings. Banned from demonstrating outside parliament, Spanish activists launched an ingenious strategy of popular resistance: they used holograms to stage the world's first virtual protest. The NoSomosDelito ("We Are Not Crime") movement, an association of more than 100 different organizations, invited supporters around the world to participate in the pioneering event by simply webcamming their faces via the campaign website. During the hour-long hologram demonstration, more webcam faces were posted than could be used. Passing the law did not make international headlines, yet this virtual demonstration, using more than 2,000 virtual images sent across the world, did.

Spain is one of many liberal democracies that have embraced coercive policies, or police repression and other punitive state action, as a way to control both social unrest and the fear of it. Yet, the use of excessive police force is only one facet of the problem, as governments around the world increasingly use legislative action to stifle public protest through administrative means. This regulatory suppression of peaceful public protest and the right to assemble in public places includes "obstructionist legal requirements, such as unnecessary notification periods; insurance requirements that reproduce systemic socioeconomic discrimination; de facto prohibitions on spontaneous protest; [and] limited legal definitions of 'legitimate' protests" (INCLO 2013). In many countries anti-terrorism laws are used against peaceful protests, and administrative obstructionism prevails as a deterrence tactic. Pride marches are regularly banned in countries like Turkey and Hungary, and France has banned pro-Palestinian demonstrations and tried to adopt in 2019 a controversial "anti-vandal" law in the wake of "yellow vest" protests. Police in Australia now have the authority to ban individual protesters from appearing in public spaces for a year. Protesting near government buildings, political conventions, and global summits, except in heavily policed so-called free-speech zones, has been a federal crime in the US since 2012.

Rising social unrest in the face of growing economic inequalities is hardly surprising. Yet the use of force as a response to social protest by democracies points to an erosion of the bond of trust between citizens and their governments. An Oxfam survey in six countries (Spain, Brazil, India, South Africa, the UK, and the US) shows that the majority of people believe that laws are skewed in favor of the rich, and that, when laws are designed and rules bent to benefit them, "wealth captures government policymaking" (Oxfam 2014: 2–3). "We are the 99 percent," the slogan of the 2011–12 Occupy movement, a worldwide social protest in more than 82 countries, captured this growing sentiment of discontent. Growing global social inequalities promise to be a flashpoint for changes both in how nation-states grapple with neoliberalism, as well as in how people who bear the costs of neoliberal policies respond.

This chapter examines how intersectionality fosters more robust understandings of two interrelated phenomena. The first involves global social protest against social inequalities that bubbles up in local settings and that finds new forms of organization via social media and social networking. The phenomenon links together the social problems of global social inequality, local grassroots community organizing, new uses of cyberspace for purposes such as forums about intersectionality, and the cultural politics of youth.

The second phenomenon is closely related to the first. Local social protests have largely taken aim at nation-states that implement unpopular neoliberal policies. Many democratic states have taken a coercive turn – that is, they increasingly use force to compel their citizens to obey. A constellation of terms describes this coercive turn, among them, the "security state," the "coercive surveillance state," the "police state," the "carceral state," or quite simply the "neoliberal state." The coercive policies take myriad forms that vary from one nation-state to the next. Mass incarceration, the militarization of police, and the securitization of immigration constitute social policies deployed by nation-states in ways that reflect the particularities of their populations, histories, and neoliberal aspirations. Using intersectionality as an analytic tool to analyze these interdependent phenomena sheds light on the global networked structure of global social protest and neoliberal policies.

Intersectionality and Global Social Protest

Global social protests may appear to be particularistic, uncoordinated, scattered, and local. Yet such protests take aim at growing economic inequality and social disenfranchisement brought about by the growing influence of neoliberalism both in global geopolitics and within nation-states. As a philosophy, neoliberalism has successfully challenged basic tenets of social democracies, undermining their commitment to participatory democracy as a dimension of ensuring equity and the public good. Seemingly hegemonic, neoliberalism's

acceptance has been so far-reaching that some scholars and activists identify its global effects as a new neoliberal world order. This neoliberal world order relies on a global system of capitalism that is inflected through unequal relations of race, gender, sexuality, age, disability, and citizenship. The global organization of power also catalyzes neoliberal state policies that aim at reducing democratic participation through increasingly repressive policies. If universal theories of capitalism that rely on class-only explanations of economic inequality are limited, theories of global political protest that embrace single-issue organizing may be similarly parochial.

The growing awareness of economic inequalities has been an important catalyst for global waves of social protest. Between 2009 and 2015, popular uprisings against various injustices spread across the globe. These protests had many names, reached out to various and sometimes contradictory constituencies, and were not unified by a single ideology or target. They were singular in their historical specificities and geopolitical stakes and took different internal forms within each country. Despite their differences, intersectionality sheds light on several common features of these seemingly scattered protests.

They usually started small, sometimes even with an action by just one individual that went viral and was coordinated through social media. In 2011, the self-immolation of a fruit vendor to protest police harassment and corruption in the small town of Sidi Bouzid, Tunisia, and the rapid and widespread dissemination on social media of a related video recorded on a mobile phone ignited the Arab Spring, a wave of rebellions across the Arab world. In 2012, Attawapiskat chief Theresa Spence's hunger strike to draw attention to the ongoing erosion of treaty and indigenous rights in Canada sparked the Idle No More movement that also quickly gained momentum through social media, rallies, and teach-ins.

In some cases, their initial targets were highly local or specific issues, such as the rising cost of public transportation (Brazil), tuition fees in higher education (Quebec, Chile, the UK), saving an urban green space from shopping mall construction (Turkey), protesting a new extradition law with China (Hong Kong), or police corruption in a local market (Tunisia). These initial protests often resonated with larger public discontent over specific government policies, namely, political corruption, authoritarian governing styles, and social inequalities that resulted from unearned benefits. For example, the 2014 anti-World Cup protest spread across 100 Brazilian cities via social media. Initially critical of the exorbitant expenditures of public money on stadium construction, protest groups rapidly addressed other social issues, ranging from housing and evictions, the right to peaceful protest, health and education reform, and demilitarization of police that was part of Brazil's legacy of dictatorship.

In other cases, from the outset, protests took aim at much broader social issues. Climate change, with the widespread transnational movement "School strike for climate" which

began when climate activist Greta Thunberg staged an action in August 2018 outside the Swedish Parliament; financial speculation and real-estate bubbles (the Occupy movement); national debt, austerity measures, and unemployment (Indignados in Spain and Aganaktismenoi [outraged] in Greece, the UK Uncut movement); political corruption (Brazil, Mexico), authoritarianism, and lack of democracy (Arab Spring, Hong Kong); and human rights violations (Arab Spring), narco-state violence (Mexico), indigenous rights, colonization, and environment (Idle No More in Canada and the Chilean student movement in defense of Mapuche rights): these have all been themes within global social protest.

A voluminous social movements scholarship provides context-specific studies for the examples of social protest that we offer here. Because we refer to social protest in a global context, it is impossible to detail the historical specificities of these movements. Rather, we identify some common themes and features that we find relevant to put into productive conversation with intersectionality.

The catalysts for these protests came from many sources – cutbacks in public funding for schools, healthcare, and other social services, rising prices for transportation, housing, and food, and a growing youth unemployment rate that left entire categories of youth without prospects for meaningful work, or, in the case of climate crisis, without prospect for future possibilities. Yet punitive state action, specifically police violence, ignited many of these protests and contributed to the public outcry against police response. Police violence has been central to the unfolding of the protests in many contexts: in Greece, Spain, Egypt, Turkey, and Mexico, at various locations of the international Occupy movement, as well as the international student movement from Chile, to Quebec, to South Africa, to the UK. Ironically, intersectional frameworks were present both in the discourses of self-identification among the protesters and in the mainstream media depictions delegitimizing these movements and their claims.

A defining feature of these seemingly scattered local protests is how participants imagine themselves as part of a broader transnational struggle on which they keep themselves informed. In Turkey, one of the slogans of the 2013 Gezi protests – “Everywhere is Taksim, resistance everywhere” – captures how the site of local resistance, Taksim Square in Istanbul, is envisioned as a transnational space of resistance. This transnational sensibility permeates slogans as chanted by Brazilian protesters in São Paulo: “The love is over, Turkey is right here,” or echoed in the title of an open letter penned by Egyptian protesters: “From Taksim and Rio to Tahrir, the smell of the teargas” (Tugal 2013: 157, 160). These actions illustrate one facet of what social movement literature calls globalization from below. This phrase refers to a transnational political imaginary, namely, a way of envisioning political action that goes beyond local face-to-face organizing and beyond national politics to

encompass a broader transnational focus. Social issues are seen as bigger than any one specific location – the case, for example, of seeing climate change as a manmade social problem that cannot be solved by any one country alone. For social justice movements, this concept of a transnational political imaginary enables them to see their local issues as part of global resistance.

This transnational political imaginary draws on intersectionality to cast light on the interrelatedness of these protests. The specific histories of disenfranchisement associated with racism, heterosexism, class exploitation, colonialism, and ethnic/caste/religious subordination that shape one another in specific social contexts are no longer understood as separate events but, rather, are connected. The necessary, but not sufficient, condition for this transnational political imaginary to emerge is its communicative possibilities via digital and mobile technologies and social media platforms that are outside mainstream media, which either censure or negatively portray these movements.

A second feature of these movements is their use of digital technologies, so much so that they can be viewed as digitally mediated social movements. Manuel Castells refers to them as networked social movements and highlights how they use both cyberspace and urban space for mobilization (2015: 221). From citizen-made cellphone videos broadcast on YouTube to the use of social media platforms such as Twitter and Facebook, protesters use new technologies to provide updates on protests and to share vital information – for example, which roads to avoid, what to do in case of arrest, and home remedies against teargas. Digital technologies have been an integral part of local movements, but they have also played a major role in linking local movements nationally and transnationally. Digital and social media helped create a sense of belonging to an imagined global community of resistance and facilitate cross-fertilization between movements in terms of style, tactics, inspiration, and use of art, as well as of building international audience and support. For Turkish sociologist Cihan Tugal, given that the countries shaken by these waves of social protest display starkly different dynamics, “it is technology (and more broadly style) rather than social factors that link the uprisings to each other” (2013: 157). Yet, it would be a tremendous error to assume that this digital community-making works only for progressive movements. As we have discussed in Chapter 4, the rise of the alt-right (the digitally mediated far right) in recent years has shown that transnationally linked networks of neo-Nazis and far-right groups and their sympathizers benefit from online recruitment. Likewise, in recent years, online tools (including fake news, internet bots, etc.) have been instrumental in the electoral success of many autocratically oriented populist parties in countries that include Brazil, the Philippines, Turkey, India, Hungary, and the US.

A third commonality among these movements is their intersectional understandings of the social problems they address. In his detailed empirical study of several of these movements, Manuel Castells argues that "they often express an acute consciousness of the intertwining of issues and problems for humanity at large, and they clearly display a cosmopolitan culture, while being rooted in their specific identity" (2015: 221). Intersectionality provides a political analysis of the initial catalyst, be it the defense of an urban green space or the cost of public transportation, such that social protest becomes a rallying platform for an array of differentially disenfranchised groups. This intersectional sensibility is also expressed in efforts to create an inclusive political identity for the movements (for the Spanish Indignados, see, e.g., Lopez and Garcia 2014), specifically the propensity for horizontal coalitions.

Collectively, global social protest embraces a transnational political imaginary that relies on digital media for communication among differently disenfranchised groups. Intersectionality enables these groups to see the interconnectedness of the issues that concern them, as well as their own placement within global power relations. But these same digital media also provide tools for organizing. As a result, political activism is both local and transnational in ways that reflect the constraints and possibilities of the new neoliberal world order. Social protest, while intense and episodic, becomes the catalyst or base for community organizing. When local groups gather together within a nation-state, or develop transnational networks that are linked to the immediacy of specific protests of different kinds across national settings, social movements take on new transnational forms. New communications technologies make this kind of community organizing possible beyond neighborhoods, workplaces, or geographic regions. Such new technologies not only expose the similarity of issues – for example, the coercive state and securitization that take a heterogeneous form – they provide new tools for combining grassroots, civil society organizations, and broader social movements.

The Rana Plaza tragedy

The global social protest that unfolded in the aftermath of the Rana Plaza tragedy that took place in 2013 in Dhaka, Bangladesh illustrates how using intersectional frameworks can shed light on global social protests and political activism. The fire and collapse of Rana Plaza, a building housing dozens of garment factories, killed 1,129 workers and injured 2,500 others. It is now considered the deadliest incident in the global history of the garment industry. Less deadly tragedies are so common in sweatshop factories across the Global South that they barely make the headlines.[1] It took a tragedy of this magnitude to initiate some change in the garment industry.

The garment industry has a long history of labor exploitation and unsafe working conditions, punctuated by egregious tragedies that, like Rana Plaza, can catalyze activism. For example, in 1911 in the US, the Triangle Shirtwaist Company factory in New York City burned, killing 145 workers, almost all of whom were young immigrant women. Nearly all of them were teenagers who did not speak English, and who were working 12 hours a day, every day, for US$15 a week. When the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union led a strike in 1909 demanding higher pay and shorter and more predictable hours, the Triangle Company was one of the few manufacturers that resisted. It hired police to imprison the striking women and bribed politicians to look the other way. The danger of fires in factories like Triangle was well known, but the levels of corruption in both the garment industry and city government ensured that few precautions were taken. The deaths from the Triangle tragedy were largely preventable – most of the victims were trapped behind locked doors on the eighth floor. The fire was over in just 18 minutes, by which time 49 workers had burned to death or been suffocated by smoke, 36 were dead in an elevator shaft, and 58 died from jumping to the sidewalks. The Workers Union organized a march on April 5 on New York's Fifth Avenue to protest the conditions that led to the fire; it was attended by 80,000 people. Activism in the wake of the tragedy fostered legal reforms that were important in preventing similar disasters in the future.

The Rana Plaza collapse shows similar signs of becoming a rallying cry for the contemporary anti-sweatshop movement where garment workers grapple with very similar working conditions. Thousands of women workers took action worldwide to commemorate the second anniversary of the fire and collapse of Rana Plaza. With a rallying slogan, "Rana Plaza is everywhere," the national chapters of the World March of Women from around the world took part on April 24, 2015, in a global 24-hour feminist action to commemorate this deadliest tragedy.[2] It took a catastrophe of this magnitude in a country that has the world's second largest national garment industry to garner international attention and revitalize the contemporary anti-sweatshop movement.

Tragedies such as the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory fire and the collapse of Rana Plaza catalyzed both global protests and organizing for workers' rights. The anti-sweatshop movement, as part of a more general call for workers' rights, reveals important ways in which people protest growing social inequality, namely, building a transnational political imaginary as a way of understanding how women workers are exploited in the garment industry.

Using intersectionality as an analytic tool sheds light on how some of the key features of the Rana Plaza collapse led to global social protest. First, because the tragedy highlights how capitalism and nation-state policies converge to shape the social inequalities in the global

garment industry, inter-sectionality suggests new avenues of investigation for social protest. In Chapter 1, we introduced FIFA as part of a global entertainment, sports, and tourism industry in which the unequal pay and differential treatment of players from the Global South are in such contrast to FIFA's profitability as a global business. Ironically, the globalized garment industry is also part of the World Cup industry, for which it produces apparel and souvenirs. The striking gap between factory workers' wages and high-priced World Cup paraphernalia led to an increasing amount of attention, through media coverage, to global economic inequalities and the garment industry.

Social protest focused not solely on the tragedy of Rana Plaza, but also on the working conditions of the people who died in the collapse. Within global capitalism, the garment industry presents an especially egregious version of the erosion of workers' rights. Employers located the Rana Plaza factories in Bangladesh because they were drawn to the country's cheap, abundant, and seemingly obedient workers. Bangladesh's favorable regulatory climate also contributed to the factory's working conditions. Lax regulations enabled violations of shoddy construction or unsafe conditions for workers to be overlooked. Despite certifications of compliance with international labor standards, actual compliance is minimal. As a result, the jobs in these factories lack fair pay, security, and safe working conditions. The Rana Plaza tragedy highlights the poor working conditions in sweatshops. Factory managers routinely block windows and doors, do not provide fire exits, stifle trade unions, and violate workers' rights through practices such as a 70-hour or longer week and restricted toilet time.

Second, the garment industry relies on workers who are multiply disadvantaged within systems of gender, age, race, and citizenship status. This case shows how intersecting systems of power produce social locations of disadvantage for workers and of privilege for managers and owners. The garment industry contains a highly feminized workforce, relies on child labor in some countries, uses race and ethnicity as markers for the kinds of people it hires, and favors undocumented migrant workers. This means that workers are drawn from populations that are disadvantaged within intersecting systems of oppression. Their poverty, illiteracy, gender, age, immigration status, race, caste, or ethnicity make them more vulnerable to capitalist exploitation and violence, specifically physical and sexual abuse. The garment industry exploits these gender and ethnic inequalities, as well as immigration status and age differences, for profitability.

Third, protests by workers are likely to be met with punitive responses. When garment workers slow down production, organize strikes, or unionize to protest their extremely poor working conditions and low wages, companies often respond by firing and intimidating them by means of threats, violence, and arrests (Armbruster-Sandoval 2005: 3–4).

Factories often relocate to other countries where laws are more favorable to sweatshop conditions and where labor is cheaper. More importantly, these labor practices are not new.

Labor practices in the garment industry have deep historical roots and reach across national borders. One can draw a straight line between the young women workers in the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory and those in Rana Plaza. Garment factories relocated from New York City to the less regulated and unionized locations in the US South, the Caribbean (in particular Haiti), and Central America, and to the cheaper labor and lax regulation of countries in South Asia. Within traditional frameworks of neoclassical economics, these historical patterns are simply the cost of doing business in an increasingly global marketplace. Yet intersectional frameworks attending to how intersecting power relations have shaped this particular industry provide a more nuanced argument about the connections between which people become workers in the garment industry (interpersonal domain), how managers control and exploit workers (disciplinary domain), the location of factories in countries with cheap labor and lax government oversight (structural domain), and social norms that send young women into factories to help support their families (cultural domain).

Fourth, in this context, the magnitude of the Rana Plaza tragedy has served as a powerful catalyst for coalitions among activists for workers' rights and consumer activism. The power of social media and digitally mediated consumer activism has revitalized unionism, enabling workers to push for legally binding plans and to pressure multinational brands to sign. In a *Guardian* article (April 24, 2014), journalist Christy Hoffman explains how, for years, the global labor movement and NGOs tried in vain to create an independent safety inspection regime for the Bangladesh garment industry. It was only after Rana that they were able to progress. Two global trade unions and a number of Bangladeshi unions, with more than 160 brands from 20 countries in Europe, North America, Asia, and Australia, signed a legally binding agreement that covered approximately half of all Bangladeshi factories for the export market and 2 million workers. It was the first time that such an agreement between global trade unions and multinational brands was reached. The scope of the Rana Plaza disaster invigorated consumer activism, especially among college students who became exposed to patterns of labor exploitation that produced their college T-shirts and trademarked school gear. Moreover, the lists of multinational companies refusing to sign any agreement and those declining to pay compensation to victims' families and injured survivors of the Rana Plaza collapse circulated on social media, generating consumer activism through boycotts and petitions.

A new wave of consumer activism has seemingly emerged in the Global North, one that is increasingly concerned with the economic conditions of workers and the environmental impacts of consumed products. Since its beginnings in the late 1960s and 1970s, consumer

activism in the Global South has been attentive to social justice issues (Hilton 2009). More recently, consumer activism in the Global North has grown. In the age of digital media, information about working conditions travels widely and rapidly, and it can influence consumer choices. Coordinated action by consumers who boycott companies that do not take responsibility for their effect on social welfare and the environment can encourage multinational brands, which make huge profits through their production via subcontracting to factories in the poorest countries, to use the power they have to positively change working conditions and wages.

The impact of consumer activism in an age of digital media cannot be underestimated. For example, after a million people signed a petition, the Italian company Benetton agreed to pay into a fund for Rana Plaza survivors, basically compensating workers who were not its direct employees. In a *Guardian* article (April 10, 2015), Tansy Hoskins, author of *Stitched Up: The Anti-Capitalist Book of Fashion*, quotes Bettina Musiolek, an activist with the Clean Clothes Campaign who had worked for garment workers' rights for 20 years: "There was not one single moment or one case that established this relationship of brands paying for people who are not their employees. It was a process over the last 15–20 years of civil society campaigns or human rights campaigns that defined the responsibility of brands and retailers." Clearly, public pressure from consumer boycotts and bad publicity have helped to change the climate for the garment industry; fashion brands must now perform their commitment to living wage rhetoric for their reputation of social sustainability. Such commitments are far from producing "meaningful change on the ground" (Edwards et al. 2019). The initial Rana Plaza compensation fund of US$8.5 million constituted a small victory for activists long involved in the anti-sweatshop movement. This amount cannot adequately compensate the thousands of victims, but it can serve as an agenda item for this ongoing social movement.

Finally, the question persists of how the global anti-sweatshop movement will sustain transnational solidarities, especially across differences of nation, gender, age, sexuality, race, and ethnicity. This social movement includes garment workers, community-based organizations, labor unions, consumer leagues, women's groups, students' associations, and faith-based groups, as well as various NGOs (Armbruster-Sandoval 2005: 2). It also comprises several intermeshed sites of political activism already mentioned: grassroots politics, civil society organizations, digital activism, and social movements.

Intersectionality raises new questions for understanding the kind of global social protest associated with the Rana Plaza collapse, the contours of the global anti-sweatshop movement, and global social protest generally. How might the emerging transnational solidarities of global social protest inform intersectional understandings of political praxis?

How might political projects operating at different levels and/or having different priorities, for example, the anti-sweatshop movement and consumer activism, find value in intersectionality's analytical and political sensibilities? What are the possibilities for coalition politics for a situation as complex as the Rana Plaza collapse and the social inequalities it upholds?

The Coercive Turn in Nation-States

Intersectional analyses of global social protest show the links between local and global social networks. Yet the Rana Plaza collapse occurred in Bangladesh, a nation-state whose national policies, forms of governance, and specific history all contributed to the forms of local protest in that country, and the global social movement in which those protests participated. In this sense, the particular governance structures of nation-states constitute important sites that link local and global politics.

Despite differences in the forms of government, political traditions, and history, government responses to social protest and to waves of social uprisings have been strikingly similar, namely, police repression and other punitive state action. When it comes to responding to social protest, the leaders of authoritarian and liberal democratic states alike often expand police-state techniques that build largely on counterterrorism and warfare (Tugal 2013: 158, 160). For example, a proposed New York City Police Department antiterror unit asked for permission to carry machine guns during public protests. The urban revolts reveal the extent of the punitive turn taken by many democratic nation-states where law enforcement methods and practices, acquired over decades of wars on drugs, on terror, or on insurgency, have become commonplace. From Cleveland to Kolkata, amplified powers of militarized and increasingly privatized police are exerted most heavily on the most structurally disenfranchised populations, whose social location within interlocking systems of oppression makes them vulnerable to violence.

Intersectionality sheds light on various facets of this process, namely the booming punishment industry, differential policing for minority and poor communities, the refinement of surveillance techniques, the militarization of police, the detainment of asylum seekers under inhumane conditions, and the criminalization of rescuing asylum seekers. First, nation-states emphasize punishment and make it profitable through varying strategies of mass incarceration. In many democratic states, the number of incarcerated people has grown substantially since the late twentieth century. The increased level of sentencing for a multitude of offenses and growing prison populations reflect the punitive turn taken in state policies. According to May 2019 statistics on incarceration rates in OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development) countries provided by Statista, the US is at top

position with 655 prisoners per 100,000 US residents, followed by Turkey (318) and Israel (234). Even in countries with lower rates of incarceration, longitudinal analyses show important increases. Between 1993 and 2012, Britain's prison population doubled, while in France, it increased by 50 percent between 2002 and 2012, a period that coincides with the 2007 introduction of longer mandatory minimum sentencing. In Canada, although the crime rate has been decreasing since the early 2000s, its prison population is at its highest level ever, and the federal budget for the Correctional Service has increased by 40 percent since 2008.[3]

In Brazil, the growth of the prison population has been massive since 1990, resulting in the fourth-largest prison population in the world after the US, China, and Russia; the so-called war on drugs carried out through discriminatory policing practices such as racial and class profiling has also played an important role. Roughly 25 percent of inmates are incarcerated on drug charges, the majority of whom are petty dealers from poor backgrounds. Black youth from poor urban neighborhoods or favelas have been the primary targets of antidrug legislation and aggressive policing. In its ongoing war on drugs, the Brazilian government has killed many favela youth, or has put them in jail or provisional detention for minor crimes without implementing safeguards to avoid their being brutalized or absorbed into organized crime.

Intersectional frameworks point out how the coercive turn taken by neoliberal states has fallen heavily on populations disadvantaged by race, class, gender, sexuality, disability, religion, and migration status. Within globalized cities, urban sanitization or revitalization policies can lead to the criminalization of so-called slums and eviction of the poor, who are viewed as "eyesores" and developmental "casualties" (Amar 2011). In India, for example, the urban homeless population has grown exponentially since the 1990s, primarily due to massive dislocations prompted by development projects and lack of employment in rural regions. The homeless are criminalized by the state, harassed by brutal police evictions, deprived of most basic facilities, such as shelter, running water, and sanitation, and ostracized as "outsiders" or "invaders." In response, with the help of NGOs, the urban homeless are mobilizing to claim basic human rights in a struggle many consider as one of the key new social movements in contemporary India. Within this urban homeless movement, women play a major role and make "gender specific demands concerning livelihood, sexual and reproductive health, childcare, privacy, security and rehabilitation" (Chakravarti 2014: 117–18). Homeless women face different sets of problems than homeless men and higher risk of sexual assault. Paromita Chakravarti argues that there is a need to find common ground across class and caste lines and between diverse movements led by disenfranchised urban women on issues related to access to the city and citizenship. The

homeless women's movement should dialog "with other street-based urban women's mobilizations like that of roadside vendors, sex workers or movements demanding women's safety in public spaces like 'Take Back the Night' which are gathering strength in Indian cities following the Delhi gang rape" (2014: 118).

Intersectional frameworks are useful in explaining how the organization of power impacts the types and outcomes of police action for different population groups. The policing tactics applied to African Americans in the US illustrate these patterns. For example, the 2014 killing of Eric Garner by the Staten Island police cannot be dissociated from his social location vis-à-vis intersecting power relations. Garner was a large black male street vendor selling unauthorized cigarettes. The police officer, who choked him to death, and who was subsequently exonerated by the court for doing so, saw Garner as an especially dangerous black thug, and not as who he was – an unarmed man repeatedly saying, "I can't breathe." Tanisha Anderson, a black woman, was killed by the Cleveland police while she was having a "mental health episode." Her mother called 911, asking for help for her daughter, yet when the police arrived, they slammed Anderson to the ground in a fashion that resulted in her death. Anderson's death reflects her social location within intersecting systems of power: a 37-year-old black woman with mental health problems whose family likely wouldn't have called 911 if they had had access to private healthcare. For the intervening police officers, Anderson wasn't someone in need of care, but was a threat: an agitated black woman. The force of stereotypes such as "black thug" or "crazy black woman" is literally lethal when coupled with police powers in a society structured by intersecting forms of racial and gendered dominance.

Intersectional frameworks examine the ways in which public policies uphold social inequalities. Take, for example, how Australia's asylum policies are militarized. A *New York Times* article, "Australia's Rigid Immigration Barrier" (Appleby 2015), outlines the Australian navy's authority to intercept and return boats carrying asylum seekers to countries like Indonesia, where they live in legal limbo, and Sri Lanka, where they may face government prosecution. Those who successfully reach Australian shores are relocated to offshore remote locations. This is the so-called Pacific Solution – a policy repeatedly denounced by the UN Human Rights Council – which enables the Australian government to offshore asylum seekers, including children, on Manus Island, Papua New Guinea, and Nauru, where conditions are kept purposefully hellish as a way of deterring asylum seekers. Implemented between 2001 and 2007 and interrupted in 2008, offshoring practices persist. In 2013, Australia reached a Regional Resettlement Arrangement with Papua New Guinea, which allowed the Australian Defence Force to divert all "unauthorized maritime arrivals," namely, people without visas, to mandatory unlimited detention on Manus Island, with no

possibility of settling in Australia. They live there in a military base under dreadful conditions and face harsh treatment by employees, sometimes resulting in death. Hunger strikes and suicide attempts among the detainees are not uncommon. No wonder Donald Trump – whose administration separates children from their families to deter asylum seekers – highly praised Australia's asylum policies of deterrence through cruelty (in a tweet on June 26, 2019).

Australia's offshore detention practices on Manus Island are also reminiscent of the US offshore detainment of suspected terrorists at Guantanamo, Cuba. Both sites operate in a legal vacuum, a globally unregulated no-man's-land, where the US exercises unchecked state power outside its national borders. Detainees become "out of sight, out of mind, out of rights" (McCulloch and Pickering 2008: 229). The carceral state operates, as evidenced in these cases of imprisonment, through in-between spaces where criminalized populations, refugee claimants, or people suspected of terrorism are placed in a state of indeterminacy vis-à-vis their most basic human rights. The case of Lucía Vega Jiménez illustrates various facets of police repression and other punitive state action as governmental responses to social protest and other perceived threats. On December 1, 2013, Jiménez finished her night shift as a chambermaid in a Vancouver hotel. She took the SkyTrain home, but she never made it there. During a routine fare check, the Transit Police (TP) stopped the 42-year-old Mexican worker because she failed to provide proof that she had paid. When the TP officer who initially stopped her heard her foreign accent, he contacted the Canadian Border Security Agency (CBSA). Jiménez was turned over to the CBSA on suspicion of being illegally in Canada. She had 20 days of detention, first in a maximum security prison, then at the immigration holding center several stories below Vancouver International Airport. During her detention, she received neither proper legal aid nor mental healthcare. Instead, what looked like deliberate neglect cost her the right to contest her deportation. Evidence shows that the CBSA hampered due process by withholding vital procedural information from her. Just 48 hours after her deportation date was set, she committed suicide.

By looking at Lucía Jiménez's story through intersectional frameworks, we see how race, class, gender, and immigrant status interconnect as categories of power. Jiménez's appearance made her the target of profiling policies. A TP officer later testified that he decided to contact the CBSA to check her identity because she "had an accent" and he believed "she wasn't originally from Canada." She was racially profiled by an armed TP officer. Her criminalization was an ideological dimension of intersecting power relations. Her detainment for several weeks in a maximum security prison shows the extent of criminalization of undocumented migrants. Each year, some 11,000 undocumented migrants, including children, are criminalized by the CBSA. Her detainment also calls

attention to the existence of subterranean holding cells under the gleaming Vancouver International Airport where Jiménez committed suicide. Harsha Walia, co-founder of the Vancouver chapter of No One Is Illegal, soberly points out in a *Mainlander* article (October 6, 2014):

> During the last month of her life, every institution that Lucia came into contact with was most interested in law enforcement and least interested in her safety. Though this is not shocking to anyone familiar with the immigration system, the facts that are emerging about what happened to Lucia while in custody are illuminating to those unfamiliar with how immigration enforcement really operates.

Moreover, the government apparently tried to cover up the suicide. Documents released by the CBSA, under the Access to Information Act, suggest that the agency deliberately withheld information from reporters and the public about Ms Jiménez's death.

This case shows how disciplinary practices also operate through intersecting power relations of race, class, and gender. The expansion of police powers, even beyond actual police forces, is one way that democratic governments regulate people's daily lives. Specifically, the TP's responsibility is to track fare evaders on public transport, yet here the officer acted as if he was part of border police, turning public transit into a de facto border. Every day, at various Sky Train stations and bus stops in the Greater Vancouver area, the TP – the only armed transit police force in Canada – profile people of color and turn those suspected to be illegal migrants over to the CBSA. According to Transportation Not Deportation, a community campaign calling for an immediate end to the TP's collaboration with the CBSA, the Vancouver TP reported 328 people to the CBSA in 2013, one in five of whom faced a subsequent immigration investigation that can lead to deportation. Lucía Vega Jiménez was one of them.

But the most significant power dynamic of this case, and the one most closely tied to the main ideas of this chapter, involves the structural power relations of nation-states that have adopted neoliberal philosophies. The treatment handed out illustrates how global capitalism, immigration, and state violence work together to categorize people like Jiménez as disposable (Bales 1999). From the point of view of oppressed groups, the ways in which nation-states disenfranchise, dehumanize, and render them disposable are everywhere. Policies and practices such as mass incarceration, the criminalization of the homeless by imposing fines for sleeping outside, evicting poor people from their homes in the name of urban revitalization, and blocking doors and windows in sweatshop factories to ensure that workers cannot leave all constitute a chain of events that collectively illustrate how nation-states organize the combined work of global capitalism and securitization.

Immigration policies are crafted and implemented by nation-states. While nation-states routinely draw upon different dimensions of neoliberalism, they do not embrace the same dimensions of neoliberal philosophies nor implement the ones that they do in the same way. Common trends across the Global North include the expansion of border checkpoints and security staff within borders. For instance, in the UK, the 2014 Immigration Act enlists employers, healthcare providers, educators, and landlords to act as border guards in their everyday lives. Those on the receiving end of this surveillance risk constant ID checks and discrimination in housing, education, employment, and public services. Like Vancouver's TP, by enforcing seemingly fair laws that have unjust outcomes, various service providers participate in border patrol proxy via loose interpretations that reflect racist biases and stereotypes. Thus, converting ordinary citizens into proxy immigration law enforcement officers resonates with other forms of neoliberal surveillance and privatization.

Overall, there is evidence of a globalized state security apparatus, with many participating nation-states, which produces long-term captive populations, making the prison industrial complex one of the fastest-growing business sectors in the world. By linking seemingly discrete phenomena, using intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis, potentially sheds light on the relationship between the growth of coercive neoliberal states, global capitalism, and configurations of social divisions and hierarchies based on class, gender, sexuality, race and ethnicity, disability, religion, nationality, and location. Intersectional analyses of the connections between immigration, securitization, and the carceral state illustrate yet another way of using such frameworks to analyze important social phenomena.

Securitization: A Problem for Everyone?

Developments such as the booming punishment industry, differential policing for minority and poor communities, the detainment of asylum seekers under intentionally inhumane conditions, the refinement of surveillance techniques by expanding the network of people with police powers, and the militarization of police all demonstrate how social democratic states respond to social protest. They are actively investing in neoliberal policies of securitization.

The term "securitization" emerged in the late 1990s at the Copenhagen School for Peace Studies to describe "how political speech acts or media representations produce subjects of politics that are used to transfer everyday social, economic and cultural governance into the realm of emergency police enforcements and military occupations" (Amar 2011: 306). With this shift, ever-larger groups of people within a population who become designated as a problem for, rather than as subjects of, justice are increasingly targeted, monitored, policed,

and incarcerated. Nation-states that implement neoliberal public policies thus retreat from regulating markets and providing social services, but intensify their practices of surveillance and control of individuals' everyday lives. The concept of securitization is useful for understanding this shift – for instance how social protest can be conflated with terrorism and contained with counterterrorism policing practices.

Securitization has many facets. For example, the differential policing of urban neighborhoods seems designed to secure the borders in order to contain poor people of color rather than protect them. Securitization can also refer to a population. For example, the global population of youth is one of the most vulnerable to policies of securitization, regardless of citizenship status. Like Jiménez, youth are routinely stopped by the police, adults, and mall security guards and questioned about their behavior. Adults who are treated like children – women, people of color – resent it, because this treatment shows unequal power relations.

The securitization of migration refers to processes through which enforcement measures identify transnational migrants and asylum seekers as problem groups, ostensibly to protect national security. Because they arrive without having been selected by governments, asylum seekers are often associated with illegality, disorder, and fraud. Depictions can range from the more benign "they are bogus refugees, queue-jumpers" to the downright hostile belief that "they are criminals" or "terrorists." This depiction posits asylum seekers as a security threat, a representation that makes their detention acceptable. The shift in border management regimes is manifest in the adoption of enforcement strategies set up to deter refugee claimants, undocumented migrants, and visa over-stayers. Such strategies include the construction of fortifications like the US–Mexico border fence; detention in maximum security prisons; and the creation of no-man's-lands, where asylum seekers are unable to claim their rights under refugee protection conventions and receiving states can skirt their protection obligations.

Forms of immigrant detention operate across the Global North to repel, deter, and contain so-called illegal migrants, including asylum seekers (who are doing nothing illegal according to the Geneva Convention) from the Global South. There is a global punitive trend targeting asylum seekers – a trend championed by Australia, which instituted a program of mandatory, prolonged, and even indefinite detention unprecedented among countries in the Global North (McCulloch and Pickering 2008: 226, 228, 239). More recent cases of criminalization of those who attempt to rescue asylum seekers, whether on the high seas (Italy) or by leaving water in the desert (US), constitute another facet of present-day cruelty against migrants.

By casting a new light on the intermeshed relationship between securitization and the coercive state, scholars and activists can use intersectional frameworks to criticize these practices. For example, Liat Ben-Moshe (2013) uses intersectionality both to reconsider the terms of the mass incarceration debate by addressing who counts as incarcerated, and to reconceptualize the linkages between medical/psychiatric institutionalization and imprisonment not simply as analogy but as a deep interconnection in their logic, historical enactment, and social effects. Considered from a perspective that redefines what counts as incarceration, it becomes clear that US incarceration rates have long been extremely high – and that many spaces can become sites of incarceration. Likewise, scholars and activists using intersectional frameworks help to unpack how state surveillance and violence disproportionately impact racialized transgender and gender nonconforming people. Mainstream racial justice or migrant rights movements often overlook the needs of this group, arguing that "trans issues" are neither significant nor representative of their constituencies.

Intersectional frameworks can also shed light on how progressive politics can shore up the security state. Some strands of feminism unwittingly contribute to the expansion of a state's repressive powers and the criminalization of society through the types of action they favor to address violence against women. This is the case when they advocate for state-driven, pro-criminalization strategies and call for increased policing, prosecution, and imprisonment, as well as anti-prostitution and anti-trafficking legislation (Bumiller 2008). Relying on ethnographic fieldwork, Elizabeth Bernstein (2010) argues that there is collusion between "carceral feminism" and militarized humanitarianism within the contemporary feminist anti-trafficking movement. Preferred political remedies seem to be carceral politics and securitized state apparatuses. Taking issue with some strands of feminism, such as anti-sex-trafficking and abolitionist feminisms, that are not reflective of intersectional praxis in their calling for the repressive state action in the form of criminalizing the demand for prostitution (clients), Bernstein suggests instead a community accountability approach that listens to sex workers and to their needs articulated in their own terms. For Bernstein:

> [These feminist actions shore up] the carceral state in matters such as "sex work" or "trafficking," … [and] espouse state-sanctioned sexual moralism and politics of respectability (white, middleclass, and heteronormative). As such, feminist respectability politics feeds into the security state's border politics through the "war against human trafficking" – feminists can thus unwittingly sanction the deportation of migrant sex workers in the name of rescuing them from "prostitution." (2010: 54)

Intersectionality, Social Protest, and Far-Right Populism

Using intersectionality as an analytical tool entails the challenge of attending to the varying forms of populism across different national settings and to the context-specific ways that far-right populism challenges progressive social movements and their social justice-oriented political projects.[4] Here the crucial question is to what extent far-right populism fosters social injustice, and it needs to be asked and answered in historically specific ways – a task beyond the scope of this book. We instead propose a brief discussion of the recurrent group boundaries that far-right populist rhetorics build and activate – boundaries that show striking similarities despite historical and contextual particularities – and how intersectionality can be useful to unpack the formidable plasticity of populism, that is, how it appears attached to different, even contradictory, political projects and ideologies in different contexts, at different times.

The philosophy of far-right populism typically claims to represent the interests of a segment of the public that stands for "the people" and that feels excluded from or left behind in social policy. It identifies the group it ostensibly represents as the most desirable, legitimate, and patriotic citizens; it accuses "others" of taking an unfair advantage of the chosen group and the nation-state. These "others" typically include racial/ethnic groups, sexual minorities, undocumented migrants, poor people, women, and children. This us/them way of thinking identifies one segment of the public that is deemed worthy of the benefits of full citizenship, and relegates everyone else to lesser status. It distinguishes between a "deserving" Us and "undeserving" Others. Far-right populism also identifies an elite that it sees as being complicit in the decline of national identity and as selling out the national interest because it favors the interests of the unworthy others over the bona fide interest of the chosen group. Far-right populism often maligns intellectuals, public officials, political parties, and journalists as being complicit in the deterioration of the state and, by implication, of their own group.

The philosophy of far-right populism is present in many situations without being named as such, and as a result, travels into different national settings. The diverse terminologies that describe different aspects of far-right populism reflect the malleability and adaptability of this philosophy within different national contexts. Each national context has its own history and constellation of intersecting power relations that lend themselves to ideological manipulation of far-right populism. Working within the history of US race relations of whiteness, blackness, and indigeneity, far-right populism has led to the use of the term "white nationalism" as a way of describing populist sensibilities. In the European context, populism articulates more acutely with ideas of ethnicity and religious difference, referring to immigrant populations, as well as to longstanding minorities within European nations. The resurgence of anti-Semitism as well as the pervasiveness of Islamophobia work with the

us/them framework of far-right populism. In India, Dhalit/Bahujan groups and Muslims identify extreme Hindu nationalism as an expression of far-right populism that builds on this specific context of casteism and Islamophobia. The main ideas of far-right populism resemble those of the ideology of "fascism" – a term that we do not use lightly (see Albright 2018; Stanley 2018).

What have been the responses to far-right populism within nation-states and to the spread of its ideas within a global context? If global social protest is, in effect, intersectional, as we claim here, how has far-right populism affected its contours? The election of a far-right populist leader in the 2016 US presidential election came as a surprise to many US citizens who, after eight years of centrist democratic public policies, expected a similar outcome in the election. The immediate response to the 2016 election was palpable. On January 21, 2017, the day after the presidential inauguration, the Women's March on Washington catalyzed worldwide social protest. As the largest single-day protest in US history, the Washington March was streamed live on YouTube, Facebook, and Twitter. It was reported that approximately 675 marches took place on that day, on all seven continents, including one in Antarctica.

The platform of the Women's March demonstrated a clear intersectional sensibility. On January 12, the march organizers released a policy platform addressing reproductive rights, immigration reform, healthcare reform, religious discrimination (primarily against Muslim Americans, LGBTQ rights, gender and racial inequities, workers' rights, and other issues). The phrase "Build bridges, not walls," a reference to the new administration's call to build a wall along the Mexican border, was a common refrain throughout the march. The organizers also addressed environmental issues:

> We believe that every person and every community in our nation has the right to clean water, clean air, and access to and enjoyment of public lands. We believe that our environment and our climate must be protected and that our land and natural resources cannot be exploited for corporate gain or greed – especially at the risk of public safety and health.[5]

The Women's March not only drew upon intersectionality in its policy statements, it also demonstrated an intersectional praxis via many coalitions that emerged in relation to a shared common cause of opposing far-right populism.

The success of far-right politicians in gaining seats in democratically elected governments, as well as holding high office in such governments, coupled with social protest against far-right populism within different national settings, raises questions concerning the relation of social protest movements to social democracies themselves. When it comes to social justice,

what can or should be the role of the nation-state? Here, social context matters greatly. Is the state the champion of social justice initiatives, the enemy of social justice initiatives, both friend and foe at the same time – or neither? Until the social problems that catalyze global social protest diminish and disappear, global social protest is here to stay. But the nature of the forms that it takes in neighborhoods, regions, within nation-states, and globally is likely to remain an open question.

When it comes to intersectionality, the resurgence of far-right populism points to the need to broaden conceptions of social protest beyond those aimed at the nation-state. One can protest the policies brought about by neoliberalism, yet traditions of social protest aimed at the state may be more characteristic and prevalent within nation-states of Europe and Latin America where there is a history of such demonstrations. In these cases, far-right populist ideology may breathe new life into neoliberal policies by revising old arguments that defend social inequality and, perhaps, offering new ones. The Women's March was ground-breaking, but can one march with the common cause of resisting a common set of ideas or a common enemy ever be enough? With the help of powerful digital media, a march of this magnitude can highlight the scope of a common concern. But just as a social movement cannot be reduced to one single event, or even a series of events, so global social protest is a long-term endeavor. The power of the media in the cultural domain of power needs to be supplemented by structural changes in who gets elected, by changes in public policies that guide disciplinary practices, and by a changed sense of identities that anchors intersecting identities within the context of a collective identity politics for social justice.

Yet the question remains – what additional forms of social protest exist that aim to counter the overt racism, sexism, and homophobia advanced by far-right populist movements? The structural and disciplinary domains of power that we emphasize in this chapter are crucial. Yet what other ways do people use to resist social inequalities that are highlighted by far-right populism? For this, we turn first to identity, then to education as important sites for intersectionality where cultural and interpersonal power relations are negotiated.

Notes

1. In September 2012, more than 300 workers died in a fire in a garment factory in Karachi, Pakistan; in November of the same year, another 112 workers died in a factory fire in Dhaka (Bangladesh); and in May 2015, a fire at a Manila (Philippines) slipper factory killed at least 72 workers.

2. Starting in New Caledonia and going around the world, actions took place between 12 noon and 1 pm in time zones around the world to underscore the ongoing struggles of

women factory workers. Their testimonials, photographs, and videos were put online to constitute a digital archive of transnational feminist solidarities for workers in the hyperglobalized apparel industry.

3. For more information, visit Statista, a Wikipedia for statistics: https://www.statista.com/statistics/300986/incarceration-rates-in-oecd-countries/ (https://www.statista.com/statistics/300986/incarceration-rates-in-oecd-countries/).

4. The global resurgence of far-right populism poses a number of challenges not only to nation-states that try to strike a balance between social welfare policies and neoliberalism, as we discussed in Chapter 1, but also to social movements, blurring the boundaries of their social justice claims with the intrusion of nativism and xenophobia (see, for instance, the alt-right "yellow vests" movement that sprang up in western Canada in 2018 following the protests of the *gilets jaunes* in France, and the controversial ADOS movement in the US, which asks for reparations for American descendants of slavery).

5. "Guiding Vision and Definition of Principles": PDF Women's March on Washington, from the original copy on January 20, 2017. https://archive.org/details/WMWGuidingVisionDefinitionofPrinciples (https://archive.org/details/WMWGuidingVisionDefinitionofPrinciples).

6
Intersectionality and Identity

Using intersectionality as an analytic tool fosters more expansive understandings of collective identities and political action. Identity has been an important dimension of intersectionality's emergence as a form of critical inquiry and praxis – the case, for example, of the black women in Brazil who politicized their identity of being both black and female in a society that devalued both (see Chapter 1); or the emergence of intersectionality in the US that reflected the coming together of identity politics of African American, Latina, Asian American, and indigenous women (see Chapter 3). Similarly, reproductive justice projects stress how traditional understandings of female identity limit the access of women and girls to bodily autonomy, healthcare services, and legal protections (see Chapter 4). Many of the progressive, global social protests organized to oppose the social problems brought about by neoliberal public policies draw upon a politics of identity that opposes securitization and oppressive policies of the state (see Chapter 5). Ironically, far-right populists organize to sustain those same power relations using similar tools for a conservative political agenda. The rise of far-right populism that advances public policies against immigrants, women, black people, and racial/ethnic minorities can be seen as a form of identity politics that also bundles together ideas about race, gender, sexuality, ability, and citizenship. Indeed, the terms "white identity politics" and "white nationalism" have increasingly come into public use in the aftermath of the 2016 US presidential election.

Intersectionality has also fostered a complex understanding of individual identities. The extensive body of scholarship within intersectionality that engages themes of individual identities as intersecting and performative has changed the meaning of identity from something one *has* to something one *does*. Rather than a fixed essence that a person carries from one situation to the next, individual identities are now seen as differentially performed from one social context to the next. And those social contexts are shaped by intersecting power relations. The work of Stuart Hall encapsulates this tension between the performative nature of identity as well as the significance of social structures

> Identity is not a set of fixed attributes, the unchanging essence of the inner self, but a constantly shifting process of *positioning*. We tend to think of identity as taking us back to our roots, the part of us which remains essentially the same across time. In fact, identity is always a never-completed *process* of becoming – a process of shifting *identifications*, rather than a singular, complete, finished state of being. (2017: 16)

The now commonsense idea that individual identity is shaped by multiple factors whose saliency changes from one social context to the next owes much to intersectionality's premise of intersecting identities. On a basic level, an individual need no longer ask, "Am I a Chicana, or am I a woman, or am I a lesbian first?" The answer of being *simultaneously* Chicana *and* a woman *and* a lesbian expands this space of subjectivity to encompass multiple aspects of individual identity.

In this sense, intersectionality has made important contributions to reconceptualizing individual identity and subjectivity. For many individuals, this focus on the social construction of intersecting identities that can be differentially performed from one setting to the next has been a space of individual empowerment. For example, the scholarly essays, personal narratives, ethnographic inquiry, and creative writings in *Critical Articulations of Race, Gender, and Sexual Orientation* (Howard 2014) point out how complex sexual identities emerge within various configurations of interlocking systems of oppression. Similarly, the essays in *Critical Autoethnography: Intersecting Cultural Identities in Everyday Life* (Boylorn and Orbe 2014) investigate the complex entanglements between interpersonal experiences of gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, and ability, and how they relate to larger systems of power, oppression, and social privilege. The process of crafting a unique sense of self that rests on multiple possibilities has generated new questions about multiple identities that are interconnected and co-forming within intersecting power relations, rather than how they should be ranked.

Despite these possibilities, there is one widespread tendency within contemporary scholarship on intersectionality and identity that merits analysis precisely because identity has been so central to intersectionality's critical inquiry and praxis. Increasingly, many people who are involved in inter-sectionality understand it as a theory of identity. Take, for example, how the introduction to the special issue of a journal devoted to "Race, Class, and Gender" summarizes this perspective: "Another attribute of this special issue is the extent to which it expresses intersectionality – a multifaceted perspective acknowledging the richness of the multiple socially-constructed identities that combine to create each of us as a unique individual" (Lind 2010: 3). Certainly, intersectionality does value the richness of multiple identities that make each individual unique. But intersectionality also means much more than this. To understand intersectionality primarily as a theory of individual identity, often with the goal of criticizing it, overemphasizes some dimensions of intersectionality, while underemphasizing others.

Much is at stake in getting the relationship between identity and intersectionality right. To explore these connections, this chapter analyzes the linkages between the politics of identity and intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis. First, because questions of the

connections between identity and intersectionality extend beyond contemporary debates within academia, the chapter begins not with academic disputes but rather with hip-hop, an important discourse within global cultural spheres. Given the amount of attention devoted to the topic of identity by some scholars, it is useful to examine a different project of critical inquiry and praxis that is not housed in the academy and whose content emphasizes the contributions of the cultural domain of intersecting power relations as a site for political engagement. Moreover, hip-hop is a global phenomenon that resonates with youth in the Global South.

Second, the chapter examines selected dimensions of contemporary scholarly debates concerning the connections of identity and intersectionality. Because the tone of academic debates often reflects efforts to disavow the relevance of identity for meaningful social justice projects, the chapter focuses on one particular strand of these debates, namely, scholarship that criticizes intersectionality because of its ties to identity. Here, social context matters. Scholars who criticize the ties between identity and intersectionality may advance provocative arguments, but they typically do so from within colleges and universities of the Global North. There are many points of view on identity and intersectionality within academia, yet this small but highly visible group has enjoyed a relatively loud voice.

Finally, the chapter concludes with a discussion of four important dimensions of the connections between intersectionality and identity. These themes highlight how intersectionality's core ideas – in particular, social context, relationality, social inequality, and social justice – relate to one another. They also speak to the significance of individual and collective identity as a core organizational principle of the interpersonal domain of power.

Hip-hop, intersectionality, and identity politics

When it comes to the theme of identity, intersectionality and hip-hop share some noteworthy similarities. Because people who experience discrimination of race, class, age, sexuality, and citizenship have been central to the creation and reproduction of both hip-hop and intersectionality, it stands to reason that significant parallels might exist between these two forms of critical inquiry and praxis.[1] Specifically, putting intersectionality and hip-hop in dialog potentially provides another angle of vision on the identity politics of both.

The theme of identity has certainly been important for intersectionality. The Combahee River Collective (CRC) provided the first expression of identity politics articulated during a foundational moment of intersectionality, which remains one of the sharpest elaborations of identity politics within intersectionality. To briefly review CRC's central tenets regarding

identity politics: (1) CRC members understood identity as multiply shaped by their shared social location as African American women within interlocking systems of oppression; (2) they conceptualized identities as political projects that are achieved through consciousness-raising about shared life conditions within structures of power; (3) they envisioned black feminism as the logical political movement to combat the manifold and simultaneous oppressions that they faced as black women; and (4) CRC identified the importance of building collective identity as a political project for women of color and other disenfranchised groups like themselves. The CRC's "A Black Feminist Statement" clearly articulates identity politics as a vital tool for resisting oppression and relies unambiguously on an understanding of identity as a political location, not an essence (Alcoff 2006: 15). This is the conception of identity politics that Crenshaw (1991) had in mind in her important article on intersectionality.

Hip-hop expresses a similar sensibility concerning identity, yet in less explicit forms than these examples from intersectionality. Regardless of the lyrics, rap music is a form of powerful personal expression where youth claim a voice that emphasizes individual identity. In today's global context, youth are positioned to craft an identity politics that criticizes the social issues they grapple with within social institutions that have incorporated neoliberal philosophies. Young people are often among the first to see the ways in which intersecting systems of power put them at risk, primarily because experiences of social inequalities in their everyday lives express various intersections (race, gender, class, sexuality, and ability). Children, teenagers, and young adults have a special vantage point on social inequalities of age as a system of power and its intersections with other inequalities. If they live in poor neighborhoods, they know that their communities receive inferior health and social services and that they may be the targets of intensified surveillance and policing. They see how their schools have less experienced teachers, are housed in old and dilapidated buildings, and have outdated textbooks. They know that legitimate jobs for teenagers are minimal, pay little, and have few benefits. Race, class, gender, and citizenship categories disadvantage many groups under neoliberal policies, yet, because age straddles all of these categories, young people's experiences of social problems are more intensified.

Many hip-hop artists have focused on the myriad social problems faced by youth. The practices associated with hip-hop – for example, rap lyrics criticizing the police and schools, tagging public space with graffiti, and disobeying the rules – disrupt the traditional status quo. Originally seen as "noise," hip-hop is increasingly considered a form of cultural politics complementary to traditional politics of voting and holding office (Clay 2012; Rose 1994). Too young to vote and to get elected to public office, where do youth take their protest? When youth confront schools, labor markets, and other social institutions as part of the

structural domain of power, and experience policing of the disciplinary domain of power, they turn to other venues for political expression.

Music, dance, poetry, and art of the cultural domain of power and personal politics of the interpersonal domain grow in significance as expressions of political activism. Significantly, the growth of mass media in the 1990s as a conduit for hip-hop and, more recently, the spread of digital and social media in the 2000s have provided tools for cultural and engagement that speak directly to youth. The content of hip-hop highlights the significance of identity for youth, giving voice to the experiences of black, brown, poor, and similarly situated youth within the changing global politics of neoliberalism. In hip-hop, teenagers and young adults tell the story of their own lives, the truths of their own experiences. Hip-hop is not identity politics in the abstract. Rather, hip-hop constitutes an important space for developing the kind of collective identity politics that informs contemporary intersectional praxis (e.g., Chun et al. 2013; Crenshaw 1991; Terriquez 2015).

When it comes to connections between politics and identity, intersectionality, and hip-hop grapple with similar sets of challenges that shape identity politics within each area. First, intersectionality and hip-hop both experienced rapid growth as their ideas traveled beyond their local origins throughout different regional and national contexts. For both discourses, the identity politics of disenfranchised groups moved into global public space, which in return impacted the ongoing construction of collective identity itself.

Yet whereas intersectionality has been incorporated within academia, within human rights venues, and throughout digital space, hip-hop has been differentially taken up within these spaces. As the cultural and political product of young people, hip-hop has had access to venues where academia and government have been less visible, but where mass media and digital space have figured prominently. The commercialization and marketing of its major figures and the “authenticity” of identity narratives by youth coalesced into a new art form that emphasized cultural politics. Youth identity politics occupy this contested space between the conformist pressures of traditions and the participatory ethos of hip-hop, especially evident in spoken word, where everyone has a voice. In this fast-paced digital era, the aesthetics and politics of hip-hop have been disarticulated and rearticulated by youth in multiple places. Because each local neighborhood and city has its own particular history and story, hip-hop takes different forms and advances distinctive issues. There is no hip-hop leader or archetypal form of hip-hop. Instead, hip-hop constitutes an assemblage of loosely linked local projects, where the meaning of local is constantly reshaped by social media itself.

A truly global phenomenon, hip-hop’s geopolitical reach has gone far beyond its US origin story. Youth use hip-hop as a form of cultural politics to intervene in important social issues

across the globe. For example, youth from the Global South of immigrant descent use hip-hop to create an in-between space that is neither their parents' home country, nor their "adopted" home where they face "othering." Muslim youth protest, through hip-hop, Western assaults on Muslim countries and Islam in general under the guise of global war on terrorism (Aidi 2014), while indigenous youth use hip-hop to denounce white settler colonialism (Shingler 2013). The Black Atlantic paradigm (Gilroy 1993), with its critique of cultural nationalism and conceptualization of a hybrid and distinctively modern geopolitical and cultural space, which is simultaneously African, American, Caribbean, and West European, constitutes another important axis of hip-hop's diasporic reach with the specific legacy of transatlantic slavery. The heterogeneity of youth experiences means that the issues they raise can resemble one another on some dimensions but not on others. For example, because issues faced by youth living in the segregated suburbs outside French cities resemble those of urban youth living inside US cities, French hip-hop and US hip-hop have a similar vibe. In contrast, youth who live in small cities and villages, where rural realities are different, often draw upon local cultures to adapt hip-hop as an art form to express their identity politics.

Second, intersectionality and hip-hop both recognize the significance of identities for political consciousness and behavior. Not only do they both offer alternative analyses of social problems, they point to reframing identities as an important dimension of political empowerment for oppressed people. Hip-hop communities understand personal identity narratives as highly influential in people's everyday lives, especially when responding to social problems. In his ethnography, *5 Grams: Crack Cocaine, Rap Music, and the War on Drugs*, Dimitri Bogazianos argues that hip-hop provided an alternative narrative for drugs that, in turn, contested public policies of criminalization that demonized and locked up youth of color. He advances a novel thesis of how hip-hop accomplished this: "What rap, ethnographic literature on crack dealing, and research on America's declining violence rates suggest is that youth, indeed, have been engaged in very serious efforts to monitor, train, and restrain themselves" (2012: 12). In other words, because youth saw the dangers of the stereotypical identities that were manufactured for them, they used rap music to resist these identities. Bogazianos suggests that the decline of crack markets and the associated declines in lethal violence that began in the early 1990s were "seriously influenced by the cultural stigma that youth in communities most affected by crack cocaine attached to its users, derogatorily referring to them as 'crackheads'" (2012: 4). Stated differently, not only did youth advance an alternative analysis of crack use, but creating, politicizing, and censuring the identity of a crackhead was an important part of their political response to drugs. Youth had to craft their own self-defined identities, an important task for disenfranchised people

who consistently have to create meaningful identities in response to stereotypes that are imposed from above.

Third, hip-hop and intersectionality both reject views of identity that pit the individual against the collective. Instead, both highlight how collective political consciousness emerges when people see how their individual life experiences reflect collective experiences as well as how both individual and collective identities themselves are shaped by broader social forces. Hip-hop's narratives contain a critique of poverty, violence, racism, and similar social problems that intersectionality also contests, but do so via an unabashed claiming of a collective identity politics as a vehicle of social commentary. For example, youth of color, especially in urban settings, are well aware of the effects of the defunding and neglect of public education on their lives. In urban areas, this educational neglect serves as a catalyst for outpourings of narratives from young people about forms of social injustice. The themes within hip-hop are often raw, pointing to the effects on young people's lives of policies decided elsewhere. Initially created by poor and working-class African American, Afro-Caribbean, and Latino youth as a means of expressing their experiences with and feelings about the economic, social, and political challenges in their lives, hip-hop has grown far beyond critique to provide a space for an emerging identity politics.

Spoken word poetry constitutes an important site where the content of youth identity narratives reflects an infusion of intersectionality's narrative of multiple identities. In spoken word venues, individual artists share experiences of sexual assault, being homeless, racial profiling, being too poor to afford clothes, homophobic violence, being kicked out of families, being rendered homeless, and the terrible conditions of their public schools. Yet they do so not in the privacy of hidden conversations, but in public venues, in supportive communities that they create and maintain. Spoken word becomes a place of healing from the injuries of varying combinations of forms of oppression. But the narratives of spoken-word poetry do not exclusively emphasize anger or sadness. As part of a broader expansion of hip-hop to include artists from multiple genders, sexualities, religious backgrounds, and even ages ("old school" rap happens too), spoken word events demonstrate the significance of art as a place of love, healing, and intimacy.

Finally, and significantly, intersectionality and hip-hop both face the challenge of how to cast a self-reflexive eye on their respective identity politics. Colleges and universities have been important sites for intersectionality's emergence and institutionalization, a placement that has elevated scholarship as the visible face of intersectionality's cultural politics. In contrast, hip-hop's institutional terrain consists of the music industry, an institution with a more visible history of exploiting artists. Hip-hop's visibility within television, music, and fashion raises questions about cultural politics as a form of political activism. In many ways,

the manipulation of identities and identity politics is more visible within the music videos of mass media venues or the huge following of celebrities on Twitter than within the textbooks and research articles of academia. Intersectionality faces pressures to turn itself into a hot commodity for academic consumption, yet hip-hop has been far more successful in doing so. The culture industry knows the power of its own practices. As a genre, hip-hop confronts capitalist marketplace relations from a seemingly different vantage point – hip-hop's profitability protects it from obscurity, yet this same visibility may undercut the political message.

Hip-hop may have the potential to foster a collective identity politics that embraces a critical consciousness, but does it actually do so? Scholars and hip-hop practitioners alike have criticized rap in particular for promoting hypermasculinity, misogyny, and homophobia. Yet the issue is to engage the contested politics of gender, sexuality, class, and ethnicity *within* different genres of hip-hop, not criticize it as a whole. More nuanced analyses by scholars and artists who want to develop hip-hop as a form of critical inquiry and praxis bring more complex intersectional analyses to the forefront (Clay 2008; Pough 2004).

Scholarship that uses intersectionality as an analytic tool to study hip-hop sheds light on hip-hop's identity politics. In *Hip-Hop Desis: South Asian Americans, Blackness, and Global Race Consciousness* (2010), Nitasha Tamar Sharma provides a fascinating and nuanced analysis of the identity politics of Desi youth in hip-hop, examining how middle-class South Asian (Desi) youth navigate the terrain of race, class, gender, and immigrant status in the US. She looks at how Desi youth craft identities in response to a mix of factors: (1) relationships with their parents who want them to retain Indian culture and middle-class lifestyles; (2) their varying social locations within diverse South Asian communities where being Indian and middle class privileges them; and (3) the neighborhoods where they live, which can be white or racially mixed. Sharma traces how hip-hop provides an alternative space for Desi youth who use hip-hop to carve out new identities within these contested politics. The complexities of Sharma's analysis lie in her attention to how Desi women within hip-hop flip the scripts of gender and sexuality. She also interrogates issues of ownership over hip-hop, illustrating that, while Desis see the connections with black people and global racism, they creatively employ hip-hop for new projects.

In his ethnography, *Hip-Hop Underground: The Integrity and Ethics of Racial Identification* (2009), Anthony Kwame Harrison provides another angle of vision on the identity politics that is associated with hip-hop, in this case an analysis of a diverse community of youth who identify as black, Latino, white, mixed, and/or LGBT. Harrison suggests that kids involved in underground hip-hop in the Bay Area, or "West Coast underground hip-hop," explicitly erode barriers that have traditionally separated hip-hop

performers from audience members, or producers from consumers. He finds a cultural community constructed across multiple racial, ethnic, sexual, and gender identities, a new place provided by hip-hop. Moreover, this community is also political because it challenges prevailing power relations to craft a more democratic community (see Collins 2010).

Imani Perry (2004) offers a more cautious analysis of hip-hop's identity politics, pointing out how the norms of participatory democracy and neoliberal marketplace competition lie at the heart of this form of cultural politics. Her analysis of the contradictions within hip-hop bear striking resemblance to those within intersectionality: "the combination of democracy ('Speak your piece') and meritocracy ('Be the best MC') that exists in hip-hop is threatened at every turn" (2004: 7). She describes hip-hop as a democratic space in which expression is more important than the monitoring of the acceptable. Hip-hop rejects the silencing impulse about taboo topics that exists in various segments of American popular culture. This impulse to silence the disenfranchised occurs not only outside African American communities, but also within them. Hip-hop resists the silencing of certain politics, ideologies, sexual preferences, and other controversial matters. Hip-hop may create a space of intellectual freedom, but Perry also points to the complexities within this space:

> Hip-hop may be democratic, but it is not, as a musical community, inherently liberatory. There are particular artists with liberatory agendas, who by their words protest racism, sexism, classism and thereby enlighten. But hip-hop is not "liberation music." The ideological democracy inherent in hip-hop prevents the kind of coherent political framework necessary for it to be characterized as such. (2004: 6–7)

As is everything else, hip-hop too is a contested site of politics with its own specific form of identity politics.

Intersectionality and Identity Debates in the Academy

Given the centrality of identity politics within both intersectionality and hip-hop, contemporary academic debates about identity can seem strangely out of touch. Were the treatment of identity politics within academia just a matter of scholarly debate, exploring hip-hop as a form of cultural politics would have been unnecessary. Yet because intersectionality has long been associated with identity politics and shunned within many academic circles by the same token, intersectionality as a form of critical analysis and praxis has much at stake in getting this question of identity right. Here we focus on criticisms of intersectionality to ask what kind of identity do these critics assume to be associated with intersectionality? And if intersectionality is so compromised by its identity politics, should it divorce itself from any identity-related concerns and investigations?

Academic scholarship focusing on identity as a crucial feature of intersectionality typically offers a narrower understanding of identity than those presented thus far in this book. Some critics construe intersectionality as inherently flawed due to its overemphasis on identity, and even recommend abandoning the concept altogether. Others, also taking issue with the overemphasis on identity, counsel intersectionality scholars to pay less attention to identity. Both see intersectionality as giving too much explanatory power to identity to elucidate social phenomena and political processes.

One criticism of intersectionality concerns the overuse of personal identity as an analytical category and argues that because too much attention is given to identity, intersectionality underplays structural analyses, especially materialist analyses of class and power. Yet a careful read of intersectionality scholarship, past and present, reveals that these criticisms become tenable only by ignoring the centrality of structural analyses that have characterized intersectionality from its beginning. For example, the work of Frances Beal, the CRC statement, as well as the explicit focus on the institutional transformation of key figures who introduced intersectionality to the academy, all suggest that, when it comes to questions of identity, intersectionality has long emphasized a combination of structural and cultural analyses. Materialist analyses remain salient within contemporary intersectionality scholarship, as evidenced by, for example, Nirmala Erevelles's intersectional take on disability, focusing on "the actual social and economic conditions that impact (disabled) people's lives, and that are concurrently mediated by the politics of race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and nation" (2011: 26).

A related criticism sees intersectionality as being overly concerned with essentialist conceptions of identity that insufficiently acknowledge difference. Essentialism conceptualizes individuals as having unchanged, fixed, or "essential" identities that they carry around with them from one situation to the next. In contrast to these identities, individuals can be seen as having multiple "subjectivities" that may vary from one situation to the next depending on power relations. In other words, people have many choices and considerable agency about who they choose to be, but all within the constraints of social circumstances that are not their choice. Much intersectional scholarship supports this perspective on human subjectivity that carefully navigates the interaction between social determinants and individual agency: individuals typically express varying combinations of their multiple identities of gender, sexuality, race, ethnicity, and religion across different situations. Social context matters in how people use identity to create space for personal freedom.

This criticism of essentialism has also been applied to collective or group-based identities. Critics claim that collective identity can have a negative effect on group politics when it

suppresses differences within a group. For example, if hip-hop elevates African American men as the essential identity for this form of cultural politics, it limits its political horizons because it ignores women, Desis, Aboriginal rappers, and Muslim rappers. The criticism of essentialism and collective politics has some validity. In fact, it is one that has been raised by scholars who use intersectionality as an analytic tool. For example, Cathy Cohen's important book, *The Boundaries of Blackness: Aids and the Breakdown of Black Politics* (1999), presents a compelling analysis of how essentialist thinking that ignores the needs of LGBT African Americans, sex workers, and other groups within African American communities compromised political responses to HIV. Rather than maligning identity politics writ large, Cohen challenges African Americans to draw upon more complex, intersectional notions of community and politics. Within the space of developing a collective identity politics, the challenge to all groups is to self-regulate and try to identify and oppose essentialist tendencies in their projects.

Yet challenging groups to avoid essentialist pitfalls while developing collective political projects is not the focus of criticism. Rather, critics deploy a scorched-earth policy of doing away with identity politics altogether in the name of eradicating the negative effects of essentialism. Yet being attentive to power relations that produce social inequality means that deconstructing identities in a context of structural injustice will have a disproportionate effect on groups facing intersecting systems of oppression.

These strands of criticism that conflate intersectionality with identity seem to understand intersectionality as a type of identity studies. Consider Robyn Wiegman's claim that intersectionality "is ubiquitous in identity-based fields of study" and circulates "as the primary figure of political completion in US identity knowledge domains" (2012: 2, 240). While intersectionality is a key framework for thinking about knowledge politics within the scholarly fields that acknowledge the importance of identity (and its relation to power) for knowledge production in general and for emancipatory knowledge production in particular, Wiegman's assertion is characterized by a misrecognition of these fields and of intersectionality as being primarily, if not solely, about identity. Irrespective of Wiegman's intent, such misrecognition leads to devaluing intersectionality on at least three grounds: (1) because of its (alleged) attachment to (supposedly) fixed categories of identity; (2) because of its focus on what are deemed as too "exclusionary" or "parochial" identities; and (3) because of its lack of aspiration to universalism and grand theory.

It is worth asking whether the criticism that intersectionality relies too much on identity categories – "there is too much identity in intersectionality" – is rather, in fact, a complaint that "there is too much identity *politics* in intersectionality." Criticizing identity can hence be a way of criticizing identity politics without directly confronting many groups who have

historically laid claim to it. In light of robust understandings of identity politics that influenced social movement inflections of intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and praxis, taking a closer look at the three main criticisms of identity politics is important.

First, identity politics is branded as separatist and fragmentary. Intersectionality becomes guilty by association: it allegedly breaks groups into ever-smaller subgroups – "the infinite regress problem" (Ehrenreich 2002). This view endorses fragmentary understandings of social organization, when it acknowledges the existence of the social at all. The charge of infinite fragmentation often uses identity politics as a foil to defend the concept of class and class politics against intersectionality (which is seen as being about culture). According to its critics, intersectionality weakens class struggle by turning people's attention toward cultural matters. This shift away from traditional politics of protesting the policies of the state serves global capitalism (Mitchell 2013). Influential leftist intellectuals not only meet identity politics with great distrust, they grossly caricature it. Take for example philosopher John D. Caputo's charge against identity politics, building on Marxist philosophers Alain Badiou and Slavoj Žižek:

> [T]here is the proliferation of identity politics, of women's rights, gay rights, the rights of the disabled, of anti-Jewish or anti-Hispanic or anti-Italian defamation organizations, and so on, which both Badiou and Žižek treat with great cynicism. Žižek recently quipped that he wanted to start up a necrophiliac rights group. Each segment of identity politics creates a new market of specialty magazines, books, bars, websites, DVDs, radio stations, a lecture circuit for its most marketable propagandizers, and so on. By creating an endless series of proliferating differences, of new specialty markets, cultural identity fits hand in glove with the ever-proliferating system of global capital. (2009: 6)

In another example, materialist feminist Eve Mitchell (2013) targets intersectionality, which she conflates with identity politics, to recenter a class analysis: "Since identity politics, and therefore intersectionality theory, are a bourgeois politics, the possibilities for struggle are also bourgeois. Identity politics reproduces the appearance of an alienated individual under capitalism and so struggle takes the form of equality among groups at best, or individualized forms of struggle at worse."

Second, critics argue that identity politics values cultural recognition over economic redistribution. In other words, groups claiming identity politics want recognition of their own narrow interests rather than having a broader commitment to the social good. This claim circumvents a vast literature documenting how disenfranchised groups tackle the issue of social justice on both fronts and view cultural empowerment and economic redistribution as inseparable. Out of necessity, women of color integrated their claims for

equity, recognition, and redistribution. Separating them was practically or analytically impossible when racism and sexism always structured the specific form of class exploitation that they face (see Bhandar 2013). Treating these claims as separable and arguing that oppressed groups can favor one over the other is invalidated by empirical evidence from political projects such as the contemporary Afro-Brazilian women's movement. Concretely, by categorizing gender and race-based claims as cultural and dissociating them from economic justice claims, this criticism fails to address how economic injustice relies on gendered and racialized structures in historically specific ways.

A third criticism of identity politics is that it fosters victimhood politics. In other words, people who claim identity politics are basically clinging to some sort of victim status – as women, or blacks, or disabled – as the basis of their separatist claims for recognition. Their political claims are based solely on victimhood, nothing else of value. Interestingly, within left-wing criticism of identity politics, and, by implication, of intersectionality, as the latter is often equated with the former, bashing identity politics on the basis of its alleged victimhood culture brings together Marxists and postmodern leftists, two strands of thought that don't generally see eye to eye. Within Marxist critique, the victimhood argument is linked to class struggle and how identity politics purportedly serves the interests of global capitalism. Surprisingly, the postmodern left presents an especially scathing criticism of identity politics. For political scientist Wendy Brown, identities invariably subjugate people and cannot be viable in emancipatory politics. She disqualifies identities as "wounded attachments" that trap disenfranchised groups in a cycle of rehashing their injuries and blaming their oppressors. Identity-based political movements thus rely on a compulsive repetition of traumatic events, holding us captive of our oppression. Brown speculates: "particular constituents … of identity's desire for recognition … seem to breed a politics of recrimination and rancor, of culturally dispersed paralysis and suffering, a tendency to reproach power rather than aspire to it, to disdain freedom rather than practice it" (1995: 55). In brief, identity politics disempowers oppressed people because it encourages them to cling to victim status.

Collectively, these arguments against intersectionality's claims to identity only work within narrow understandings of intersectionality that simultaneously emphasize it as a form of abstract inquiry and neglect it as a form of critical praxis as it actually happens. This book's expansive understanding of the concept provides an intellectual context for these particular criticisms of intersectionality and identity politics. It suggests that identity politics has had an opposite effect. For example, the case study of why black women in Brazil felt they needed a black women's movement speaks to this use of identity. The living identity politics of this group were decidedly not separatist: they valued both cultural recognition – namely,

respect as Afro-Brazilian women – and economic redistribution in Brazil. They also eschewed victimhood politics of begging for intellectual and political guidance from more powerful groups. Several studies provide empirical evidence that confirm how disenfranchised people use identity politics for political empowerment. This empirical work both uses inter-sectionality as an analytic tool and refutes the main points of the depiction presented above of the identity politics within intersectionality. In the following three studies, researchers underscore how identities are primarily understood as a collective political subjectivity and conscious coalition that also leaves room for individual identity.

The ethnographic work of political scientist José E. Cruz (1998) counters the three major criticisms of intersectionality's identity politics: they are separatist; they value cultural recognition over economic redistribution; and they convey victimhood politics. His study of Puerto Rican politics in Hartford, Connecticut, one of the oldest concentrations of Puerto Ricans in the US, demonstrates how identity-based political organizing, rather than causing isolation or wallowing in victimhood, encouraged greater political mobilization and citizen involvement. The Puerto Rican Political Action Committee of Hartford mobilized Puerto Rican identity as "a code that structured their entrance into mainstream society and politics" (Cruz 1998: 6). Their demands neither fragmented the political setting, nor artificially separated cultural recognition from economic redistribution.

Similarly, Kalpana Kannabiran's work on Dalit feminist resistance within India's National Federation of Dalit Women not only invalidates the critiques of identity politics, but also postmodernist assumptions that intersectionality is deeply flawed by essentialism. Exposing how the Dalit women's movement mobilized a collective identity that was forged "in several struggles at once" (2006: 68) and sought to create solidarities and dialog with other women's rights movements, Kannabiran explicitly talks about "the intersectional articulation of the Dalit women's political position" (2006: 67). For her, Dalit women's identity is a creative expression of a political standpoint shaped by multiple and interrelated systems of oppression: religiously sanctioned casteism, patriarchy, capitalism, state, and religion. Vulnerabilities and violence generated by this organization of power are also multiple and interrelated: higher caste aggression perpetrated both by men and women, Dalit male aggression, patriarchal violence within the family and community, sexual assaults by men of higher castes, economic exploitation of both Dalit men and women by dominant caste-owned capital (e.g., landowners and factory owners), and the complicity of the state and its institutions. Kannabiran's work shows how, through identity-based resistance and struggle, Dalit women forged solidarities among race, caste, and gender at the local, national, and international levels. Moreover, they did so by using international soft-law

mechanisms, as well as the theoretical framework provided by "intersectionality in race theory" (2006: 68).

Another study refuting the understandings of identity politics offered by intersectionality's critics is Edwina Barvosa-Carter's historical account of the emergence of Latino/a identity in 1970s Chicago. Barvosa-Carter shows how this new ethnic identity was a "politically strategic formation," enabling the members of two discrete ethnic groups, Mexicans and Puerto Ricans, to collectively understand themselves as "members of a single, larger, internally diverse, and politicized ethnic group" (2001: 21). This new identity helped them collaborate across their differences to fight discrimination. Hardly a homogeneous ethnic identity, Latino/a signifies a political coalition aware of multiple differences – not only those between Mexicans and Puerto Ricans, but also those within them. "In the process, Latino/a identified people both engaged a new identity and retained the identities they already had – including national, sexual, gender, age, ideological, class, professional, and other identities" (2001: 21).

Overall, scholars viewing intersectionality as flawed because of its ties to identity typically rely on understandings of both that neglect how intersectionality as a form of critical praxis operates across many different venues. Instead, their criticisms constitute theoretical approaches to power and politics that remain plausible in the abstract. For orthodox Marxists, identity means being apolitical in ways that obscure class as the most fundamental oppression. For those who embrace postmodern anti-categorical thinking, intersectionality's identity conceptions are essentialist and exclusionary. Thus, in many of these critiques, identity is either associated with bad politics or dissociated from politics altogether. Yet, a more holistic approach to intersectionality, one that attends to intersectionality's critical praxis, creates space to rethink this relationship between intersectionality and identity politics.

Then What Kind of Identity for Intersectionality?

The mainstream criticisms leveled against intersectionality's identity politics – namely, that intersectionality fosters separatism, overemphasizes cultural recognition, and exaggerates victimhood – could just as easily be targeted at hip-hop. But when it comes to hip-hop's identity politics, these criticisms falter. As a form of cultural politics with tremendous global reach, hip-hop can hardly be accused of being separatist. As a genre, hip-hop contains numerous demands for better schooling, adequate housing, jobs, and stopping police violence. These demands can only be met with some form of economic redistribution. Thus, hip-hop's cultural politics cannot be reduced to cultural recognition from the mainstream. Instead, hip-hop uses identity politics as an important vehicle to criticize the lack of

recognition of the social problems faced by disenfranchised youth. As for victimhood politics, what would be gained by youth who kept their victimization to themselves? The power of the voice in spoken word and rap lies in sharing stories not only of victimization, but also of triumph, struggle, disappointment, and a range of human experiences. Who benefits from the suppression of identity politics advanced by disenfranchised groups? This is exactly the question that intersectionality must ask concerning its own practice.

When it comes to intersectionality as a form of critical analysis and praxis, how might reclaiming identity politics speak to contemporary challenges of understanding social inequality and fostering social justice? It is impossible to do justice to the heterogeneity and richness of scholarship, cultural production, and political projects that take up varying aspects of this question in any one book, but we have made a consistent effort here to identify suggestive examples. Four identity-related themes have emerged as having potentially important implications for intersectionality: identities as strategically essential, identities as de facto coalitions, identities and intersecting power relations, and the transformative potential of identities. These themes highlight several of intersectionality's core ideas, in particular, social context, relationality, social inequality, and social justice. They also speak to the significance of individual and collective identity as a core organizational principle of the interpersonal domain of power.

First, identities mobilized in political struggles of disenfranchised groups are not fundamentally fixed and unchanging but, rather, are strategically essentialist (Spivak 1996). For postcolonial scholar Gayatri Spivak, strategic essentialism entails adopting a deliberately essentialist position with respect to relevant identity categories (or a combination of them) in order to articulate and mobilize a collective consciousness for achieving a set of chosen political ends. This brings to the fore the political saliency of "identity categories" in a given situation from the perspective of those who mobilize those identities in their struggles. In this context, being strategic means identifying the most useful intersections for analysis and action, such as caste and gender in response to India's reproductive policies, or gender and ethnicity in those of Zimbabwe (see Chapter 4). Strategic essentialism rests on having a platform of some sort around which individuals and groups can coalesce.

Reading a *social context* is an important aspect of whether to rely on strategic essentialism and, if so, how strategic essentialism might be deployed. Black women in Brazil were able to incorporate so many different groups into their movement because they had shifting alliances with many groups. One sees in their work the use of strategic essentialism as an important legitimate political tactic in a struggle for social justice. Viewing strategic

essentialism as a valuable tool for intersectionality creates space for subordinated groups to use identity politics for political goals.

Second, conceptualizing identity as being inherently coalitional generates new directions for understanding the constitution of collective identities and fosters solidarity politics. Such linking of identity and coalition also resonates with intersectionality's core idea of *relationality*. A conception of identity as being already or soon-to-be coalitional figures prominently in Crenshaw's work (see Carastathis 2013). Crenshaw uses intersectionality as a framework to conceptualize identity-based groups as de facto coalitions, "or at least coalitions waiting to be formed" (1991: 1299) so as to expand the possibilities for political organizing that attends to intersecting power differentials within the group.[2]

Third, this more expansive understanding of individual identity and collective identity as both situated and as performative potentially deepens intersectionality's premise of *intersecting power relations*. The FIFA case (see Chapter 1) presented a power analytic for intersectionality: intersecting power relations are to be analyzed both via specific intersections, for example, of capitalism and racism, as well as across domains of power, namely, structural, disciplinary, cultural, and interpersonal. Identity politics invokes the connection between individual and collective empowerment. Because individual identity invokes the interpersonal domain of power, situating identity within intersectionality's power analytics highlights how the structural, cultural, and disciplinary domains of power inform individual identity. We create our individual identities within intersecting power relations, and the collective actions of individuals underpin local, national, and global social protest. When it comes to collective group-based identities, an especially productive approach lies in examining how the political dimensions of individual and collective identity can constitute a starting point for intersectional inquiry and praxis rather than being an end in itself. Queer of color theorist Rod Ferguson captures this sensibility of identity as a starting point for intellectual and political action: "Women of color feminism had to express a politics … in which identity was a point of departure since the gendered and sexual regulations of national liberation proved that women of color, in general, and lesbians of color in particular could not take comfort in the presumed accommodations of nationalism" (2004: 130). In other words, Ferguson argues that women of color feminism, the kind found in the work of the Combahee or Anzaldúa's attention to the borderlands, have effectively challenged social injustice because they drew upon their intersecting identities to ground their politics.

Finally, an understanding of identities that foregrounds their transformative potentialities, which effectively builds on the three previously discussed themes – identities as strategically essential, identities as de facto coalitions, and identities and intersecting power relations –

dovetails with intersectionality's social justice aspirations and captures the spirit of identity politics within various expressions of intersectionality. Many struggles led by racialized communities (black, indigenous, people of color) point to the importance of identity for building collective political subjects and the transformative possibilities that are opened up through politicized identities that are formed within, and shape in return, broader social struggles. Identity politics rests upon a recursive relationship between individuals and social structures, when the former bring into being a collective based on shared similar social locations within power relations. A transformed identity is potentially transformative and long-lasting. Once people are changed on the individual level through political consciousness-raising, they are also likely to become actors for collective change. Focusing on the self, on its wholeness, provides a major impetus for individual and collective empowerment.

Notes

1. The linkages between intersectionality and hip-hop are particularly salient in hip-hop feminism – a strand of third wave feminism that was initially articulated by young black women in the late 1990s and is now present in many places across the Global North and South.

2. For Crenshaw, this recognition of "the intersectional experiences of women of color disenfranchised in prevailing conceptions of identity politics does not require that we give up attempts to organize as communities of color. Rather, intersectionality provides a basis for reconceptualizing race as a coalition between men and women of color … or a coalition of straight and gay people of color" (1991: 1299).

7
Intersectionality and Critical Education

Globally, critical education has long been aligned with intersectionality's critical inquiry and praxis. Across classroom settings, religious communities, mass media venues, village schools, living rooms, or street corners, education has the potential to oppress or liberate. In this context, the emancipatory potential of education is far-reaching. Many of the cases and examples throughout this book have demonstrated some commitment to education as part of their praxis. Immigrant women whose growing proficiency in English enabled many of them to develop into savvy activists (Chun et al. 2013: 926); young people who use hip-hop as an art form and philosophy to educate one another about the common challenges they face (Perry 2004); scholars/activists who envisioned race/class/gender studies through the lens of transforming colleges and universities (Dill et al. 2009); and the broad-based program of the Afro-Brazilian women's Latinidades festival all illustrate the scope of critical education.

Intersectionality and critical education share similar sensibilities, primarily because the same people have been involved in both projects. Within schools, teachers, parents, principals, administrators, curriculum specialists, and college and high-school counsellors, among others, have advocated on behalf of the care and well-being of children and youth. Many community leaders embraced critical education for participants as well as for the public as essential for social justice activism. Take, for example, Marian Wright Edelman, founder and president of the US-based Children's Defense Fund. Edelman has been an activist for the rights of children and an advocate for disenfranchised people for her entire professional life. Her work illustrates how her intersectional analysis, which saw how intersections of race, class, and age differentially disadvantage children, stimulated her life's work on behalf of all children.

Contemporary expressions of intersectionality, discussed throughout this book, and critical education not only emerged within the same set of social relations; they also influenced one another. Both projects have much longer histories than can be presented here, and their intertwined relationship has enhanced both. Yet the changes ushered in by the growing influence of neoliberalism, and more recently of far-right populism, on public schools and public institutions, have put this synergistic relationship in jeopardy. This chapter examines contemporary challenges that confront this relationship between intersectionality and education, especially concerning issues of equity and social justice.

A Critical Convergence: Intersectionality and Education

Brazilian educator Paulo Freire's classic volume *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970) analyzes how education can either disenfranchise or empower. While not typically categorized this way, this book constitutes a core text for intersectionality. Freire rejects a class-only analysis of power relations in favor of the more robust power-laden language of the "oppressed." The oppressed of Freire's twentieth-century Brazil are similar to those oppressed of today: homeless/landless people, women, poor people, black people, sexual minorities, indigenous people, undocumented immigrants, prisoners, religious minorities, disabled people, and the young. Freire's use of the terms "oppression" and "oppressed" invokes intersecting inequities of class, race, ethnicity, age, religion, and citizenship. Via his choice of words, Freire links the needs of oppressed people to calls for social justice. In the context of contemporary euphemisms – including "disenfranchised," "disadvantaged," "racialized," "gendered," "marginalized," and similar terms – his language can seem bold and direct. Just as terms like "racial discrimination" and "racial profiling" may describe the same behavior, so the terms themselves bring a different meaning. The word "oppression" may be out of favor, but the social conditions that it describes are not.

Freire also expresses a broader understanding of pedagogy than do narrow technical definitions that stress classroom management skills or how to teach subject matter. Rather, pedagogy invokes a philosophy of education that is grounded in the practice of education, i.e., education as praxis. Such a broader understanding of pedagogy as praxis can be found, for instance, in the work of Nancy Naples (2009) on her practice of teaching intersectionality. It also has ties to social justice, which can be either enhanced or retarded by pedagogical practices. Moreover, for oppressed people, different pedagogies can either deepen or limit understandings of social justice.

Freire saw the kind of pedagogies that limit understandings of social justice as being governed by what he called a "banking concept of education." This concept refers to educational practices whereby students master "ready-made" knowledge, the facts and ways of thinking that make them fit into an unequal status quo. A banking approach to education can reinforce existing social inequalities, leaving some students with more opportunities than others. For example, within societies that see girls' futures solely as domestic caretakers, as wives and mothers, it makes little sense to give them formal schooling. School funding is "wasted" on girls because they will bank skills that they will never spend.

But the process of banking education can be more pernicious than excluding people from schools. For Freire, the banking concept asks students to uncritically accept and thereby reproduce their assigned place in the social hierarchy. Within this logic, not only do schools

teach elite white men that they are better than everyone else, but schools as institutions are set up to deliver cultural capital to this group so that they can achieve that end. Oppressed groups face an opposite reality – the tenets of banking education can teach them to uphold the very practices that produce their subordination. When Freire published *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* in 1970, neoliberalism was not yet dominant. Still, his criticism exposes how the banking approach to education relies on emergent neoliberal principles of individualism, privatization, and marketplace relations as the solutions to social problems. Accumulating or banking a certain kind of educational capital promises stable jobs with fair wages and benefits – a promise that is unlikely to be kept under neoliberalism, where such jobs are exceptions rather than the rule. Oppressed people know well how tilted is the playing field.

Freire also presents education for critical consciousness as a contrasting pedagogy. This alternative pedagogy rests on a dialogical engagement, a way of critically analyzing the world by asking tough questions, by problem solving, and by means of critical thinking. Oppressed people need education in order to become critically aware because, without it, they lack important tools both for analyzing their own subordination and for opposing it. Developing a critical consciousness on social inequality, as well as one's own placement in it, is essential for personal and collective empowerment. Significantly, while Freire grounds his analysis of critical education in the needs of oppressed people, the value of critical education is open to everyone. Everyone benefits from a better understanding of the dynamics of intersecting social inequalities, as well as the kinds of critical thinking and problem-posing skills that can remedy them. Developing a critical consciousness of how individual and collective identities reflect and organize domains of power framework can be life-changing.

Despite dominant rhetoric that claims that historically disenfranchised groups do not value education, the record says otherwise (see Lopez 2002; Perry et al. 2003; Alonso et al. 2009; Rios 2011). Education has long been central to political struggles, going beyond the banking concept of education. When coupled with gaining marketable skills for survival within systems of social inequality, education for critical consciousness better positions oppressed groups to challenge their experiences of social inequalities. Sometimes, leaders within oppressed groups go to great lengths to procure the critical thinking skills that will enable them to question their banking education. For example, black feminist educator and intellectual Anna Julia Cooper is known within US black feminism for her 1892 book *A Voice from the South*, which presented an intersectional analysis. Yet Cooper also started a night school, in her Washington, DC living room, for African American working-class and disabled adults who could not attend public school. She invited the excluded to attend her "public" school free of charge. Cooper is known for her scholarly contributions to black

feminism, as well as her signature contributions to intersectionality, yet her community education work remains less well-known (May 2007).

Developing multiple forms of literacy constitutes one pedagogical feature of education for critical consciousness. Freire was clear that skills of basic literacy constituted the bedrock of critical consciousness – if oppressed people could not read or manage the basics of finance, they were at the mercy of privileged groups. As we saw in Chapter 2, Muhammad Yunus developed microcredit as a new way of banking for poor, rural villagers, which also fostered their financial literacy. But gaining literacy also has a broader meaning. Skills in "reading" the social relations of one's own experiences, whether using social media to debate the meaning of intersectionality for digital feminist activism, or using critical intersectional perspectives to analyze spreading patterns of securitization in prisons, schools, or immigration policies, can stimulate people who care about these issues to take action.

Another core pedagogical feature of education for critical consciousness concerns the centrality of dialog across differences of experience and power for creating knowledge. Within a dialogical concept of education, learning also entails sharing knowledge with a community of learners. For researchers working with youth, participatory action research designs, where participants are co-investigators rather than subjects within a study, can foster better questions and produce relevant knowledge (Brown and Rodriguez 2009). The identity politics of hip-hop also points toward a dialogical engagement between artists and consumers that not only educates but also might empower both. Moreover, dialogical engagement can topple old ideas about what counts as knowledge and can develop new forms of knowledge creation. New ICTs create the possibilities for new dialogs in a global context, but such technologies are tools that can be put to a variety of uses.[1]

Freire's focus on critical consciousness and on personal and collective empowerment points to several connections between intersectionality and critical education. First, when it comes to educational equity and formal schooling, Freire's pedagogical framework aligns with important distinctions between philosophies of neoliberalism and participatory democracy. Neoliberalism typically rests on unstated assumptions about education and equity that have been implemented at the primary, secondary, and graduate levels. Neoliberal logic suggests that schools should not be in the business of promoting equity but, rather, should seek cost-effective ways of delivering skills and training in a nondiscriminatory fashion. Differences between students are technical problems that are amenable to diagnosis and appropriate remedies. For example, the sustained attention in the US to the achievement "gap" between the performance of white middle-class children and everyone else preoccupies educational researchers (Banks and Park 2010). Success occurs when the gap is narrowed. This diagnosis of the problem uncritically presumes that, beyond skills delivery, the primary

purpose of schooling lies in training the youth who trail behind to catch up with the children who achieve. Working within neoliberal assumptions, assimilating seemingly failing youth into existing social hierarchies will eventually produce educational equity.

Participatory democracy rests on a different conceptual foundation (see Hilmer 2010; Naples 2013). Within a logic of participatory democracy, schools are more than institutions where young people go to acquire technical skills and social capital that will make them attractive to employers. Schools certainly do this, but they also are venues where intersecting power relations routinely privilege some students over others. Formal schooling thus constitutes an important venue for teaching students both to fit in and criticize existing social hierarchies. Many teachers and parents see schools as places where they have to fight for the rights of children and youth not only to get an education, but to get an education that fosters critical literacy and critical thinking skills. Notably, schools are often important venues for social protest for young adults who are either excluded from formal education altogether or who, attending only because of the compulsory school age, cast a critical eye on the schooling they receive. A critical education perspective understands the organization of schools themselves as part and parcel of a broader education conceptualized as a field of power (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977).

Historically, the struggles for a quality public education by people who encountered routine and systemic discrimination within educational institutions aligned with ongoing efforts to reform US public education. In the US, the idea that public schools prepare citizens for participatory democracy runs deep. John Dewey, Jane Addams, W. E. B. Du Bois, and other early twentieth-century American pragmatist thinkers, saw education as essential for democratic citizenship (see Collins 2012b). *Democracy and Education* (2004 [1916]) and *The Public and Its Problems* (1954), classic works by philosopher John Dewey, stressed the importance of public education for American democracy. For Dewey, educating the public required communication between people so that they could decide what problems they thought were worth pursuing and how best to move forward. Yet, since the public itself was so heterogeneous, strong democratic institutions required that people both commit to those institutions and work through their differences for the public good; informed citizens needed to learn from one another. In this regard, participatory democracy required dialog to cut across differences. In other words, people needed resources and structured support for learning how to share ideas in order to be able to take the participatory role in their own governance that democracy is supposed to make available to them.

Many segments of the US public disagreed with this vision of participatory democracy. Prior to the new social movements of the 1950s–80s, schools in the US aimed to “Americanize” immigrant and ethnic minority students by assimilating them into dominant Anglo-Saxon

Protestant middle-class norms and values. This version of assimilation ignored the fact that becoming American often meant upholding racism, sexism, and xenophobia by learning how to practice the discriminations that they engendered. The new social movements that were so important to black feminism, race/class/gender studies, and intersectionality were closely aligned with the concept of participatory democracy that critical education had long upheld.

Intersectionality and critical education in the US share important similarities: both projects have been associated with schools and thus participate in the politics of education in schools themselves. Because it helps reproduce social inequalities, formal schooling is a contested site of knowledge production. At the same time, people who attend or work in school settings also challenge these social inequalities, typically by questioning the school's curriculum and often by rejecting its rules and regulations. For example, interviews with the high-school students conducted by Gaston Alonso and colleagues (2009) provide a sobering analysis of how and why they feel failed by their schools. Many have been pressured to see themselves as failures because they seemingly cannot or won't assimilate into their school's banking culture. Yet, while their high schools uphold this ideology, they provide few opportunities for students to achieve.

Because US teenagers and young adults spend large amounts of time in middle schools, high schools, colleges, and universities, these institutions are important venues for youth activism. When teenagers and college students develop a critical consciousness about social inequality, their examples are often drawn from their school experiences because that is where they spend their time. The quality of the education offered is typically high on their list of concerns. Youth dissatisfaction with schooling, especially pressures to assimilate and conform, manifests itself in many forms and makes use of spatial boundaries.[2] Many historical examples of youth activism where education has been central to the political demands of high-school and college-age students exist, yet interpretations of the activism of young people become engulfed in other categories.

Youth activism around education-related issues is also an important theme within global social protest. During South Africa's long anti-apartheid struggle, black secondary-school students boycotted schools, some for many years, because they refused to be taught in Afrikaans. This "lost generation" rejected the formal schooling that aimed to assimilate them into expectations of racial inequality (Franklin 2003). Pakistani human rights activist Malala Yousafzai's campaign in support of education for girls and women led to her being the target of an assassination attempt by the Taliban. After being awarded the 2014 Nobel Peace Prize for her struggles for the right of all children to an education, Malala started a school for girls.

Finally, critical education's emphasis on dialogical pedagogy and intersectionality's focus on relationality speak to a similar theme, namely, that navigating differences is an important part of developing a critical consciousness both for individuals and for forms of knowledge. Throughout this book, we have cited numerous thinkers who identify negotiating differences as an important challenge facing intersectionality. Critical education's dialogical education offers a useful avenue for how intersectionality might better navigate differences. Using intersectional frameworks to rethink social inequality requires a more participatory and democratic methodology that rejects neoliberal tendencies to assess knowledge based on its "use" or "function" for one's individual project. Instead, dialogical education takes on the hard work of developing critical consciousness by talking and listening to people who have different points of view. When it comes to grappling with social inequality, dialogical education might also help in thinking through some of the challenges that intersectionality faces in terms of methodology. Rather than downplaying or dismissing differences, an intersectional methodology requires negotiating differences that exist within discrete scholarly and political traditions of race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, nationality, ethnicity, colonialism, religion, and immigration. This dialogical methodology assumes no preformatted connection between them. The goal is to make those connections within specific social contexts. Hence, intersectionality's heuristic is a starting point for building intellectual solidarities between distinct yet interrelated scholarly formations.

This dialogical approach sees conflict as an inevitable outcome of bona fide differences and strives to make them generative. In her essay "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House," initially delivered at a feminist conference, Audre Lorde counsels a creative engagement with difference, transforming it into a resource:

> Advocating the mere tolerance of difference between women is the grossest reformism. It is the total denial of the creative function of difference in our lives. Difference must be not merely tolerated but seen as a fund of necessary polarities between which our creativity can spark like a dialectic. Only then does the necessity for interdependency become unthreatening. Only within that interdependency of different strengths, acknowledged and equal, can the power to seek new ways of being in the world generate, as well as the courage and sustenance to act where there are no charters. (1984: 111–12)

Lorde poses this idea of difference-infused relationality as a poet, a visionary thinker. But how does one actually practice this beyond a community of like-minded people? Doing intersectional work that takes difference seriously means working with people who really are different. Engaging differences in diverse fields of study and political projects is even more challenging.

To sum up: historically, intersectionality and critical education seemingly share three similarities: both areas draw from broader philosophical traditions of participatory democracy; both work primarily in schooling and formal education as one primary institutional location for their praxis; and, for each, navigating differences is an important part of developing a critical consciousness. Yet this historical and conceptual proximity of intersectionality and critical education as intertwined projects need not mean that they are currently linked in a critical fashion, or that either one remains critical in the same way as in previous eras. When it comes to social inequality, how is this connection between intersectionality and critical education being reframed? One way to get at this question is to trace how intersectionality has been understood and used within US secondary schools and higher education. The ideas of intersectionality continue to circulate in these venues, although not always under the term "intersectionality." Instead, the term "diversity" often serves as a surrogate term. And as the terms change, so their meaning does as well. Sara Ahmed's analysis of diversity initiatives within higher education illuminates why these linguistic shifts matter: "The arrival of the term 'diversity' involves the departure of other (perhaps more critical) terms, including 'equality.' There is reason to be cautious about diversity's institutional appeal and ask whether the ease of its incorporation by institutions is not a sign of its depoliticizing" (2012: 1). Paying attention to such linguistic substitutions sheds light on how diversity is currently understood and used within education, which in turn illuminates how intersectionality and critical education are both being reframed.

Multicultural Education, Diversity, and Urban Public Schools

John Dewey and other early twentieth-century school reformers could not have foreseen how a late twentieth-century logic of neoliberalism could erase from public view their ideas about education, participatory democracy, and public schools. In the US, neoliberal goals of privatizing prisons, healthcare, transportation, and other public institutions, of scaling back the social welfare state, deregulating the labor market, and pointing to personal responsibility as the cause and cure for social problems have reshaped public education. Because schools are tasked with the job of producing workers with marketable skills, they are primary sites of implementing a neoliberal agenda. Yet this reshaping of US formal education masks a growing reality for workers: the shrinking of permanent employment, job security, health and education benefits, and pensions. Students are taught to assume the risks of the marketplace because no safety net will be provided by a diminishing welfare state.

All educational institutions have felt the effects of neoliberal reorganization, yet public schools, from elementary level through public colleges and universities, have been especially hard hit. Many current educational practices reflect the waning commitment to public education: differential patterns of investment in school infrastructure leave some public schools dilapidated and overcrowded, while others with private resources that service wealthy students manage to have music teachers, football teams, state-of-the-art science and computer laboratories, and art studios; some public elementary and high schools are horribly overcrowded, sending students to school in shifts, whereas other students, just one school district away, do not; in some states, teacher unions remain under attack, with teachers stigmatized as the cause of school problems rather than part of the solution; and the growth of part-time faculty on college campuses erodes the long-term tradition of tenure as the protection of free and often unpopular speech. Practices such as the growing use of mandatory high-stakes testing for students and more intensified evaluation processes for public-school teachers, as well as linking pay structures to student test scores, illustrate the growth of a culture that elevates measurements above relationships. Collectively, these policies aim to install a banking model of education implementing the core ideas of a neoliberal philosophy.

The defunding of urban public schools illustrates the full force of these changes. Privatization has been the weapon of choice for reshaping the opportunity structure of urban public education that historically provided children from poor, working-class, immigrant, and disadvantaged backgrounds with access to quality schooling. The attack on the social welfare state has meant abandoning these children, often by transferring public funds and other subsidies to charter schools, boarding schools, and similar private institutions that promise to do a better job with urban youth. Policies designed to improve public education's quality by increasing competition in the educational marketplace have reshaped urban public-school bureaucracies and classroom practices alike.

By law, all children in the US are entitled to a free public education. Many Americans therefore believe that because educational equity in the law has already been attained, defunding public education is harmless. Yet preexisting intersecting social inequalities assign children and youth to neighborhoods and schools that are noticeably unequal. US school policies in any given school district are shaped by where children live and the property taxes that those areas can collect. Wealthy districts get good public schools, while poor districts do not. Early in life, children are assigned to different pipelines. Some pipelines provide a smooth path serviced by qualified and experienced teachers, challenging courses for college preparation, remedial help to navigate the rough spots, good counseling about college and careers, honors programs, contact with full-time faculty, and fellowships

for graduate education. The pipeline for other children, regardless of their talent, motivation, and self-discipline, fosters less rosy outcomes – part-time jobs with no benefits, unemployment, and prison. When it comes to talent, children start off the same. Yet different pipelines characterized by educational inequality yield markedly different results.

Children from families that are poor, of racial/ethnic groups, and with undocumented immigrant status are more likely to attend urban public schools with classmates from similar backgrounds. Regardless of social class, African American and Latino students are more likely to attend racially homogeneous schools, a phenomenon that the Civil Rights Project at UCLA calls the re-segregation of US public education. This re-segregation of public schooling has created urban public-school districts that are overwhelmingly Latino, African American, low income, and with large numbers of migrant children. Just as neighborhoods have tipping points where well-off whites decide to move if too many black or Latino families move in, so urban public schools with too many black and Latino students are deserted by white families, which leads to a comparable erosion of support and funding. The children who remain in these underfunded schools encounter public policies favoring securitization over instruction. Ironically, primarily because middle-class and/or white families have abandoned urban public schools, children from families that are affluent, white, and hold US citizenship also attend racially homogeneous schools. Yet these quality suburban schools are rarely seen as segregated.

Historically, multiculturalism in the US has been intertwined with civil rights struggles for educational equity.[3] As such, multicultural education initiatives have been part of debates about the function of US public schools, especially their responsibility for educating children from heterogeneous backgrounds (Banks and Park 2010: 385–6). Developed in the 1970s and 1980s, the same period when race/class/gender studies and similar critical projects embraced a critical education model for empowerment, multicultural education was a direct descendant of school reform efforts for participatory democracy. Multicultural education initiatives pointed to the changing demographics of youth in the US to buttress their arguments that not only was schooling necessary, but that multiculturalism should form an important part of public education. Yet those same initiatives did not see diversity as lying primarily within the student population. Rather, earlier initiatives looked toward structural factors as facilitating or providing barriers to equity. Public schools were important players in bringing about structural change. In this sense, while multicultural education was sparked by the issues of, to use Freire's language, oppressed children, it aimed to assist all students by adopting the national project of school desegregation. As public institutions, public schools interpreted their mandate as one of providing fair access to opportunities for students from diverse backgrounds, as well as helping all students, including those growing

up with privilege, to learn from and respect those with experiences that were very different from their own. These earlier movements were concerned with the growing heterogeneity of the population to be educated across differences of race, class, gender, ethnicity, language, citizenship status, and sexuality.

The idea of multiculturalism remains. Yet the waning philosophy of participatory democracy in US public education, coupled with neoliberalism's influence on school policies and the growing rhetoric of far-right populism in public discourse, has shifted the terms of the debate. Within education, policymakers, scholars and teachers, and government officials have increasingly moved away from the term "multiculturalism" in favor of the term "diversity." Commitment to "diversity" replaces multiculturalism's emphasis on reforming schools for educational equity. The changing meaning of diversity, a step along the road from intersectionality to multiculturalism and now diversity, signals a new understanding both of the problem of educational equity and its possible solutions.

The concept of the "demographic imperative" illustrates how diversity rhetoric operates in this context of school re-segregation. The imperative refers to the mismatch between the children who are most likely to attend public schools in the future and those who are likely to be teaching them. One component of this imperative concerns the increasing percentage of youth and children from diverse racial/ethnic/linguistic backgrounds and of varying immigrant status within the US population. Because these children are much more likely to attend urban public schools, the latter become more "diverse." Another component focuses on teachers. Despite demographic changes in the US population overall, the teaching staff of public schools is predicted to remain overwhelmingly white and female. How will young white teachers deal with the future student diversity in urban public schools?

This focus on demographic predictions for the future about the schoolchildren and teaching staff in public schools masks a troubling set of assumptions. In the context of racial re-segregation, diversity lies in the children who bring their differences into the school setting and who, by their presence, make schools more "diverse." This term thus becomes a stigmatized code word signaling that a "diverse" school has "too many blacks" or "too many Latinos." Ironically, diversity rhetoric that is inherited from multicultural education as a good thing to be celebrated remains in use. Yet the reality is that some forms of diversity remain more desirable than others. An urban district or an urban public school with too much diversity signals public institutions that are deemed to be inferior because they have too many of the wrong kind of children.

The demographic imperative – and how diversity is deployed in conjunction with it – fosters tunnel vision on broader issues of public schooling and critical education. Emphasizing the mismatch between children who are likely to attend defunded public schools and

professional staff who are likely to teach them as the reason for diversity training misdiagnoses the problem. Whatever they may be called, diversity initiatives working with complex identities that are important to students and that see these identities as linked to broader structural forces retain ties to multiculturalism and intersectionality. It is important to understand the multiple identifications of students attending urban public schools and to uphold efforts at curriculum reform or teacher training that will change public schools. Fair treatment of youth and children is a good thing, as is recruiting caring, competent, and skilled school personnel. Yet diversity initiatives aiming to increase teachers' cultural competency or to make students fit better into the existing system miss an opportunity to use intersectionality as an analytic tool that can enhance critical education.

Here we turn to specific policy initiatives aiming to foster diversity, namely, efforts to recruit more underrepresented youth into science. This new language of science policy and education includes multiple institutional and national initiatives tied to training more American youth for careers in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). Many elementary and secondary schools have STEM programs, with some becoming specifically STEM schools. Developing a workforce for STEM fields has implications for US economic growth and security. A strong diversity initiative encourages STEM to come to terms with the overlooked and underutilized talent among American youth, especially the underrepresentation within STEM fields of two groups: girls/women and African Americans/Latinos. How might using intersectionality as an analytic framework shed light on this initiative?

Pipelines to somewhere or nowhere?

The metaphor of "pipelines" is increasingly used to address the causes of, and to envision cures for, the underrepresentation of historically disenfranchised groups in STEM – in the same way that it is in describing the social problems. When applied to education, pipelines are conceived as either working well when they produce a sufficient number of the "right" kind of students or "leaking" and losing talent along the way when they don't. On the surface, pipeline logic seems benign. In the US context, this metaphor has been a useful tool for developing diversity initiatives within STEM. In some ways, the former national priority of ensuring equal education access for all children has been narrowed to a more targeted program of recruiting underrepresented populations into science. Attention to STEM skills, degrees, and fields constitutes an important national priority. Institutional and national initiatives to strengthen pipelines in STEM fields for girls and women as well as for black and Latino youth reflect substantial advocacy on the part of people of color to align public policy objectives with the perceived needs of disadvantaged youth. Yet framing issues of

educational equity through the either/or logic of pipelines for girls and women and pipelines for people of color is shortsighted. Analyzing gender, race, and class as separate entities narrows the ability of pipeline metaphors to solve the problems they encounter. Intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry points to the limited utility of trying to fix social inequality with the insufficient concept of pipelines.

Because girls of color are typically treated as a subcategory of gender pipelines, they are often ill-served by this frame. Accordingly, white girls constitute the core group that is under-represented in STEM fields, while girls of color are deemed to experience "special" problems that are not representative of this core group. Recruiting African American and Latina girls and women, historically disadvantaged US populations, into science constitutes an important policy proposal for advancing the stated goals of STEM initiatives. The commitment to women and girls of color seems to be there, yet the question of how to conceptualize and remedy their absence in science raises questions of interpretive frameworks.

An intersectional analysis would replace this ranking with a view of African American and Latina girls as having multiple identities that cannot be accommodated within either the gender pipeline or the racial/ethnic pipeline. Here, intersectionality describes women of color as being at the "intersection" of women and people of color, two underrepresented groups in science education and science careers. This shift would focus increased attention on barriers to science that girls of color face, many of which are the same barriers that confront boys. Both groups meet similar barriers, but experience them differently. The language of pipelines, with its related metaphors of leaky places from which talent leaks out, has increasingly replaced structural analyses with their language of barriers to achievement. The problem is represented as cracks in an otherwise sound pipeline in places that allow girls of color seemingly to leak out. In contrast, the structural barriers metaphor pays far more attention to the organization of formal education itself, suggesting that inadequate funding creates the barriers that block the achievement of women and girls of color. The structural barriers metaphor is likely to see remedies as lying within the structural organization of schools and in their disciplinary policies. In contrast, the leaky pipeline metaphor draws more heavily on the cultural capital that girls and women of color bring to schooling, as well as individual attributes that predispose individual girls of color to high achievement.

An intersectional analysis would also change understandings of why African American and Latino boys are underrepresented in STEM fields. When it comes to educational equity and these boys, pipeline logic takes a different turn: the issue of educational achievement becomes linked less to questions of leakage, and more to how effectively a different pipeline

works to push African American and Latino boys out of school altogether. In this case, the pipeline metaphor can be useful up to a point.

The metaphor of a pre-kindergarten (pre-K) to prison pipeline to describe dismal educational outcomes for African American and Latino boys better fits empirical reality. The pre-K to prison pipeline constitutes an institutional mechanism for applying policies of securitization to African American and Latino male youth. This use of the pipeline metaphor challenges assumptions that urban public schools are places of equity and upward social mobility. This emerging framework on the pre-K to prison pipeline refocuses attention away from the personal qualities of boys and toward institutional policies not just of schools, but also of police. Many studies painstakingly trace all the ways that school policies and practices discipline poor black boys and mark them as dangerous criminals – or about to become such. Tracing the connections for black boys can be heartbreaking. In elementary school, black boys encounter harsher disciplinary practices than do other students (Arnett Ferguson 2000). Despite valuing education in the abstract, they are pushed out of high school and disproportionately drop out. Colleges offer opportunities for black boys in sports, illustrating a continuation of the pipeline for those who do manage to remain in school. But they disproportionately end up in prison, fueling the growth of the prison industry (Collins 2006). In a post-agricultural and postindustrial society, non-educated black boys are a surplus population deemed to be disposable (Bales 1999).

Understanding the ways in which black boys are exploited and pushed through a discriminatory pipeline is important work. Yet intersectionality raises the uncomfortable issue of the framing of such work. Does the focused attention on black boys in ways that treat gender as a descriptive category of analysis inadvertently misread the problems of black girls, who experience similar kinds of political, economic, and social control? Stated differently, gender is less often used to explain than it is to describe the experiences of black boys and men. Yet gender analyses can be applied to the experiences of both black women and men. Both live in a carceral society and experience its effects.

These uses of pipeline metaphors for thinking through the institutional mechanisms underpinning bleak educational outcomes for girls and women of color and boys and men of color are important in different ways. Yet this focus on gender and race also obscures a third significant way that pipeline logic is used but remains unconnected to questions of educational equity. Class is largely missing from pipeline analyses that assume educational equity. Also absent is sustained attention to the deteriorating condition of public education itself. For many people, the existing system is either already fair (it's amazing how many young white preservice teachers believe that it is), or is so beyond reform that all one can do

is fit in (help diverse populations assimilate). Pipeline metaphors rarely take these issues into account.

Overall, the changing meaning of diversity initiatives illustrates why public schools are important sites for educational equity. The interdependent domains of power can shed light on multicultural education, the logic of pipelines, and other facets of formal schooling discussed here. Examining the structural domain of power shows how schooling institutionalizes sorting mechanisms, such as admissions policies, curricular offerings, tracking, allocation of resources, and districting policies, as well as how economic barriers to entry, such as tuition, financial aid processes, and costs of eligibility requirements (e.g., the cost of testing and test prep), get solidified in school and state policies. Examining how power works in the cultural domain shows how people both reproduce and legitimate the ideas that uphold a given social order, and how they critique that order and imagine alternatives to it. Inquiries into a disciplinary domain of power reveal how rules and regulations of everyday school life – grades, testing, zero-tolerance policies – punish already subordinated students and offer rewards to those whom the system privileges. Each of these domains of power shapes, in turn, how power plays out interpersonally: in interactions among individuals and groups, including increasingly heterogeneous student populations (Collins 2009a).

Intersectionality, Diversity, and Higher Education

On most US college and university campuses, intersectionality and diversity initiatives are strange bedfellows. Bonnie Dill's perception that "intersectionality is the intellectual core of diversity work" (2009: 229) may have been the case when race/class/gender studies arrived on college campuses in the 1980s, but is this the case today? Over the last few decades, intersectionality and campus diversity initiatives have traveled different institutional paths. Intersectionality has emphasized its research and teaching components, basically, a focus on critical inquiry. In contrast, diversity initiatives have become more closely aligned with administrative services. Campus diversity initiatives now span activities as varied as monitoring an institution's legal antidiscrimination compliance, providing diversity training for university staff, and student services. Intersectionality may have once been the intellectual core of diversity work, and in some places it still is. Yet the institutional changes that have taken place on college and university campuses that pursue neoliberal agendas have altered the contours of many social justice initiatives, including the relationship between intersectionality and diversity within higher education.

Contemporary diversity initiatives vary greatly across US college campuses, in part because social inequalities in K–12 (kindergarten through 12th grade) urban public schools ration

college access for poor, working-class, Latino, African American, and undocumented students, among others. Most children may have the right to a public education, yet the combination of spatial boundaries and ability to pay means that the schools that they attend are unequal. With regard to college access, most students have the right to attend college. But is this likely or even possible for students who attend K–12 schools in urban school districts? Through their recruitment mechanisms, financial aid packets, and investments in fancy student centers and upscale dormitories, colleges and universities compete for the so-called best students. University rankings do not just reflect which has the best sociology program or which is the best campus for studying abroad; they also provide a snapshot of structural social inequalities in higher education. When combined, these processes of re-segregation within K–12 public education that relegate poor children and children of color to urban public schools and policies of recruitment that routinely overlook these populations result in a highly stratified college system with varying student populations on each college campus.

The understanding of what it means to attend college in the US requires careful calibration of which institutions house diversity initiatives at all, as well as of the form that those initiatives might take. These differences between the colleges and universities also point to the various ways that intersec-tionality may or may not be the intellectual core of diversity work. Because higher education institutions – be they community colleges, elite Ivy League institutions, small liberal arts colleges, large public universities, and both regional and flagship state institutions – differ so much from one another, diversity initiatives and campus environments vary greatly. Many community colleges are horribly overcrowded: they service large numbers of students seeking affordable college education. Those who are fortunate enough to enroll in quality community colleges can find courses taught by teachers who are particularly skilled at working with students from heterogeneous backgrounds. Others are less fortunate. For-profit colleges have become so adept both at marketing questionable degree programs and getting working-class students to take out government-backed loans to pay for them that, in 2015, the US federal government stepped in to assist students mired in debt. A small number of poor and working-class students in urban school districts may have the talent and good luck to find counselors to help with college applications or schools that still have affirmative-action outreach programs into urban districts. More often, students most in search of a critical education are less likely to find it in colleges that themselves uncritically accept “banking” standards.

When it comes to student populations, some schools have a surplus of “diversity,” whereas others have a scarcity. Reflecting understandings of diversity depicted by K–12 schools that work with heterogeneous populations, diversity initiatives are virtually nonexistent on

underfunded community college campuses. Overworked and underpaid faculty, staff, and administrators are hardly in a position to offer extensive tailored services to heterogeneous student populations. These colleges already have more diversity than they can handle – recruiting students from diverse backgrounds is not the issue. In contrast, highly selective colleges and universities must work to overcome the legacy of exclusionary practices against people of color, women, ethnic and cultural minorities, and new immigrants. These schools may appear to be more diverse and, when it comes to the visible presence of students of color and international students, they are. But elite institutions remain the preserve of students from wealthy families. Elite private institutions can afford to pay for full-service diversity initiatives.

In this universe of ranked colleges and universities, large public institutions stand out as places that can both attract heterogeneous populations and find ways to work with a heterogeneous public. Most large schools have diversity initiatives, organized through a chief diversity officer who oversees and coordinates a university's diversity programs. Such initiatives at public universities fall somewhere between those of underresourced colleges, where funding is earmarked for more basic services, and the designer diversity initiatives of elite schools that have the resources to individualize both their instructional practices and their programs. The shifting meaning of diversity provides a window on changes in how diversity is conceptualized and managed within US colleges and universities. These shifts also shed light on the directions that intersectionality has taken or might take as the intellectual core of diversity work.

Ostensibly supported by public funding, public institutions become targeted sites for campus diversity by university employees and students, by state legislators, as well as by members of the general public. During the 1960s social movement era, public universities were touchstones for important racial desegregation efforts – for example, James Meredith sued the University of Mississippi and African American students desegregated the University of Alabama at Tuscaloosa. The University of Michigan–Ann Arbor, the University of Texas at Austin, and the public universities of the California state system have all faced legal challenges to their affirmative action policies to produce campus diversity, in part because they are prestigious public institutions of higher education. The steady erosion of affirmative action oversight, with its attention to structural forms of discrimination and their remedies, has effectively erased talk of intersecting oppressions and similar structural phenomena. The absence of language to discuss social injustices, such as Freire's analysis of oppression, fosters a muteness about structural discrimination. When it comes to structural transformation, the term "diversity" may just have to suffice.

Several features of the shifting meaning of diversity within higher education are significant for intersectionality's critical analysis and praxis. First, diversity initiatives have increasingly jettisoned structural analyses of social inequality in favor of individual and cultural interpretations of social problems. Within this logic, if students don't get along, the problem does not lie in their dormitories, classrooms, work-study jobs, or access to faculty. Rather, it lies in them: perhaps anger-management training will help or service learning that might remind them of others who are far less fortunate. If the problem is conflict among students across lines of race, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, or religion, perhaps sensitivity training will help, or, at least, a diversity requirement in their curriculum.

Teaching people about diversity and how to get on better with one another is not inherently problematic. Diversity initiatives can draw upon intersectionality's critical attention to difference to craft programs and help students manage the challenges of race/class/ethnic desegregation. They can find a rich body of material: for example, intersectional frameworks creating space for the expression of dynamic, mixed identifications, whether racial or ethnic, and non-normative or non-binary gender and sexual identities. Diversity initiatives focusing on building campus communities among heterogeneous student populations are often highly effective, especially when their institutional mandates also reflect student interest. When done well, examining the heterogeneity of social identities and helping students deal with them humanizes the schooling process for all students. Democratizing diversity initiatives to include additional categories of analysis makes intellectual sense, but it comes at the cost of reducing hard-hitting analyses of racism, sexism, heterosexism, capitalism, and other forms of power. Integrating additional categories of diversity makes pragmatic sense when dealing with heterogeneous student populations. Sexuality, religion, ethnicity, and citizenship status bring more complexity to diversity, reflecting student demands for equity and recognition. Basically, as the heterogeneity within and across student populations grows more apparent, diversity has stretched to become a more elastic category.

Yet, overemphasizing individual remedies for social problems, at the expense of analyzing their structural underpinnings such as college access, is a risky enterprise. Even when antidiscrimination and affirmative action policies remain on the books, diversity initiatives can move away from this kind of oversight in favor of an institutional mandate of diversity management in ways that ensure the smooth functioning of the institution. How, then, in this context, can diversity initiatives tasked with managing diversity continue to envision diversity work as a site of critical praxis?

Many diversity professionals try to sustain a critical praxis but find themselves and their programs on a slippery slope leading to watered-down understandings of diversity. As Sara Ahmed points out, "diversity is often used as shorthand for inclusion, as the 'happy point' of

intersectionality, a point where lines meet. When intersectionality becomes a 'happy point,' the feminist of color critique is obscured. All differences matter under this view" (2012: 14). Social inequality and power differentials, such as those shaping K–12 public education or the rankings of colleges, disappear when all differences matter. They also reinforce a view that all differences matter but only at an individual level. This slippery slope of redefinition strips the term "diversity" and, by implication, the term "intersectionality," of their analytical force. Earlier programs highlighted structural analyses that focused on issues of fairness and justice for the greater good, one where "feminism of color provides us with a way of thinking through power in terms of 'intersectionality,' to think about and through the points at which power relations meet" (Ahmed 2012: 14).

A second feature of the shifting meaning of diversity concerns how this shift made the field less critical of social inequality. Diversity and intersectionality may have both moved away from their earlier associations with social justice. For example, earlier diversity initiatives focused on providing equal opportunities for students and on issues such as faculty diversification. Similarly, earlier statements of intersectionality were far more comfortable with terms such as oppression, equality, and fairness than they are now.

More recently, diversity initiatives have become subject to institutional mandates. One such mandate concerns the measurable utility of diversity, especially in line with goals of colleges and universities. Diversity initiatives must find ways to contribute to the institution's bottom line. Aimed at serving diverse populations, they increasingly become recast as useful promotional tools enabling colleges and universities to demonstrate their commitment to inclusion – for instance, highlighting a diverse student population to attract students seeking a multicultural experience or faculty members seeking heterogeneous classrooms.

This shift in meaning enabled institutions to redefine their diversity initiatives as student service sites for recruiting diverse students. Ironically, recruitment required flattening out the bona fide differences among students in support of a common language that traveled well within institutional circles. Take, for example, the use of the category "people of color" in the US as a technical, managerial term within diversity initiatives. This term aims to reduce the complexities among racial/ethnic groups. Redefining the outcomes of intersecting power relations of race and ethnicity to a simple matter of color seemed to solve the messy problem of the growing presence of racial/ethnic groups, some with contentious histories of discriminating against each other. Categorizing African Americans, Nigerian Americans, Caribbean Americans, Latinos, Hmong, Cherokee, and South Asian immigrants of varying gender and class statuses under the umbrella "of color" reinstalled a white frame of seeing the world as white and all racial others as equivalent and interchangeable. When imposed from above, terms such as "people of color" flatten the experiences of racial/ethnic

groups into a homogeneous "color" category. This naming resembles how intersectionality replaced the earlier vocabulary of race/class/gender studies in ways that may have weakened attention to distinct forms of inequality. The terms "people of color" and "intersectionality" are less the issue than the need to ensure that initiatives are chosen and reworked from the inside out, in the case of people of color, by people of color who engage in dialog with one another about the meaning of their experiences and how it fills out the term.[4]

Diversity's shifting meaning within US higher education is significant for intersectionality for a final reason. Another shift in vocabulary – and, as a result, a shift in meaning – is occurring. Institutional mandates are moving away from the language of diversity itself. The term "diversity" was already once-removed from intersectionality, a cleavage that upheld the distinction between theory and practice. Yet a more recent linguistic shift encourages students and support staff in US colleges and universities not to "embrace diversity" but rather to be "culturally competent." The phrase "culturally competent" works well with neoliberal agendas, as it lends itself to measurable criteria that can be used to train people (workshops, videos, etc.) in cultural competency. A cottage industry of consultants stands by to help campuses achieve cultural competence by providing training for a fee. Cultural competence also invokes a broader, global framework of preparing students to be global citizens. A related and more intriguing development concerns the measurement of cultural competence. If cultural skills become redefined as yet another form of intelligence, for example, "cultural intelligence," competence skills can be taught, learned, and evaluated using tools developed from intelligence testing.

As was the case in valuing democratizing diversity by attending to multiple identities, recognizing culture's significance in human social interactions constitutes a worthy educational goal. Developing the "literacy" to read intercultural situations and the power differentials they entail can facilitate education for critical consciousness. For example, in her study *Keepin' It Real: School Success beyond Black and White*, sociologist Prudence Carter (2005) identifies "cultural straddlers," the category of students in a heterogeneous student body who were most comfortable with both black and white cultures, as the group most likely to experience school success. Carter's work suggests that students who can develop a skill set of working across differences, or "straddling" them, become most effective in intercultural settings.

Yet when it comes to the initial vision of intersectionality's practitioners, this slippery slope from race/class/gender studies to intersectionality, then intersectionality to diversity, then diversity to cultural competence may simply be too many dots to connect. Shifting from diversity to cultural competence further masks how structural inequities, especially those

within education itself, contribute to social inequality. This education for critical consciousness that would equip people to solve problems is instead replaced by training modules presenting preset packets of culture that can be used as part of a curricular diversity requirement or to get continuing education credit.

Diversity professionals stand in varying relationships to these broader trends and, accordingly, demonstrate varying levels of political savvy and skill in dealing with them. On the one hand, when staff, students, and faculty develop programs drawing upon intersectionality in ways that retain its social justice ethos, they invoke Freire's notion of education for critical consciousness. Ironically, they may not call their programs "intersectional." For strategic reasons, these diversity professionals recast the social justice mandate within the narrowing interpretive frameworks of cultural competence. A range of social actors do diversity work, sometimes publicly, but often via a hidden diversity commitment that resembles the subversive opposition of K–12 school personnel. For example, the cases assembled by Christine Clark and colleagues in *Occupying the Academy* (2012) illustrate how chief diversity officers, mid-level administrators, and faculty negotiate the contemporary challenges of diversity. Written by (and not about) frontline diversity practitioners, these cases capture the perspectives of people who are actually doing diversity work, not studying how it has or should be done. Tracing the workings of diversity and the equity of actual institutional victories and frustrations provides a rare glimpse of the perspectives of people who actually do upper-level diversity work, not just research it. These narratives show how difficult diversity work is, but also how committed many diversity professionals are to making it work.

Some of the most insightful work on diversity in higher education comes from people who are actively engaged in pedagogical projects that straddle the institutional mandates to separate inquiry from praxis. For example, in *Intellectual Empathy: Critical Thinking for Social Justice*, philosopher Maureen Linker (2015) describes 15 years of pedagogical practice at the University of Michigan–Dearborn that show how she links theory and practice with a population of African American, Muslim, female, returning, and working-class white male students. In accessible language that itself demonstrates a feel for critical pedagogy, Linker not only includes content on intersectionality; she helps her students link its main ideas to their lives. In this case, the insights of Freire's education for critical consciousness become embedded in actual pedagogical practice, putting the ideas of participatory democracy into action.

Intersectionality, Critical Education, and Social Justice

Intersectionality and critical education both initially saw social justice as central to their mission. Both projects face new challenges raised by neoliberalism, as well as those raised by far-right populism, challenges that may push them closer together or pull them further apart. When it comes to social justice, what are some promising points of connection between these two projects? Specifically, how might intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry contribute to critical education? Conversely, how might critical education contribute to intersectionality?

First, using intersectionality as an analytic tool may provide a more expansive lens for addressing the complexities of educational equity. Aligning the copious literature on intersecting identities with real-life school settings may be especially useful for classroom teachers and school personnel. The act of making the politics of diversity visible within diversity initiatives creates possible alliances among youth who look at the world not solely through the legacy explanations of families and formal school curricula, but by seeing the interconnectedness of their heterogeneous experiences. This sensibility is built one person at a time, not with the goal of banking information, but rather as a generational sensibility that has taken up the struggle for a critical education from prior generations. The issue is to democratize this rich and growing literature of intersecting identities – not to assume that only African American students will be interested in black history because it will help their apparent low self-esteem, or that LGBTQ youth will be the only ones interested in queer studies. Rather, the task is to place this research on intersecting identities in broader intersectional frameworks that investigate the potential of critical education to dismantle social inequality.

Second, intersectionality's emphasis on intersecting power relations, especially as refracted through the domains of power framework – with structural, disciplinary, cultural, and interpersonal domains – refocuses attention on education as a field of power. Intersectionality resists neoliberal pressures to focus on individual and personal causes of social inequality, pointing out how structural factors are always at work. This revitalized focus on the relations between the personal and the political, the linchpin of identity politics, potentially facilitates new connections between traditional educational research and intersectionality. Social inequality lies neither solely in school structures nor in the cultural attributes of students, but rather in the interaction between the two. Many studies in educational research already claim some variation of intersectionality and use it to examine the complex identities of students. For K–12 schooling, incorporating intersectionality's analytic sensibility within educational research on topics such as classroom culture, preparing culturally responsive teachers, and improving the effectiveness of school principals and administrators who work with diverse student populations may all be

welcome improvements. Reforming these practices will certainly make schools more humane but, by itself, will not tackle the thorny issue of educational inequity.

Finally, the struggles within education suggest that if intersectionality abandons its focus on critical praxis, it compromises its own ideals. Parents, teachers, and others who work directly with youth know that if they simply ignore the political conditions in which they work, the youth that they serve will be harmed. It's hard to administer yet another standardized test, or even worse, be forced to teach to that test, without seeing the effects that ideas honed within a banking concept of education have on youth. Critical education reminds us that praxis matters, especially for intersectionality's commitment to social justice. The ways in which diversity professionals grapple with their changing institutional context – one that has been tied to intersectionality's reputation – matters. Focusing on intersectional scholarship in a context where public schools, colleges, and universities harm the very people whom intersectionality has historically aimed to help seems short-sighted.

Yet critical education brings an important lesson to bear on social justice. Diversity initiatives have often struggled to switch gear to respond to populations that have also experienced discrimination, for example, undocumented immigrants, people with disabilities, transgender people, and returning students. Intersectionality's scholarship on multiple, complex identities has been useful in this regard. Yet opening the diversity umbrella to encompass multiple identities raises some tough questions. Should all forms of diversity be included within diversity mandates? Does claiming an indigenous ancestor make one indigenous? Are some identities more important than others? Intersectionality faces a set of similar concerns. Debates about how to write intersectionality's history tap into deeper questions. What counts as intersectionality? Who decides? Investigating intersectionality as a form of critical analysis and praxis aims to answer these questions by focusing explicitly on praxis. College students, staff, and administrators face similar questions concerning the changing meanings of diversity, albeit from the place of praxis.

Despite these shared concerns, distinctive institutional trajectories that intersectionality and diversity initiatives take within colleges and universities result in a shrinking intellectual space to engage these questions. Dialogs about the meaning of being critical within the contemporary organization of intersectionality and diversity initiatives might enhance the social justice dimensions of both endeavors.

Notes

1. This technology should not be celebrated as being inherently emancipatory. As we have seen in Chapter 4, looking at digitally networked social movements, there is nothing

intrinsically progressive or empowering for participatory democracy in the digital turn, which, on the contrary, may have benefited conservative forces more than it has progressive ones, as the rise of the digital far right (the alt-right) evidences. When it comes to the new forms of knowledge creation through digital/social media, the prolific world of the alt-right should not be forgotten.

2. See, for instance, Maryann Dickar's (2008) study on spatial tensions between student-dominated hallways and teacher-dominated classrooms, and how the former provide high-school students with an alternative space, despite being under teacher surveillance, for political speech and action.

3. The term "multiculturalism" has a different history in other national contexts. For an overview of these issues, see Kivisto (2010).

4. In Canada, indigenous people constitute a distinct category, not amalgamated with the Canadian version of "people of color," which is conveyed by the term "visible minorities."

8
Intersectionality Revisited

The synergistic relationship between intersectionality's inquiry and praxis constitutes a core organizing principle of this book. Moreover, this relationship between its intellectual contours and its political action has also been essential for intersectionality as a form of *critical* analysis. We argue that maintaining the creative tension joining these two dimensions has been essential to intersectionality's originality and growth. For example, the way we told the history of intersectionality situated its emergence within social movement activism, while also addressing institutional incorporation in the academy, a positioning that highlights the vibrancy and necessity of intersectionality's ties to social justice movements and the need to continue to defend those ties within increasingly neoliberal colleges and universities. Maintaining this creative tension between inquiry and praxis as intersectionality expands its global reach characterizes dialogues within human rights venues, within reproductive justice initiatives and digitally networked social justice activism. The juxtaposition of intersectionality's ties to various forms of identity politics – for example, the black women's movement in Brazil and hip-hop as a global discourse of youth – and identity debates within intersectional scholarship highlights an important controversy that hinges on distinguishing between praxis and inquiry. Our analysis of diversity in public schools and higher education examines the challenges of placing intersectionality as a field of inquiry and praxis in dialog with critical education, an area that faces similar challenges.

These examples suggest that this synergy between inquiry and praxis is simultaneously critical and creative, catalyzing new ideas for inquiry and suggesting new forms of praxis. Many of our examples highlight intersectionality's contributions to creative solutions to important social problems, such as violence against women and girls, labor exploitation in unsafe working conditions, and the denial of education to youth. We include many examples of critical intersectional analysis that flows from praxis, the case of social activism for reproductive justice or immigrants' rights. This dialogical sensibility between knowing and doing has enriched intersectionality as a field of inquiry within academia, fostering new questions, avenues of investigation, and explanations across many disciplines.

Maintaining this creative tension between critical inquiry and critical praxis remains an ongoing challenge for intersectionality. Yet many people within academia, within activist settings, as well as within digital intersectionality do not see this relationship between inquiry and praxis as foundational to intersectionality's critical work. Some scholars wish to

extract intersectionality from praxis, leaving a purified set of ideas that can be manipulated unencumbered by the kinds of political stakes that have concerned intersectional practitioners. Similarly, activists who interpret intersectionality as being overly abstract and not worth studying demonstrate an anti-intellectual bias that elevates praxis over serious study. As the debates within online feminist publics and the spread of digital violence suggest, intersectionality's footprint within digital media can make conflict more overt and amplified. Significantly, creativity honed by placing inquiry and praxis in dialog need not generate consensus – indeed, it often catalyzes conflict. Yet being critical requires dialogs across differences in power, as long as such dialogs are committed to strengthening intersectionality.

The term "intersectionality" is very much in use these days, but is employed in a variety of ways by different social actors. We see the impetus toward intersectionality as more connected to the puzzles presented by the social world that we live in, rather than the concerns of established disciplinary endeavors. Our efforts to provide a useful but not final definition of intersectionality speak to the impetus to encompass intersectionality's dual focus on inquiry and praxis. Toward this end, we began this book by offering the following description of intersectionality:

> Intersectionality investigates how intersecting power relations influence social relations across diverse societies as well as individual experiences in everyday life. As an analytic tool, intersec-tionality views categories of race, class, gender, sexuality, class, nation, ability, ethnicity, and age – among others – as interrelated and mutually shaping one another. Intersectionality is a way of understanding and explaining complexity in the world, in people, and in human experiences.

We settled on this working definition because it is broad and elastic enough to house the diversity within intersectionality, yet provides some guidance on some important boundaries around intersectionality. Throughout the book, we have aimed to deepen this working definition in ways that embrace intersectionality's heterogeneity and dynamism.

The significance of this working definition goes beyond its organizational utility for this book. The definitional question is important because prematurely settling on one definition, history, or canon can shut down intersectionality's creativity and growth. We have tried to avoid these pitfalls by providing a more expansive view of intersectionality than can be found in any one location. We emphasize how using intersectionality as an analytic tool introduces greater complexity into a host of topics, such as digitally mediated social movements, climate change, and reproductive justice. Consensus often ends when we dig deeper into intersectionality's actual use. We have highlighted some of the debates within intersectionality, for example, conflicting views of the meaning of identity within

intersectionality. We also discuss the challenges that intersectionality confronts in remaining critical within varying venues that increasingly adopt neoliberal frameworks, for example, its own placement within the normative standards of higher education and the changing meaning of diversity work within public schools and academia. We avoid some of the most contentious debates that, in our assessment, sweep up intersectionality in service to other agendas, for example, arguments that "we," whoever that might be, should move "beyond" intersectionality to some sort of "post-intersectionality" landscape.

Throughout the book, we emphasize several important premises that provide guidelines for our approach to intersectionality. First, we highlight the significance of the social structural domain of power for intersectionality. Not only do we build out this structural domain across many social institutions, for example schools, prisons, the media, and the workplace; we also present intersectionality's structural context as traversing multiple layers of social organization. Specifically, we include examples from microlevel analysis that highlights the workings of individual creativity in social problem solving (Chapter 2 – Muhammad Yunus and microcredit), as well as within small group social interaction (our close reading of the meeting concerning intersectionality and human rights policy in Chapter 4). We provide examples of how grassroots groups draw upon intersectionality to guide social action – for example, the case of the Albuquerque initiative for reproductive justice. We do not treat macrolevel phenomena such as the state and global geopolitics as background variables. Instead, we present the nation-state as an important site of intersectionality's structural social context, stressing how heterogeneous nation-states stimulate diverse public policies. We also present a transnational framework for human rights, social protest, and similar global phenomena that strives to link and transcend national contexts.

Second, we pay close attention to selected philosophical traditions that influence intersectionality's ideas and politics. For example, we identify social democracy and neoliberalism as important philosophies or systems of ideas within intersectionality's interpretive context. Fostering democracy has been an ongoing preoccupation for intersectionality, with various intersectional projects aligned with liberal, social, or participatory democratic projects. Intersectionality's claims for inclusion, dialog, equity, and social justice rest on deepening the meaning of democracy. Yet neoliberalism has challenged these democratic ideals. The ideas of social democracy and neoliberalism remain contested within many of the public policies discussed here, among them securitization and the criminal justice system, the defunding of public education, and the FIFA business model (see Chapter 1). The growing visibility of far-right populism, especially its denigration of immigrants, people of color, and women, adds complexity to this mix. Certainly, there are other philosophies with wide social impact. Yet focusing on democracy and neoliberalism

provides a context for seeing how power influences the synergy of inquiry and praxis generally, and intersectionality specifically.

Third, we highlight the ideas and actions of people who make important, albeit often unrecognized, contributions to intersectionality. Because the synergy between intersectionality's critical inquiry and praxis is often more visible in the work of women of color, poor people, LGBTQ people, indigenous peoples, as well as young people, we bring the ideas of historically disenfranchised people to the forefront of our analysis as much as possible. For example, we highlight the ideas that emerged within the black women's movement in Brazil, as well as the identity politics of hip-hop, because black women and young people have made important contributions to intersectionality. Similarly, our approach to intersectionality's genealogy emphasizes the significance of social movement projects advanced by historically disenfranchised people for intersectionality's critical inquiry and praxis. Standard intellectual histories routinely overlook the intellectual work of people who are discriminated against within intersecting power relations of race, class, gender, sexuality, disability, and nationality. Significantly, these are often the same people who are most versed in social justice praxis.

Together, these premises concerning intersectionality's social structural context, the importance of philosophies in shaping intersectionality, and the importance of looking to oppressed people as agents of knowledge have informed our analysis. Guided by these premises, we settled on six core themes – namely, social inequality, intersecting power relations, social context, relationality, complexity, and social justice – to provide some guideposts in analyzing intersectionality's critical inquiry and praxis. Just as these characteristic themes reappear, albeit in different forms, within intersectionality itself, so we discuss them in different ways throughout the book. Here we revisit these themes as a way both of synthesizing some of the main ideas in the book and of discussing how intersectionality might cast a self-reflexive eye on its own truths and practices. Some of these themes have long been recognized and considered worthy. On others, the record is far more contested. We close this book by asking, where might intersectionality be headed? We look back in order to move forward.

Social Inequality

Social inequality is a fundamental object of investigation for intersectionality, and we treat it as such throughout our book. For example, our discussion of income and wealth as dimensions of global economic inequality lays a foundation for a more informed discussion of social inequality that takes different philosophies into account. We also discuss how philosophies that offer different explanations for social inequality impact public policies of

nation-states. Focusing on social inequality sharpens our provisional definition: intersectionality constitutes a way of understanding and explaining complex social inequalities in the world, in people, and in human experiences.

Intersectionality bundles together disparate traditions on social inequality. This is its challenge and its strength. Understanding the historical patterns of scholarship and activism that catalyzed antiracism, decolonialism, feminism, critical disability studies, and similar critical projects requires serious study. These fields each have distinctive forms of critical inquiry and critical praxis that speak to the particular forms of social inequality that they study. Simply cherry-picking the ideas from several areas and bundling them together provides a thin understanding of social inequality that can masquerade as intersectionality. In one book, we could not do justice to the expansive literatures on social inequality that intersectionality aims to pull together. Instead, we ground our analysis in specific social practices, social problems, and social issues as one way of showing how using intersectionality as an analytical tool can foster more robust understandings of social inequality. Our discussion of FIFA in Chapter 1, for example, provides a good sense of how multiple social inequalities are structured and replicated. Rather than grappling with social issues in the abstract, as purely theoretical concerns, we instead adopted a more grounded approach of using intersectionality to examine a range of social issues.

We have also been careful not to present social inequality as something that is natural, normal, and inevitable. Using intersectionality as an analytical tool provides a powerful way of analyzing how intersecting power relations produce social inequalities. The scope of social inequality and the practices that organize it are certainly formidable. We pay attention to nation-state power in this book, both as a topic of investigation and as an important context for intersectionality's own praxis. The effects of neoliberalism and state policies of securitization suggest that elites wield inordinate power, with the resurgence of far-right populism raising new challenges for subordinated people. Yet these same tools of intersectionality can also be used to examine resistance to social inequality. The black women's movement in Brazil, hip-hop as a form of cultural politics, and digital activism all suggest that the response to social inequality need not be capitulation. Throughout this book, we provide examples where people not only do not give in, but actively protest the forms of social inequality that confront them. Our choice of topics speaks to this theme of resistance: global social protest, reproductive rights, digital activism, critical education, and the significance of identity politics all speak to the myriad ways that people resist within intersecting systems of power.

Intersecting Power Relations

Power, another core idea of intersectionality, is complex and contested. Throughout this book, we approach intersectionality through a power-conscious lens or analytical framework. Intersectionality strives to look at power from many angles and asks what kind of power relations might be hidden behind those that are more apparent in a given context. We conceptualize power as a relationship rather than as a static entity. Power is not a thing to be gained or lost as in the zero-sum conceptions of winners and losers on the football playing field. Rather, power is exercised via the relationships that created the very categories of winners and losers.

Because the term "power" is widely used without there being much agreement as to what it is, we emphasize intersecting power relations to sharpen our book's approach to power and do not shy away from difficult topics. Intersecting power relations permeate important global phenomena: those that oppress – for example, global social inequality and violence – as well as political actions that resist or oppose such oppression – for example, social protests that flare up in various national settings, ongoing social movements that evolve as they engage global phenomena, and digital media as new resources for oppressive and emancipatory uses. These global phenomena permeated by intersecting power relations are also variably impacted by the rise of far-right populism, which we attend to in this new edition, as it speaks to important changes in our current conjuncture and encompasses the very real menace of fascism. This power-conscious lens raises two important points about intersecting power relations and the political responses they can engender. First, intersectional frameworks understand power relations through a lens of mutual construction. In other words, people's lives and identities are generally shaped by many factors in diverse and mutually influencing ways. Race, class, gender, sexuality, age, disability, ethnicity, nation, and religion, among others, constitute interlocking, mutually constructing, or intersecting systems of power. As categories of analysis, race, gender, sexuality, class, and nation gain meaning from power relations of racism, heterosexism, class exploitation, and nationalism. Within intersectional frameworks, there is no pure racism or heterosexism. Rather, power relations of racism and heterosexism gain meaning in relation to one another.

Second, power relations are to be analyzed both via their intersections, for example, of racism and heterosexism, as well as across domains of power, namely structural, disciplinary, cultural, and interpersonal. The framework of domains of power provides a heuristic device or thinking tool for examining power relations. The FIFA World Cup case introduced this heuristic by analyzing each domain of power separately. It broke them down into the kinds of power relations that are solidified in social structures (for example, organizations like FIFA and institutions like national governments) that are shared through

ideas and media, or culture broadly speaking, that appear repeatedly in the ways that informal social rewards and punishments get distributed in everyday interactions, and that affect the players' individual identities. These are, respectively, the structural, cultural, disciplinary, and interpersonal domains of power. Looking at how power works in each domain can shed light on the dynamics of larger social phenomena, the case, for example of the IMF's mainstream economic philosophies, or the longevity of the Afro-Brazilian women's movement. Yet, in actual social practice, the domains overlap, and no one domain can be put as the most determinant a priori.

Throughout this book, we investigate an important question: how is intersectionality situated within the power relations that it seemingly studies? Positioning intersectionality within contemporary power relations and analyzing the significance of that placement raise additional questions. How does intersectionality critically assess power relations of race, class, gender, sexuality, age, ethnicity, nationality, and ability? How might intersectionality better understand the way in which intersecting power relations shape its own praxis? These questions must repeatedly be asked and answered under the changing conditions of neoliberalism, far-right populism, and their challenges to social democracy.

In this book, we criticize intersectionality when it seems to be veering away from what we see as its core concern areas that are clearly associated with intersecting power relations. For example, because we have been especially troubled by the decreasing focus on social inequality within intersectionality's scholarship, we emphasize this theme. The hollowing-out of meanings of rich scholarly traditions that critically analyze social inequalities – for example, capitalism, colonialism, racism, patriarchy, and nationalism – and replacing them with shortcut terms such as race, class, and gender may look harmless, but much is lost when systems of power compete for space under some versions of intersectionality. The terms themselves may appear to be equivalent and easily substituted for one another, yet the social relations that these shorthand terms reference are far more complicated.

Sexism, racism, and heterosexism all contain the "ism" that makes them recognizable as unjust systems of power, an important feature that is lost when these systems become reframed as identity categories of gender, race, and sexuality. The term "nation" cannot capture the complexities that accompany its use. Historical expressions of nationalism, both state-sanctioned repression and anticolonial movements for emancipation, replicate binary categories of nation as an entity that is inherently bad or good. Replacement terms such as "citizenship status" or "undocumented migrants" aim to take up the theoretical slack by referencing selected populations that are penalized by nationalist ideologies and nation-state policies. Similarly, when understood as a synonym of socioeconomic status which is

often measured by the use of income, the term "class" performs a different kind of reductionism within some versions of intersectionality.

This strategy of using shortcut language to describe intersecting power relations seemingly solves one set of problems, but it creates others. Over time, for example, these terms no longer invoke the original meanings of racism, sexism, nationalism, and capitalism, but instead become recast as floating signifiers that, unmoored from specific critical analytical traditions, can be assembled and reassembled at will. This reduction of intersectionality to an assemblage of shortcut terms does appear to be more democratic in that it encompasses more categories than before. Yet the mantra of "race, class, and gender" can be repeated so often that it becomes meaningless. The phrase serves as an unexamined litmus test for scholars who can claim that their work is better than race-only or class-only analyses, primarily because it references more terms of social inequality. Our analytical framework of power, which offers a dual analysis that identifies intersecting categories of power that are organized across domains of power, is designed to counter these trends. This power-conscious analysis, in turn, suggests that intersectionality is a form of critical praxis within a response to complex social inequalities that are organized by a complex matrix of power.

Social Context

With regards to social context, our book sits in a difficult position: we firmly believe in the importance of thinking and deploying intersectionality in context-specific ways that attend to both historical particularities and the increasing significance of a global context. Yet given the scope of intersectionality, we stress whenever possible the importance of contextualizing intersectionality in a global context, for example, the identity politics of hip-hop and the organization of networked global social movements as simultaneously local and global phenomena. We have done this in part by selecting important social issues and highlighting the political dimensions of a global framework. The term "contextualize" comes from this impetus to think about social inequality, relationality, and power relations in a social context. Using intersectionality as an analytic tool means contextualizing intersectionality's arguments, both via our selection of examples, but also by being aware of how particular historical, intellectual, and political contexts shape intersectionality's inquiry and praxis.

Our decisions throughout the book speak to the many ways that we investigate the relationship between intersectionality, local issues, and global phenomena. Knowing that it is impossible to give an exhaustive account of social context for every topic, we instead provide cases where place and space, both geographic and digital, constitute key components of social context. Our discussion, in Chapter 5, of the Rana Plaza collapse in Bangladesh shows how this event went far beyond Bangladeshi national borders. Instead,

this event illustrates the significance of working for an employer that provides dangerous working conditions in factories in other countries. It also shows how the global anti-sweatshop movement redefines global social movement space by exposing how FIFA paraphernalia that was produced by sweatshop labor in Bangladesh was marketed and sold in Brazil. The Rana Plaza case also illustrates how historically disenfranchised people can develop new understandings of their institutional and geographic social context by seeing connections that were formerly obscured. Global social protest occurs both geographically in local places, as well as in cyberspace.

Social context is such a broad term that, in this book, we emphasize the importance of nation-states for providing an often taken-for-granted social context for intersectional analysis. Whenever possible, we make mention of national context to remind readers that the ideas of intersectionality take different forms. For example, we introduce the ideas of Afro-Brazilian feminism, black feminism in the US, and Chicana feminism as sites where intersectionality evolved, not to compare them, but rather to contextualize the arguments of each. National context writ large matters, as do the positions of different social groups within each national context. The term "indigenous peoples" does speak to shared global experiences and challenges, but it also minimizes the unique experiences and challenges of groups within very different nation-states. This theme of varying perspectives that can arise within and across diverse social contexts informs differences within intersectionality itself.

Our emphasis on nation-states within our power-conscious intersectional analysis highlights the significance of political geography of intersectionality's social location as shaping its intellectual context. For example, here we approach nation-states both as the object of intersectional analysis as well as the setting for intersectionality's critical inquiry and praxis; for example, using intersectionality as a critical tool differs in South Africa, India, and Canada. Here we stress the institutional setting of academia as a social context for intersectionality's intellectual and political endeavors. Our analysis of the shifting meanings of intersectionality within social movements and incorporation into the academy contrasts the effects of these two institutional environments on intersectionality; our analysis of neoliberal state power, its discourse of securitization, and how institutional structures are shaped by these ideas, is a primary theme of our book; our comparison of varying interpretations of identity politics within academia and hip-hop also highlights the significance of the university and mass media as two institutional sites of cultural production; our analysis of the changing contours of intersectionality and diversity within higher education highlights the significance of context. In brief, intersectionality's institutional trajectories are important for understanding how its ideas instantiate differently in different contexts.

At several points throughout this book, we express our concern that the growth, acceptance, and legitimation of intersectionality within academia and some public policy venues necessarily change its composition and purpose, often for the better, but also for the worse. For example, we explore the politics of intersectionality's naming and incorporation into the academy as a bona fide discourse. Is intersectionality the victim of its own success? Contemporary trends that reduce intersectionality to a theory of identity also reflect the challenges of absorption. Within US higher education, the splitting of intersectionality into an academic component of scholarship and diversity initiatives of institutional service signals an attack on intersectionality's critical perspective. Via these concerns, we raise the question of who benefits from intersectionality's legitimation within academic social contexts. The answers to this question are far from clear and may vary from one situation to the next. It is not enough to simply bury oneself in one's own work, claiming intersectionality as a set of stimulating ideas while ignoring the conditions that make that work possible.

The tongue-in-cheek phrase "saving intersectionality from intersectionality studies" (Bilge 2013) reminds all scholars to be self-reflexive regarding our own practices in the context of intersectionality's newfound visibility and legitimation. Saving intersectionality might involve reclaiming intersectionality from people who often have little or no commitment to intersectionality's social justice ethos. This may also mean saving intersectionality from ourselves if we practice intersectionality as "business as usual," namely, as just another scholarly discourse or content specialization without implicating our work within the power relations that shape the field and academy at large. Such practices often follow the well-known path of mentioning some canonical figures within the field without really engaging with their work, and then using this familiar genealogy as a proxy for the field itself.

Then there is the issue of historic context. The version of intersectionality that we present in this volume reflects the specific historical moment of the early twenty-first century and aims to be a critical intervention in that moment. For many scholars, the time of intersectionality as an idea came "precisely because of the plethora of authors working independently across the globe making vastly similar sets of claims" (Yuval-Davis 2011a: xii). Our discussion of intersectionality's genealogy takes this perspective. Yet it is important to point out that history is always in the making and is never finished. While intersectionality analyzes contemporary issues, it is also simultaneously formed and transformed by them. We see an important role for critical analytical inquiry and praxis at this specific historic moment. In so doing, we corroborate Stuart Hall's insights: "Movements provoke their theoretical moments. And historical conjunctures insist on theories: they are real moments in the evolution of theory" (Hall 1992: 283). For current debates inflected by the growing influence

of intersectionality within UN venues, juxtaposed with increasingly verbal critiques of intersectionality within European academia, intersectionality seems to represent both a promise and a threat. Accordingly, we reflect upon the specificities of historical events in which intersectionality is embedded, with the aim of understanding and describing how different historical periods frame different theoretical and political moments of intersectionality.

Relationality

Relationality references the connections among ideas, among discourses, and among political projects. The term "intersectionality" invokes a different understanding of relationality than that advanced within Western scholarship and political practice. Intersectionality's basic heuristic, the seemingly simple idea that entities that are typically treated as separate may actually be interconnected, has had a major impact on disciplinary knowledge. The creation of interdisciplinary fields concerned with social justice illustrates the effects of new forms of relational thinking (Parker et al. 2010). This basic idea of examining the possibilities of interconnections and new political relationships among historically disenfranchised groups of people also informs desegregation within nation-states and decoloniality as a signature global phenomenon.

The insight that entities that historically have been conceptualized as separate and oppositional are interconnected and interrelated constitutes a major contribution of intersectionality to a variety of intellectual and political projects. Intersectional scholarship challenges forms of binary relational thinking that oppose theory to practice or scholarship to activism. Instead, intersectional frameworks strive to go beyond assumptions of oppositional thinking to forge a complex understanding of the relationships among history, social organization, and forms of consciousness, both personal and collective (Bannerji 1995: 12). Inspiring scholars and activists alike, intersectionality's conception of relationality replaces notions of oppositional difference (either/or thinking) with notions of relational difference (both/and thinking) and has generated new questions and avenues of investigation (Collins 2019: 225).

Identifying the centrality of both/and understandings of relationality within much intersectional inquiry and practice, in this book we engage relationality in varying ways. For instance, our core premise that intersectionality is a form of critical inquiry and praxis is a statement of relationality between knowing and doing, a view that sees theory and practice as interconnected. We investigate the ways that the relationships among different groups across differences in power informs their analysis and praxis. We took issue with versions of intersectionality that reduce identity to an apolitical, individualistic category, arguing

instead that identity is always constructed in relationship to and within social contexts shaped by intersecting power relations. We have also foregrounded the importance of relationality for building co-resistance between various social justice-oriented struggles that often seem to be scattered, but may in actuality be interrelated phenomena. Our case of the Afro-Brazilian women's movement sketches out how coalitions that took relationality seriously and attended to both similarities and differences were crucial to the creation and maintenance of a vibrant social movement.

We devote less time here than we would like to examining intersectionality's relationship with similar projects, such as critical race theory, feminism, ethnic studies, or the intellectual debates in which these areas participate. Intersectionality's interconnectedness with other similar knowledge projects is mentioned at various places, but a substantial investigation is beyond the scope of this book (see Collins 2019: 87–120). When engaging with these projects globally, intersectionality must be wary of annexing other perspectives, such as decolonial and transnational approaches, under its wide tent umbrella. When intersectionality enters the Global South via top-down humanitarian, developmental frameworks, and projects from the North, it often erases local resistant knowledges and praxis and silences local knowledge producers (Bilge 2019). A similar erasure occurs through academic moves that ostensibly introduce intersectionality into new Northern contexts, where local struggles and racialized knowledge producers disappear (Bilge 2013). There is a fundamental difference between situations where disenfranchised groups around the world themselves claim versions of intersectionality, as evidenced by Dalit and Romani transnational feminist activisms, Afro-Brazilian women forming an independent black feminist movement, or the global contours of reproductive justice initiatives, and situations where some national or supranational instance imposes a top-down, watered-down diversity qua intersectionality agenda upon historically disenfranchised people.

This caveat also applies to knowledge projects that have an affinity with intersectionality. In a context of increasing commodification of post-1960s knowledge projects, for example, ethnic studies or women's and gender studies, within neoliberal academia, the current decolonial turn in higher education risks treating indigenous knowledges as simple add-ons (Bilge 2020). In the same way that scholars hope to fix their disciplines by adding intersectionality, indigenous knowledges increasingly face similar opportunistic shallow incorporation. There is reason to be wary about easy calls for integrating indigeneity into intersectionality, because such incorporations risk reproducing colonial academic practices. Rather than incorporation, intersectionality scholars should aim for an ethics of deep conversation with indigenous knowledges and question why intersectionality is not systematically used by indigenous scholars. Andrea Smith explains the reticence of

indigenous scholars to engage with ethnic studies: “Many Native studies scholars have refused engagement with ethnic studies or critical race theory because they think such engagement relegates Native peoples to the status of racial minorities rather than as members of sovereign nations” (2012: 76). Taking our cue from Smith, we can extrapolate and presume that this could also very well be the reason for indigenous qualms with intersectionality in our current moment, although collaborations between black, indigenous, and women of color were frequent in the formative years of intersectional thinking and action (see Chapter 3).

But annexing other perspectives need not be the case. Here, the challenge for intersectionality’s scholars and practitioners is to engage in ethical conversations with other emancipatory thought traditions and knowledge producers, whether they are in the Global South or the Global North, and to do so in ways that do not reproduce knowledge hierarchies and the power conferred by intersectionality’s academic capital on the global market of scientific ideas. In the face of the political, social, economic, and ecological urgencies of our times, the viability of social movements that may build an alternative future depends on how well we can practice radical relationality and deep reciprocity with each other and with nonhuman animate and inanimate beings, and work together in co-resistance.

Complexity

Overall, these core ideas of social inequality, intersecting power relations, social context, and relationality highlight intersectionality’s complexity. Because these ideas interact with one another, collectively they contribute to intersectionality’s complexity. Thinking about social inequalities and power relations within an ethos of social justice, and doing so not in abstract generalizations but in their specific contexts, brings complexity to intersectional inquiry and praxis. Attending to how intersecting power relations shape identities, social practices, institutional arrangements, and cultural representations and ideologies in ways that are contextualized and historicized introduces a level of complexity into everything. Moreover, the creative tension linking intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry and critical praxis introduces complexity into intersectional projects.

As we argue throughout this book, this creative tension raises important questions about which understandings of intersectionality will prevail. When we focus on intersectionality as a form of critical inquiry, we find a rich tapestry of scholarship produced by people who use intersectionality as an analytic tool in new and creative ways. Not all scholarship is like this, and not all people who advocate intersectionality share this vision. But, overall, intersectionality’s scholarship record thus far has been impressive. When we broaden our

lens to include intersectionality as critical praxis, both its initial expression within social movements and its global reach beyond academia, the practices and ideas of diverse people past and present, in the Global North and in the Global South, come into view.

Conversely, if we reverse the object of our gaze and begin with an expansive lens that focuses on the social actions of projects to counter social inequality, we uncover the ideas of intersectionality in places that remain underemphasized. Grounding intersectionality in social action to address social inequalities and the social projects they engender greatly expands intersectionality's context of discovery. Moreover, this broader view of intersectionality's critical praxis provides a different context for analyzing intersectional inquiry. Narrowing this expansive lens to specific social contexts brings intersectionality within academia into sharper focus.

Intersectionality faces the challenge of sustaining the creative tension between its critical inquiry and practice as a route to stimulating complexity. Building greater complexity into intersectionality's arguments requires cultivating dialogs with and among scholars and activists of the Global South as well as examining social issues that do not seem to be part of intersectionality's focus. The analysis of intersectionality in this book may be of universal relevance, yet there is no way of knowing so without greater participation of scholars, activists, practitioners, policymakers, and teachers from the Global South. We have emphasized the ideas and experiences of social actors from historically disenfranchised groups within the Global North as well in the Global South whenever possible, taking care to do so in ways that do not reduce their experiences to data that reinforce the frameworks of the Global North. For example, our case studies of the black women's movement in Brazil and their successful project of Latinidades and the increasing visibility of the anti-sweatshop movement following the Rana Plaza collapse both illustrate the significance of starting our analysis in the Global South, Brazil and Bangladesh, respectively. We also reject trying to fix problems of exclusion by simply adding missing people and experiences into intersectionality as a preconceived entity. Instead, intersectionality requires a rethinking of these approaches in ways that democratize the social construction of knowledge.

Incorporating a global analysis into intersectionality is an ongoing process of broadening dialogs and introducing ever-greater complexity into its critical inquiry and praxis. Attending to global phenomena means that intersectionality must take a critical stance concerning its own social location as a legitimated discourse within the Global North, and must use this position as a way of broadening participation in ways that are not exploitative or tokenistic. Currently, the growth of social media and access to a wide array of ideas within popular culture suggests that intersectionality's ideas are no longer rationed by academic

gatekeepers or legacy media. Bringing more people into intersectionality's dialogs bodes well for its impetus toward social justice.

Social justice

We emphasize the core theme of social justice because, in the face of institutional incorporation that seemingly severs intersectionality from political praxis, we have concerns with versions of intersectionality that may only pay lip service to social justice. As a form of inquiry that grapples with complex social inequalities, intersectionality's raison d'être is not simply to provide more complex and comprehensive explanations of how and why social inequalities persist, or to bemoan social injustices in the world, leaving someone else to fix them. Better explanations of social inequality and social injustice have long been used to defend these realities, not dismantle them. Social inequality and social injustice are not the same, although these ideas are often used interchangeably.

As we point out, intersectionality should not be conflated with social justice. Intersectional projects must be interrogated for their connections to social justice, without simply assuming that, because intersectional scholarship examines some facet of social inequality, it is by default furthering social justice. We raise a similar argument concerning diversity initiatives within higher education as a case where intersectionality may invoke earlier social justice traditions, yet where actual programs have been pressured to relinquish initial emphasis on access and equity. Critical engagement has been a strong theme within intersectionality as a field of inquiry, often through questions of social justice. The work of practitioners shows not only how social justice is critical, but also how social justice work challenges the borders between academic and activist work. For example, by challenging myths that racial democracy had been achieved, or that the Black Movement could handle the gendered concerns of women, or that Brazilian feminism was adequate for all women, the social justice activism of the black women's movement in Brazil provides a different angle of vision on social inequality and social justice.

We find there is more to be learned from examining the ideas and actions of people who use intersectionality as an analytic tool for social justice than from merely criticizing those who don't. Working for social justice is often seen as synonymous with intersectionality, primarily because the people who use intersectionality as an analytic tool, and people who see social justice as central rather than as peripheral to their lives, are often one and the same. These people are typically critical of, rather than accepting of, the status quo. We highlight intersectional projects that express a social justice ethos, yet also caution that a commitment to social justice is not present in all scholarship that claims intersectionality. Our arguments throughout the book have varying implications for social justice. For

example, the FIFA World Cup case suggests that competition is not inherently bad. People accept the idea of winners and losers if the game itself is fair. Yet fairness is elusive in unequal societies where the rules may seem fair, but differentially enforced through discriminatory practices. Fairness is also elusive where the rules themselves may appear to be equally applied to everyone, yet still produce unequal and unfair outcomes: in democratic societies, everyone has the "right" to vote, but not everyone has equal access to do so.

Social justice can be an overarching theme that brings the possible connections among critical discourses into sharper focus. The fields of critical race theory, critical race feminism, gender and sexuality studies, queer theory, ecological feminism, disability studies, and critical animal studies all speak to the ways in which various social categories of difference work to place particular bodies at risk of exclusion, marginalization, erasure, discrimination, violence, destruction, and othering. Intersectionality has been focused on bringing together the separate struggles of blacks, Chicanos, indigenous peoples, women, and similar historically disenfranchised people. Yet this strong focus on the significance of the collective identity politics of such groups can overlook the importance of overarching issues that affect these groups and all others. We wonder whether social justice and similar ethical concerns can provide a unifying ethical framework for intersectionality. Shared oppression provides a powerful point of departure for dialogs among historically disenfranchised people. While it is important to recognize shared discrimination and victimization, can this recognition provide a shared vision for intersectional inquiry and praxis?

When it comes to social justice, intersectionality demands more than simply being critical and entails turning critical analyses into critical praxis. Moreover, as intersectionality develops a deeper self-awareness of how social justice has and might inform its own critical inquiry and praxis, it becomes better positioned to investigate its connections to projects that share similar justice concerns. For example, while we only scratch the surface of questions of climate change and the environment, the growing visibility of environmental justice approaches provides an important site for dialog and building co-resistance (Malin and Ryder 2018). Environmental justice studies recognize that social inequality and oppression in all forms intersect, and that actors in the more-than-human world are subjects of oppression and frequently agents of social change. These insights are important for building an understanding of the ways that intrahuman inequality and oppressions function and how they intersect with human-nonhuman oppression (Pellow 2018). In this sense, social justice may provide an aspirational framework of shared interest that simultaneously expands and deepens intersectionality's critical project.

Coda

Throughout this book, we have cast a self-reflexive eye not simply on intersectionality but also on our own praxis. One important objective of this last chapter is to clarify our choices. Telling the story of intersectionality does a certain kind of political work in terms of authenticating and legitimizing particular schools of thought and subjects and privileging particular genealogies and national locations at the expense of others. Particular histories that chart intersectionality as a field of study in particular ways might be rightly viewed as acts of closure, however temporary they are. These histories pursue, in their own ways, scientific recognition, authority, and legitimacy and settle intersectionality within the Euro-American scientific archive in particular ways. As such, they participate in the establishment of intersectionality as a legitimate field of knowledge, which might be at odds with the pursuit of social justice. Our history of intersectionality has emphasized praxis, a dimension of intersectionality that does not routinely appear in these legitimated histories, although a critical praxis does permeate intersectionality.

As we wrap up this book, we ask: what ideas and experiences are not here? In what way is our interpretation of intersectionality limited by these omissions? More importantly, how might we go about expanding the breadth of intersectionality to encompass the heterogeneity of ideas and experiences that are global without flattening their differences? Intersectionality can't engage with these expansive questions if it severs its critical inquiry from its critical praxis. These questions have no straightforward answers, certainly none that can easily be resolved. Rather, they call out for more people working on them via expanded global conversations.

We wish that we could have written a book that incorporated more knowledge projects and points of view from various regions of the globe and within a more expansive time period than the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. We want to see more people involved in the kind of dialogical intellectual and political work that pursuing intersectionality entails. This openness would encourage a dialogical methodology for intersectionality that would advance a more democratic construction of knowledge itself. Equally important is the task of moving intersectionality into the politics of the not-yet, or, in the words of late queer of color scholar José Muñoz, "a utopian political imagination" that enables us to envision something else, a "not yet," driven by "a desire that resists mandates to accept that which is not enough" (2009: 96). Moving into the politics of the not-yet is moving to a place of sustained hope in a social, political, and ecological climate that may not inspire hope. To move toward this place of the not-yet, it is imperative, we believe, that intersectionality remain open to the element of surprise.

Intersectionality now stands at an important crossroads. Thus far, it has managed to sustain intellectual and political dynamism that grows from its heterogeneity. This is immensely difficult to achieve when faced with the kinds of intellectual and political challenges that we have explored in this book. But just because something is difficult does not mean that it's not worth doing. In order to remain a vibrant, growing endeavor, intersectionality must cast a self-reflexive eye on its own truths and practices. We see intersectionality's heterogeneity not as a weakness but, rather, as a source of tremendous potential for emancipatory social change. Intersectionality is a tool that we can all use in moving toward a more just future.

References

Addams, Jane. 1994. *Twenty Years at Hull-House*. Cutchogue: Buccaneer Books.

Adofoli, Grace. 2013. "Young Feminist: The Need for Different Voices: Revisiting Reproductive Justice, Health and Rights." *National Women's Health Network*. https://www.nwhn.org/young-feminist-the-need-for-different-voices-revisiting-reproductive-justice-health-and-rights/ (https://www.nwhn.org/young-feminist-the-need-for-different-voices-revisiting-reproductive-justice-health-and-rights/).

Aguilar, Delia. 2012. "From Triple Jeopardy to Intersectionality: The Feminist Perplex." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 32: 415–28.

Ahmed, Sara. 2012. *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Aidi, Hisham. 2014. *Rebel Music: Race, Empire, and the New Muslim Youth Culture*. New York: Vintage Books.

Alarcón, Norma, Castro, Rafaela, Pérez, Emma, Pesquera, Beatriz, Riddell, Adaljiza Sosa, and Zavella, Patricia (eds.). 1993. *Chicana Critical Issues: Mujeres Activas en Letras y Cambia Social*. Berkeley: Third Woman Press.

Albright, Madeleine. 2018. *Fascism: A Warning*. New York: HarperCollins.

Alcoff, Linda. 2006. *Visible Identities: Race, Gender, and the Self*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Alexander, Jacqui, and Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1997. "Introduction: Genealogies, Legacies, Movements," in J. Alexander and C. Mohanty (eds.), *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures*. New York: Routledge, pp. xiii–xlii.

Alexander-Floyd, Nikol. 2012. "Disappearing Acts: Reclaiming Intersectionality in the Social Sciences in a Post-Black Feminist Era." *Feminist Formations* 24: 1–25.

Alonso, Gaston, Anderson, Noel, Su, Celina, and Theoharis, Jeanne. 2009. *Our Schools Suck: Students Talk Back to a Segregated Nation on the Failures of Urban Education*. New York: New York University Press.

Amar, Paul. 2011. "Turning the Gendered Policies of the Security State Inside Out?" *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13: 299–328.

Amnesty International. 2018a. "Troll Patrol Findings." https://decoders.amnesty.org/projects/troll-patrol/findings (https://decoders.amnesty.org/projects/troll-patrol/findings).

Amnesty International. 2018b. “Toxic Twitter – Women’s Experiences of Violence and Abuse on Twitter.” https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/research/2018/03/online-violence-against-women-chapter-3/ (https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/research/2018/03/online-violence-against-women-chapter-3/).

Andersen, Margaret, and Collins, Patricia Hill (eds.). 2020. *Race, Class and Gender: Intersections and Inequalities*, 10th edn. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Anthias, Floya, and Yuval-Davis, Nira. 1992. *Racialized Boundaries: Race, Nation, Gender, Colour and Class and the Anti-Racist Struggle*. New York/London: Routledge.

Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera*. San Francisco: Spinsters/Aunt Lute Press.

Anzaldúa, Gloria (ed.). 1990. *Making Face, Making Soul/Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Foundation Books.

Appleby, Gabrielle. 2015. “Australia’s Rigid Immigration Barrier,” *New York Times*, May 7. http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/08/opinion/australias-rigid-immigration-barrier.html?_r=0 (http://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/08/opinion/australias-rigid-immigration-barrier.html?_r=0).

Armbruster-Sandoval, Ralph. 2005. *Globalization and Cross-Border Labor Solidarity in the Americas: The Anti-Sweatshop Movement and the Struggle for Social Justice*. New York: Routledge.

Arnett Ferguson, Ann. 2000. *Bad Boys: Public Schools in the Making of Black Masculinity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Arredondo, Gabriela, Hurtado, Aida, Klahn, Norma, Nájera-Ramírez, Olga, and Zavella, Patricia (eds.). 2003. *Chicana Feminisms: A Critical Reader*. Durham: Duke University Press.

AWUC (Asian Women United of California) (eds.). 1989. *Making Waves: An Anthology of Writing by and about Asian American Women*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Bagilhole, Barbara. 2010. “Applying the Lens of Intersectionality to UK Equal Opportunities and Diversity Policies.” *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences* 27(3): 263–71.

Bales, Kevin. 1999. *Disposable People: New Slavery in the Global Economy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bambara, Toni Cade (ed.). 1970. *The Black Woman: An Anthology*. New York: Signet.

Banks, James, and Park, Caryn. 2010. “Race, Ethnicity and Education: The Search for Explanations,” in P. H. Collins and J. Solomos (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Race and Ethnic Studies*. London: Sage, pp. 383–414.

Bannerji, Himani. 1995. *Thinking Through. Essays on Feminism, Marxism and Anti-Racism*. Toronto: Women’s Press.

Barassi, Veronica. 2015, *Activism on the Web: Everyday Struggles against Digital Capitalism*. New York: Routledge.

Barvosa-Carter, Edwina. 2001. "Multiple Identity and Coalition Building: How Identity Differences Within Us Enable Radical Alliances Among Us," in J. M. Bystydzienski and S. P. Schaht (eds.), *Forging Radical Alliances across Difference*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 21–34.

Battle, Juan, Cohen, Cathy, Warren, Dorian, Fergerson, Gerard, and Audam, Suzette. 2002. *Say It Loud, I'm Black and I'm Proud: Black Pride Survey 2000*. New York: Policy Institute of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force.

Beal, Frances. 1995 [1969]. "Double Jeopardy: To Be Black and Female," in B. Guy-Sheftall (ed.), *Words of Fire: An Anthology of African American Feminist Thought*. New York: The New Press, pp. 146–55.

Benjamin, Ruha (ed.). 2019a. *Captivating Technology: Race, Carceral Technoscience and Liberatory Imagination in Everyday Life*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Benjamin, Ruha. 2019b. *Race After Technology*. Cambridge: Polity.

Ben-Moshe, Liat. 2013. "Disabling Incarceration: Connecting Disability to Divergent Confinements in the USA." *Critical Sociology* 39(3): 385–403

Bennett, W. Lance, and Segerberg, Alexandra. 2013. *The Logic of Connective Action: Digital Media and the Personalization of Contentious Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Berger, Michele, and Guidroz, Kathleen (eds.). 2009. *The Intersectional Approach: Transforming the Academy through Race, Class & Gender*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Bernstein, Elizabeth. 2010. "Militarized Humanitarianism Meets Carceral Feminism: The Politics of Sex, Rights, and Freedom in Contemporary Antitrafficking Campaigns." *Signs* 36: 45–71.

Bhandar, Brenna. 2013. "On Race, Gender, Class, and Intersectionality." *The North Star*, June 25.

Bilge, Sirma. 2012. "Developing Intersectional Solidarities: A Plea for Queer Intersectionality," in M. Smith and F. Jaffer (eds.), *Beyond the Queer Alphabet: Conversations in Gender, Sexuality and Intersectionality*. Teaching Equity Matters E-book series, University of Alberta.

Bilge, Sirma. 2013. "Intersectionality Undone: Saving Intersectionality from Feminist Intersectionality Studies." *Du Bois Review* 10: 405–24.

Bilge, Sirma. 2014. "Whitening Intersectionality: Evanescence of Race in Intersectionality Scholarship," in W.-D. Hund and A. Lentin (eds.), *Racism and Sociology*. Berlin: Lit Verlag/Routledge, pp. 175–205.

Bilge, Sirma. 2019. "Quand l'intersectionnalité interpelle le développement," in C. Levy and A. Martinez (eds.), *Genre, féminismes et développement: Une trilogie en construction*. Ottawa: Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa, pp. 39–52.

Bilge, Sirma. 2020. "'We've Joined the Table but We're Still on the Menu': Clickbaiting Diversity in Today's University," in J. Solomos (ed.), *The Routledge International Handbook of Contemporary Racisms*. London: Routledge.

Blackwell, Maylei. 2011. *Chicana Power! Contested Histories of Feminism in the Chicano Movement*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Blackwell, Maylei, and Naber, Nadine. 2002. "Intersectionality in an Era of Globalization: The Implications of the UN World Conference against Racism for Transnational Feminist Practices." *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism* 2: 237–48.

Blea, Irene. 1992. *La Chicana and the Intersection of Race, Class, and Gender*. Newport: Praeger.

Bogazianos, Dimitri. 2012. *5 Grams: Crack Cocaine, Rap Music, and the War on Drugs*. New York: New York University Press.

Bonilla, Yarimar, and Rosa, Jonathan. 2015. "#Ferguson: Digital Protest, Hashtag Ethnography, and the Racial Politics of Social Media in the United States." *American Ethnologist* 42(1): 4–17.

Bosch, Tanja. 2017. "Twitter Activism and Youth in South Africa: The Case of #RhodesMustFall." *Communication & Society* 20(2): 221–32.

Bourdieu, Pierre, and Passeron, Jean-Claude. 1977. *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Bowleg, Lisa. 2008. "When Black + Lesbian + Woman (Does Not Equal) Black Lesbian Woman: The Methodological Challenges of Qualitative and Quantitative Intersectionality Research." *Sex Roles* 59: 312–25.

Boylorn, Robin, and Orbe, Mark (eds.). 2014. *Critical Autoethnography: Intersecting Cultural Identities in Everyday Life*. Walnut Creek: Left Coast.

Brown, Melissa, Ray, Rashawn, Summers, Ed, and Fraistat, Neil. 2017. "#SayHerName: A Case Study of Intersectional Social Media Activism." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 40(11): 1831–46.

Brown, Tara, and Rodriguez, Louie. 2009. "Special Edition: Youth in Participatory Action Research." *New Directions for Youth Development* 123.

Brown, Wendy. 1995. *States of Inquiry: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Browne, Irene, and Misra, Joy. 2003. "The Intersection of Gender and Race in the Labor Market." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29: 487–513.

Bryan, Beverley, Dadzie, Stella, and Scafe, Suzanne. 1997 [1985]. *The Heart of the Race: Black Women's Lives in Britain*. London: Virago.

Buechler, Stephanie, and Hanson, Anne-Marie (eds.). 2015. *A Political Ecology of Women, Water and Global Environmental Change*. London: Routledge.

Bullard, R. D. (ed.). 1994. *Unequal Protection: Environmental Justice and Communities of Color*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

Bumiller, Kristin. 2008. *In an Abusive State: How Neoliberalism Appropriated the Feminist Movement against Sexual Violence*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Burawoy, Michael. 2005. "2004 Presidential Address: For Public Sociology." *American Sociological Review* 70: 4–28.

Caldwell, Kia Lilly. 2007. *Negras in Brazil: Re-envisioning Black Women, Citizenship, and the Politics of Identity*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Caputo, John. 2009. "Introduction. Postcards from Paul: Subtraction versus Grafting," in J. Caputo and L. Alcoff (eds.), *Saint Paul among Philosophers*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 1–23.

Carastathis, Anna. 2013. "Identity Categories as Potential Coalitions." *Signs* 38: 941–65.

Carneiro, Sueli. 1995. "Defining Black Feminism," in A.-O. Pala (ed.), *Connecting Across Cultures and Continents: Black Women Speak Out on Identity, Race and Development*. New York: UN Development Fund for Women, pp. 11–18.

Carneiro, Sueli. 2002. "A Batalha de Durban." *Estudos Feministas* 10(1): 209–14.

Carter, Prudence L. 2005. *Keepin' It Real: School Success Beyond Black and White*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Castells, Manuel. 2015. *Networks of Outrage and Hope: Social Movements in the Internet Age*, 2nd edn. Cambridge: Polity.

Chakravarti, Paromita. 2014. "Living on the Edge: Mapping Homeless Women's Mobilization in Kolkata, India," in M. Alston (ed.), *Women, Political Struggles and Gender Equality in South Asia*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, pp. 117–36.

Chang, Mariko. 2010. *Lifting as We Climb: Women of Color, Wealth, and America's Future*. Washington, DC: Insight Center for Community Economic Development.

Chiweshe, Marvern, Mavuso, Jabulile, and Macleod, Catriona. 2017. *Feminism and Psychology* 27(2): 203–24.

Cho, Sumi, Crenshaw, Kimberlé, and McCall, Leslie. 2013. "Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Applications, and Praxis." *Signs* 38(4): 785–810.

Chow, Esther Ngan-Ling. 1987. "The Development of Feminist Consciousness among Asian American Women." *Gender and Society* 1(3): 284–99.

Chun, Jennifer Jihye, Lipsitz, George, and Shin, Young. 2013. “Intersectionality as a Social Movement Strategy: Asian Immigrant Women Advocates.” *Signs* 38: 917–40.

Clark, Christine, Fasching-Varner, Kenneth, and Brimhall-Vargas, Mark (eds.). 2012. *Occupying the Academy: Just How Important Is Diversity Work in Higher Education?* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Clay, Andreana. 2008. “Like an Old Soul Record: Black Feminism, Queer Sexuality, and the Hip-Hop Generation.” *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism* 8: 53–73.

Clay, Andreana. 2012. *The Hip-Hop Generation Fights Back: Youth, Activism and Post-Civil Rights Politics*. New York: New York University Press.

Cohen, Cathy. 1999. *The Boundaries of Blackness: AIDS and the Breakdown of Black Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cohen, Cathy. 2010. *Democracy Remixed: Black Youth and the Future of American Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, Cathy, and Jones, Tamara. 1999. “Fighting Homophobia versus Challenging Heterosexism: ‘The Failure to Transform’ Revisited,” in E. Brandt (ed.), *Dangerous Liaisons: Blacks, Gays, and the Struggle for Equality*. New York: The New Press, pp. 80–101.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1998a. *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 1998b. “The Tie That Binds: Race, Gender and US Violence.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21: 918–38.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2006. “New Commodities, New Consumers: Selling Blackness in the Global Marketplace.” *Ethnicities* 6: 297–317.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2007. “Pushing the Boundaries or Business as Usual? Race, Class, and Gender Studies and Sociological Inquiry,” in C. Calhoun (ed.), *Sociology in America: A History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 572–604.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2009. *Another Kind of Public Education: Race, Schools, the Media, and Democratic Possibilities*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2010. “The New Politics of Community.” *American Sociological Review* 75: 7–30.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2012a. *On Intellectual Activism*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2012b. “Piecing Together a Genealogical Puzzle: Intersectionality and American Pragmatism.” *European Journal of Pragmatism and American Philosophy* 3(2): 88–112.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2015. “Intersectionality’s Definitional Dilemmas.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 41: 1–20.

Collins, Patricia Hill. 2019. *Intersectionality as Critical Social Theory*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Collins, Patricia Hill, and Chepp, Valerie. 2013. “Intersectionality,” in L. Weldon (ed.), *Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics*. New York: Oxford, pp. 31–61.

Cooper, Anna Julia. 1892. *A Voice from the South; by a Black Woman of the South*. Xenia: Aldine.

Corradi, Laura. 2018. *Gypsy Feminism: Intersectional Politics, Alliances, Gender and Queer Activism*. New York: Routledge.

Cotera, Marta (ed.). 1976. *Diosa y Hembra: The History and Heritage of Chicanas in the US*. Austin: Information Systems Development.

Cotera, Marta (ed.). 1977. *The Chicana Feminist*. Austin: Information Systems Development.

CRC (Combahee River Collective). 1995 [1977]. “A Black Feminist Statement,” in B. Guy-Sheftall (ed.), *Words of Fire: An Anthology of African American Feminist Thought*. New York: The New Press, pp. 232–40.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams. 1989. “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Anti-Discrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Anti-Racist Politics.” *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 140: 139–67.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams. 1991. “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color.” *Stanford Law Review* 43: 1241–99.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams. 2000. *Background Paper for the Expert Meeting on the Gender-Related Aspects of Race Discriminations*. Zagreb: WCAR Documents, November 21–24.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams, Gotanda, Neil, Peller, Gary, and Thomas, Kendall (eds.). 1995. *Critical Race Theory: The Key Writings that Formed the Movement*. New York: The New Press.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams, Ocen, Priscilla, and Nanda, Jyoti. 2015. *Black Girls Matter: Pushed Out, Overpoliced, and Underprotected*. New York: African American Policy Forum and Columbia Law School’s Center for Intersectionality and Social Policy Studies.

Cruz, Jose E. 1998. *Identity and Power: Puerto Rican Politics and the Challenge of Ethnicity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Daniels, Jessie. 1997. *White Lies: Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality in White Supremacist Discourse*. New York: Routledge.

Daniels, Jessie. 2009. “Rethinking Cyberfeminism(s): Race, Gender, and Embodiment.” *Women’s Studies Quarterly* 37: 101–24.

Daniels, Jessie. 2016. “The Trouble with White Feminism: Whiteness, Digital Feminism, and the Intersectional Internet,” in S. Noble and B. Tynes (eds.), *Intersectional Internet: Race, Sex and Culture Online*. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 41–60.

Davis, Angela. 1981. *Women, Race, and Class*. New York: Random House.

Davis, Kathy. 2008. “Intersectionality as a Buzzword: A Sociology of Science Perspective on What Makes a Feminist Theory Successful.” *Feminist Theory* 9: 67–85.

Dewey, John. 1954. *The Public and Its Problems*. Athens: Ohio University Press

Dewey, John. 2004 [1916]. *Democracy and Education*. Mineola: Dover Publications.

Dickar, Maryann. 2008. *Corridor Cultures: Mapping Student Resistance at an Urban High School*. New York: New York University Press.

Dill, Bonnie Thornton. 1988. “Our Mothers’ Grief: Racial Ethnic Women and the Maintenance of Families.” *Journal of Family History* 13: 415–31.

Dill, Bonnie Thornton. 2002. “Work at the Intersections of Race, Gender, Ethnicity, and Other Dimensions of Difference in Higher Education,” in *Connections: Newsletter of the Consortium on Race, Gender, & Ethnicity*, pp. 5–7.

Dill, Bonnie Thornton. 2009. “Intersections, Identities, and Inequalities in Higher Education,” in B. T. Dill and R. Zambrana (eds.), *Emerging Intersections: Race, Class, and Gender in Theory, Policy, and Practice*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, pp. 229–52.

Dill, Bonnie Thornton, and Zambrana, Ruth (eds.). 2009. *Emerging Intersections: Race, Class, and Gender in Theory, Policy, and Practice*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Dill, Bonnie Thornton, Zambrana, Ruth, and McClaughlin, Amy. 2009. “Transforming the Campus Climate through Institutions, Collaboration, and Mentoring,” in B. T. Dill and R. Zambrana (eds.), *Emerging Intersections: Race, Class, and Gender in Theory, Policy, and Practice*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, pp. 253–73.

Donovan, Joan. 2019. “First They Came for the Black Feminists.” *New York Times*, August 15. https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/08/15/opinion/gamergate-twitter.html (https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/08/15/opinion/gamergate-twitter.html).

Driskill, Qwo-Li, Finley, Chris, Gilley, Joseph Brian, and Morgensen, Scott (eds.). 2011. *Queer Indigenous Studies: Critical Interventions in Theory, Politics, and Literature*. Phoenix: University of Arizona Press.

Ducre, Kishi Animashaun. 2018. “The Black Feminist Spatial Imagination and an Intersectional Environmental Justice.” *Environmental Sociology* 4(1): 22–35.

Dzodan, Flavia. 2011. “My Feminism Will Be Intersectional, or It Will Be Bullshit!” *Tiger Beatdown*, October 10. http://tigerbeat down.com/2011/10/10/my-feminism-will-be-intersectional-or-it-will-be-bullshit/ (https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/08/15/opinion/gamergate-twitter.html).

Dzodan, Flavia. 2014. “I Can’t Think of Any High-Profile White UK Feminist who has ‘Rejected’ Intersectionality.” *Red Light Politics*, January 1. http://www.redlightpolitics.info/post/71842333716/i-cant-think-of-any-high-profile-white-uk-feminist (http://www.redlightpolitics.info/post/71842333716/i-cant-think-of-any-high-profile-white-uk-feminist).

Earl, Jennifer, and Kimport, Katrina. 2011. *Digitally Enabled Social Change: Activism in the Internet Age*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Edwards, Remi, Hunt, Tom, and LeBaron, Genevieve. 2019. *Corporate Commitments to Living Wages in the Garment Industry*. Sheffield: Sheffield Political Economy Research Institute.

Ehrenreich, Nancy. 2002. “Subordination and Symbiosis: Mechanisms of Mutual Support Between Subordinating Systems.” *UMKC Law Review* 71(2): 251–324.

Eisenstein, Zillah. 2014. “An Alert: Capital Is Intersectional; Radicalizing Piketty’s Inequality.” *The Feminist Wire*, May 26. http://thefeministwire.com/2014/05/alert-capital-intersectional-radicalizing-pikettys-inequality/ (http://thefeministwire.com/2014/05/alert-capital-intersectional-radicalizing-pikettys-inequality/).

Elliott, Thomas, Earl, Jennifer, and Maher, Thomas. 2017. “Recruiting Inclusiveness: Intersectionality, Social Movements, and Youth Online,” *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* 41:279–311.

Erel, Umut, Haritaworn, Jin, Rodriguez, Encarnación Gutiérrez, and Klesse, Christian (eds.). 2008. “On the Depoliticisation of Intersectionality Talk” in E. Miyake and A. Kuntsman (eds.), *Out of Place: Queerness and Raciality*. York: Raw Nerve Books.

Erevelles, Nirmala. 2011. *Disability and Difference in Global Contexts: Enabling a Transformative Body Politics*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Evaristo, Conceição. 2007. *Ponciá Vicencio*, trans. P. Martinez-Cruz. Austin: Host Publications.

Falcón, Sylvanna. 2012. “Transnational Feminism and Contextualized Intersectionality at the 2001 World Conference Against Racism.” *Journal of Women’s History* 24: 99–120.

Falcón, Sylvanna. 2016. *Power Interrupted. Antiracist and Feminist Activism inside the United Nations*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Ferber, Abby. 1998. *White Man Falling: Race, Gender, and White Supremacy*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Ferguson, Roderick. 2004. *Aberrations in Black: Toward a Queer of Color Critique*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ferguson, Roderick. 2012. *The Reorder of Things: The University and its Pedagogies of Minority Difference*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fernandez, Maria, Wilding, Faith, and Wright, Michelle (eds.). 2003. *Domain Errors! Cyberfeminist Practices*. Brooklyn: Autonomedia.

Franklin, Vincent. 2003. "Patterns of Student Activism at Historically Black Universities in the United States and South Africa, 1960–1977." *Journal of African American History* 88: 204–17.

Freeman, Michael. 2011. *Human Rights*. Cambridge: Polity.

Freire, Paulo. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Garcia, Alma. 1997a. "The Development of Chicana Feminist Discourse," in L. A. West (ed.), *Feminist Nationalism*. New York: Routledge, pp. 247–68.

Garcia, Alma. 1997b. "Introduction," in A. M. Garcia (ed.), *Chicana Feminist Thought: The Basic Historical Writings*, vols. 1–16. New York: Routledge.

Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 1998. "Gender, Race, and Class: Bridging the Language–Structure Divide." *Social Science History* 22: 29–38.

Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 2002. *Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Grzanka, Patrick (ed.). 2014. *Intersectionality: A Foundations and Frontiers Reader*. Philadelphia: Westview.

Hale, Charles. 2008. "Introduction," in C. T. Hale (ed.), *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 1–28.

Hall, Stuart. 1992. "What Is This 'Black' in Black Popular Culture?" in G. Dent (ed.), *Black Popular Culture*. Seattle: Bay Press, pp. 21–33.

Hall, Stuart. 2017. *Familiar Stranger: A Life Between Two Islands*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Hanchard, Michael. 1994. *Orpheus and Power: The Movimento Negro of Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo, Brazil, 1945–1988*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2007a. "Intersectionality as a Normative and Empirical Paradigm." *Politics and Gender* 3: 248–55.

Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2007b. “When Multiplication Doesn’t Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm.” *Perspectives on Politics* 5: 63–79.

Hankivsky, Olena. 2007. “Gender vs. Diversity Mainstreaming: A Preliminary Examination of the Role and Transformative Potential of Feminist Theory.” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 38(4): 977–1001.

Hankivsky, Olena (ed.). 2012. *An Intersectionality-Based Policy Analysis Framework*. Vancouver: Simon Fraser University.

Harad, Tejas. 2018. “Toward an Internet of Equals.” *Live.mint*, August 31. https://www.livemint.com/Leisure/c7XqIj7NcWEhmcV3WdeauI/Towards-an-internet-of-equals.html (https://www.livemint.com/Leisure/c7XqIj7NcWEhmcV3WdeauI/Towards-an-internet-of-equals.html).

Harris, Duchess. 1999. “All of Who I Am in the Same Place: The Combahee River Collective.” *Womanist Theory and Research* 2: 9–22.

Harrison, Anthony Kwame. 2009. *Hip Hop Underground: The Integrity and Ethics of Racial Identification*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Hartman, Chester, and Squires, Gregory D. (eds.). 2006. *There Is No Such Thing as a Natural Disaster: Race, Class and Hurricane Katrina*. New York: Routledge.

Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hilmer, Jeffrey D. 2010. “The State of Participatory Democratic Theory.” *New Political Science* 32: 43–63.

Hilton, Matthew. 2009. *Prosperity for All: Consumer Activism in an Era of Globalization*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hoffman, Christy. 2014. “Have Garment Factory Working Conditions Improved since Rana Plaza?” *Guardian*, April 24. https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/garment-factory-working-conditions-rana-plaza-collapse-unions (https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/garment-factory-working-conditions-rana-plaza-collapse-unions).

Holmwood, John. 2019. “Claiming Whiteness.” *Ethnicities*. First published online: April 15. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796819838710 (https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796819838710).

Hong, Grace K. 2008. “The Future of Our Worlds: Black Feminism and the Politics of Knowledge in the University under Globalization.” *Meridians: Feminism, Race, Transnationalism* 8: 95–115.

Hoskins, Tania. 2015. “Rana Plaza.” Are Fashion Brands Responsible for Those They Don’t Directly Employ?” *Guardian*, April 10. https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/sustainable-fashion-blog/2015/apr/10/rana-plaza-are-fashion-brands-responsible-for-those-they-dont-directly-employ (https://www.theguardian.com/sustainable-business/sustainable-fashion-

blog/2015/apr/10/rana-plaza-are-fashion-brands-responsible-for-those-they-dont-directly-employ).

Hoskins, Tania. 2014. *Stitched Up: The Anti-Capitalist Book of Fashion*. London: Pluto Press.

Howard, Philip, and Hussain, Muzammil. 2013. *Democracy's Fourth Wave? Digital Media and the Arab Spring*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Howard, Sheena C. (ed.). 2014. *Critical Articulations of Race, Gender, and Sexual Orientation*. London: Lexington Books.

INCITE! n.d. "Analysis: Dangerous Intersections." http://incitenational.org/page/analysis (http://incitenational.org/page/analysis).

INCLO. 2013. "'Take Back the Streets': Repression and Criminalization of Protest around the World." October. https://www.inclo.net/pdf/take-back-the-streets.pdf (https://www.inclo.net/pdf/take-back-the-streets.pdf).

Johnson, Cedric (ed.). 2011. *The Neoliberal Deluge: Hurricane Katrina, Late Capitalism, and the Remaking of New Orleans*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Jónsson, Ragnar. 2013. "Is the '4th Wave' of Feminism Digital?" *Bluestockings Magazine*, August 19. http://bluestockingsmag.com/2013/08/19/is-the-4th-wave-of-feminism-digital/ (http://bluestockingsmag.com/2013/08/19/is-the-4th-wave-of-feminism-digital/).

Jordan, June. 1981. *Civil Wars*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Kaijser, Anna, and Kronsell, Annica. 2014. "Climate Change through the Lens of Intersectionality." *Environmental Politics* 23(3): 417–33.

Kannabiran, Kalpana. 2006. "A Cartography of Resistance: The National Federation of Dalit Women," in D. Yuval, K. Kannabiran, and U. Vieten (eds.), *The Situated Politics of Belonging*. London: Sage, pp. 54–71.

Keating, AnaLouise. 2009. "Introduction: Reading Gloria Anzaldúa, Reading Ourselves … Complex Intimacies, Intricate Connections," in A. Keating (ed.), *The Gloria Anzaldúa Reader*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 1–15.

King, Deborah. 1988. "Multiple Jeopardy, Multiple Consciousness: The Context of a Black Feminist Ideology." *Signs* 14: 42–72.

Khan, Khadija. 2017. "Intersectionality in Student Movements: Black Queer Womxn and Nonbinary Activists in South Africa's 2015–2016 Protests." *Agenda: Empowering Women for Gender Equity* 31(3–4): 110–21.

Kivisto, Peter. 2010. "Multiculturalism and Racial Democracy: State Policies and Social Practices," in P. H. Collins and J. Solomos (eds.), *Handbook of Race and Ethnic Studies*. London: Sage, pp. 253–74.

Knapp, Gudrun-Alexi. 2005. “Race, Class, Gender: Reclaiming Baggage in Fast Travelling Theories.” *European Journal of Women’s Studies* 12: 249–65.

Krizsan, Andrea, Skjeie, Hege, and Squires, Judith. 2012. “Institutionalising Intersectionality: A Theoretical Framework,” in A. Krizsan, H. Skjeie, and J. Squires (eds.), *Institutionalizing Intersectionality: The Changing Nature of European Equality Regimes*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan, pp. 1–32.

LaDuke, Winona. 1999. *All Our Relations: Native Struggles for Land and Life*. Cambridge: South End Press.

Latina Feminist Group (ed.). 2001. *Telling to Live: Latina Feminist Testimonios*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Lim, Shirley Geok-lin, and Tsutakawa, Mayumi (eds.). 1989. *The Forbidden Stitch: An Asian American Women’s Anthology*. Corvallis: Calyx Books.

Lind, Rebecca Ann. 2010. “A Note from the Guest Editor.” *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 54: 3–5.

Lindsay, Beverley. 1979. “Minority Women in America: Black American, Native American, and Chicana Women,” in E.-C. Snyner (ed.), *The Study of Women: Enlarging Perspectives on Social Reality*. New York: Harper & Row, pp. 318–63.

Linker, Maureen. 2015. *Intellectual Empathy: Critical Thinking for Social Justice*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Lockhart, Lettie, and Danis, Fran (eds.). 2010. *Domestic Violence: Intersectionality and Culturally Competent Practice*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lopez, Marta Cruells, and Garcia, Sonia Ruiz. 2014. “Political Intersectionality within the Spanish Indignados Social Movement.” *Intersectionality and Social Change* 31: 3–25.

Lopez, Nancy. 2002. *Hopeful Girls, Troubled Boys: Race and Gender Disparity in Urban Education*. New York: Routledge.

Lorde, Audre. 1984. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Freedom: Crossing Press.

Lowe, Lisa. 1991. “Heterogeneity, Hybridity, Multiplicity: Marking Asian American Differences.” *Diaspora* 1: 23–44.

Lumsden, Karen, and Harmer, Emily (eds.). 2019. *Online Othering*. *Exploring Digital Violence and Discrimination on the Web*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Luna, Zakiya, and Luker, Kristin. 2013. “Reproductive Justice.” *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 9: 327–52.

Lynn, Samara. 2019. “Artificial Intelligence and Algorithms: 21st Century Tools for Racism.” *Black Enterprise*, April 30. https://www.blackenterprise.com/racism-of-artificial-intelligence-and-algorithms/ (https://www.blackenterprise.com/racism-of-artificial-intelligence-and-algorithms/).

Malin, Stephanie, and Ryder, Stacia. 2018. “Developing Deeply Intersectional Environmental Justice Scholarship.” *Environmental Sociology* 4(1): 1–7.

Manuel, Tiffany. 2006. “Envisioning the Possibilities for a Good Life: Exploring the Public Policy Implications of Intersectionality Theory.” *Women, Politics and Policy* 28: 173–203.

Matamoros-Fernández, Ariadna. 2017. “Platformed Racism: The Mediation and Circulation of an Australian Race-Based Controversy on Twitter, Facebook and YouTube.” *Information, Communication & Society* 20(6): 930–46.

Matua, Athena. 2010. “Law, Critical Race Theory and Related Scholarship,” in P. H. Collins and J. Solomos (eds.), *Handbook of Race and Ethnic Studies*. London: Sage, pp. 275–305.

May, Vivian. 2007. *Anna Julia Cooper, Visionary Black Feminist: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Routledge.

McCall, Leslie. 2005. “The Complexity of Intersectionality.” *Signs* 30:1771–800.

McClintock, Anne. 1995. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge.

McCorkel, Jill. 2013. *Breaking Women: Gender, Race, and the New Politics of Imprisonment*. New York: New York University Press.

McCulloch, Jude, and Pickering, Sharon. 2008. “The Violence of Refugee Detention,” in P. Scraton and J. McCulloch (eds.), *The Violence of Incarceration. Advances in Criminology*, vol. 5. New York: Routledge, pp. 225–42.

Medrado, Andrea, and Muller, Ana Paula. 2018. “Maternal Rights Digital Activism and Intersectional Feminism.” *Brazilian Journalism Research* 14(1): 174–201.

Mitchell, Eve. 2013. “I am a Woman and a Human: A Marxist-Feminist Critique of Intersectionality Theory.” *North Star*, December 2. http://www.thenorthstar.info/?p=11425 (http://www.thenorthstar.info/?p=11425).

Mirza, Heidi Safia (ed.). 1997. *Black British Feminism: A Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Monture-Angus, Patricia. 1995. *Thunder in My Soul: A Mohawk Woman Speaks*. Halifax: Fernwood.

Moraga, Cherrie, and Anzaldúa, Gloria (ed.). 2015 [1983]. *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Moreno, Dorinda (ed.). 1973. *La Mujer – En Pie de Lucha*. Mexico City: Espina Del Norte.

Muñoz, José Estéban (2009). *Cruising Utopia. The Then and There of Queer Futurity*. New York: New York University Press.

Murphy, Yvette, Hunt, Valerie, Zajicek, Anna, Norris, Adele, and Hamilton, Leah (eds.). 2009. *Incorporating Intersectionality in Social Work Practice, Research, Policy, and Education*. Washington, DC: NASW Press.

Nakamura, Lisa. 2002. *Cybertypes: Race, Ethnicity, and Identity on the Internet*. New York: Routledge.

Nakamura, Lisa, and Chow-White, Peter (eds.). 2011. *Race after the Internet*. New York: Routledge.

Naples, Nancy. 1996. "Activist Mothering: Cross-Generational Continuity in the Community Work of Women from Low-Income Urban Neighborhoods," in E. N.-L. Chow, D. Wilkinson, and M. B. Zinn (eds.), *Race, Class, and Gender: Common Bonds, Different Voices*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 223–45.

Naples, Nancy. 2009. "Teaching Intersectionality Intersectionally." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 11: 566–77.

Naples, Nancy. 2013. "Sustaining Democracy: Localization, Globalization and Feminist Praxis." *Sociological Forum* 28: 657–81.

Nash, Jennifer. 2008. "Rethinking Intersectionality." *Feminist Review* 89: 1–15.

Niessen, Molly. 2016. "Love Inc: Toward Structural Intersectional Analysis of Online Dating Sites and Applications," in S. Noble and B. Tynes (eds.), *Intersectional Internet: Race, Sex and Culture Online*. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 161–78.

Noble, Safiya Umoja. 2016. "A Future for Intersectional Black Feminist Technology Studies." *The Scholar and Feminist Online*, 13(3)–14(1). http://sfonline.barnard.edu/traversing-technologies/safiya-umoja-noble-a-future-for-intersectional-black-feminist-technology-studies/2/ (http://sfonline.barnard.edu/traversing-technologies/safiya-umoja-noble-a-future-for-intersectional-black-feminist-technology-studies/2/).

Noble, Safiya Umoja. 2018. *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. New York: New York University Press.

Noble, Safiya Umoja, and Tynes, Brendesha (eds.). 2016. *Intersectional Internet: Race, Sex and Culture Online*. New York: Peter Lang.

Norman, Brian. 2007. "'We' in Redux: The Combahee River Collective's Black Feminist Statement." *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 18: 103–32.

Okolosie, Lola. 2014. "Beyond 'Talking' and 'Owning' Intersectionality." *Feminist Review* 108: 90–6.

Oliver, Melvin and Shapiro, Thomas. 1995. *Black Wealth/White Wealth: A New Perspective on Racial Inequality*. New York: Routledge.

Olofsson, Anna, Öhman, Susanna, and Nygren, Katarina. 2016. "An Intersectional Risk Approach for Environmental Sociology." *Environmental Sociology* 2(4): 346–54.

Oxfam. 2014. *Working for the Few: Political Capture and Economic Inequality*. 178 Oxfam Briefing Paper, January 20. https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/file_attachments/bp-working-for-few-political-capture-economic-inequality-200114-en_3.pdf (https://www.oxfam.org/sites/www.oxfam.org/files/file_attachments/bp-working-for-few-political-capture-economic-inequality-200114-en_3.pdf).

Oxfam. 2015. *Wealth: Having It All and Wanting More*. Oxfam International Research Report, January 19. http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/wealth-having-it-all-and-wanting-more-338125 (http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/wealth-having-it-all-and-wanting-more-338125).

Oxfam. 2019. *Public Good or Private Wealth?* Oxfam Briefing Paper, January. https://www.oxfam.org.nz/reports/public-good-or-private-wealth (http://policy-practice.oxfam.org.uk/publications/wealth-having-it-all-and-wanting-more-338125).

Parker, Joe, Samantrai, Ranu, and Romero, Mary (eds.). 2010. *Interdisciplinarity and Social Justice: Revisioning Academic Accountability*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Patil, Smita. 2017. "Debrahmanizing Online Spaces on Caste, Gender and Patriarchy." *Intersectional Feminism – Desi Style!*, September 22. https://feminisminindia.com/2017/09/22/debrahmanizing-online-spaces-caste-gender/ (https://feminisminindia.com/2017/09/22/debrahmanizing-online-spaces-caste-gender/).

Pellow, David Naguib. 2018. *What Is Critical Environmental Justice?* Cambridge: Polity.

Perry, Imani. 2004. *Prophets of the Hood: Politics and Poetics in Hip-Hop*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Perry, Theresa, Steele, Claude, and Hilliard III, Asa. 2003. *Young, Gifted and Black: Promoting High Achievement Among African American Students*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Pew Research Center. 2011. "Wealth Gaps Rise to Record Highs between Whites, Blacks, Hispanics." *Social Trends*, July 26. http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2011/07/SDT-Wealth-Report_7-26-11_FINAL.pdf (http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/files/2011/07/SDT-Wealth-Report_7-26-11_FINAL.pdf).

Pough, Gwendolyn. 2004. *Check It While I Wreck It: Black Womanhood, Hip-Hop Culture, and the Public Sphere*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Rifkin, Mark. 2011. *When Did Indians Become Straight? Kinship, the History of Sexuality and Native Sovereignty*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rios, Victor. 2011. *Punished: Policing the Life of Black and Latino Boys*. New York: New York University Press.

Risam, Roopika. 2015. “Beyond the Margins: Intersectionality and the Digital Humanities.” English Faculty Publications, Paper 4. http://digitalcommons.salemstate.edu/english_facpub/4 (http://digitalcommons.salemstate.edu/english_facpub/4).

Roberts, Dorothy. 1997. *Killing the Black Body: Race, Reproduction, and the Meaning of Liberty*. New York: Random House.

Roberts, Dorothy. 2015. “Reproductive Justice, Not Just Rights.” *Dissent*, Fall: 79–82.

Roberts, Dorothy, and Jesudason, Sujatha. 2013. “Movement Intersectionality: The Case of Race, Gender, Disability, and Genetic Technologies.” *Du Bois Review* 10: 313–28.

Rose, Tricia. 1994. *Black Noise: Rap Music and Black Culture in Contemporary America*. Hanover: Wesleyan University Press.

Ross, Loretta. 2017. “Reproductive Justice as Intersectional Feminist Activism.” *Souls: A Critical Journal of Black Politics, Culture, and Society* 19(3): 286–314.

Roth, Benita. 2004. *Separate Roads to Feminism: Black, Chicana, and White Feminist Movements in America’s Second Wave*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sandoval, Chela. 2000. *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sarma, Deepika. 2015. “Six Reasons Why Every Indian Feminist Should Remember Savitribai Phule.” January 5. http://theladiesfinger.com/six-reasons-every-indian-feminist-should-remember-savitribai-phule/ (http://theladiesfinger.com/six-reasons-every-indian-feminist-should-remember-savitribai-phule/).

Schradie, Jen. 2019. *The Revolution That Wasn’t: How Digital Activism Favors Conservatives*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Schulz, Amy, and Mullings, Leith (eds.). 2006. *Gender, Race, Class and Health: Intersectional Approaches*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sharma, Nitasha Tamar. 2010. *Hip Hop Desis: South Asian Americans, Blackness, and Global Race Consciousness*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Sharma, Sanjay. 2013. “Black Twitter? Racial Hashtags, Networks, and Contagion.” *New Formations* 78(1): 46–64.

Shingler, Benjamin. 2013. “The Next Hot Sound? Powwow Step, Aboriginal Hip-Hop.” *Aljazeera America*. November 28. america.aljazeera.com/articles/2013/11/28/the-next-hot-soundyouhearwillbepowwowstepaboriginalhiphop.html (http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2013/11/28/the-next-hot-soundyouhearwillbepowwowstepaboriginalhiphop.html).

Silliman, Jael, Fried, Marlene Gerber, Ross, Loretta, and Gutiérrez, Elena. 2004. *Undivided Rights: Women of Color Organize for Reproductive Justice*. Boston: South End Press

Smith, Andrea. 2009. “Indigenous Feminism without Apology,” in Unsettling Minnesota (ed.), *Unsettling Ourselves: Reflections and Resources for Deconstructing Colonial Mentality*. Chicago: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 159–61.

Smith, Andrea. 2012. “Indigeneity, Settler Colonialism, White Supremacy,” in D. HoSang, O. LaBennett, and L. Pulido (eds.), *Racial Formation in the 21st Century*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 66–90.

Smyrnaios, Nikos. 2018. *Internet Oligopoly. The Corporate Takeover of our Digital World*, trans. Cynthia Johnson. Bingley: Emerald Publishing.

Sokoloff, Nathalie, and Pratt, Christina (eds.). 2005. *Domestic Violence at the Margins: Readings on Race, Class, Gender, and Culture*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Spivak, Gayatri. 1996. “Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography,” in D. Landry and G. Maclean (eds.), *The Spivak Reader*. New York: Routledge.

Springer, Kimberly. 2005. *Living for the Revolution: Black Feminist Organizations, 1968–1980*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Stanley, Jason. 2018. *How Fascism Works: The Politics of Us and Them*. New York: Random House.

Steinbugler, Amy, Press, Julie, and Dias, Janice Johnson. 2006. “Gender, Race and Affirmative Action: Operationalizing Intersectionality in Survey Research.” *Gender and Society* 20: 805–25.

Stoler, Ann Laura. 1995. *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault’s History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Taylor, D.E. 1997. “Women of Color, Environmental Justice, and Ecofeminism,” in K. Warren and N. Erkal (eds.), *Ecofeminism: Women, Culture, Nature*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Taylor, Verta. 1989. “Social Movement Continuity: The Women’s Movement in Abeyance.” *American Sociological Review* 54: 761–75.

Terriquez, Veronica. 2015. “Intersectional Mobilization, Social Movement Spillover, and Queer Youth Leadership in the Immigrant Rights Movement.” *Social Problems* 62: 343–62.

Terriquez, Veronica, Brenes, Tizoc, and Lopez, Abdiel. 2018. “Intersectionality as a Multipurpose Collective Action Frame: The Case of the Undocumented Youth Movement.” *Ethnicities* 18(2): 260–76.

Theocharis, Yannis, Lowe, Will, van Deth, Jan, and García-Albacete, Gema. 2015.”Using Twitter to Mobilize Protest Action: Online Mobilization Patterns and Action Repertoires in the Occupy Wall Street, Indignados, and Aganaktismenoi Movements.” *Information, Communication & Society* 18(2): 202–20.

Thurman, Erica. 2014. “Because All the Women Are Not White and All the Blacks Are Not Men: MBK, Intersectionality, and 1000+ Of Us Who Are Brave,” June 19.

http://ericathurman.com/mbk-and-woc/ (http://ericathurman.com/mbk-and-woc/).

Tüfekçi, Zeynep. 2017. *Twitter and Teargas. The Power and Fragility of Networked Protest*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Tugal, Cihan. 2013. "'Resistance Everywhere': The Gezi Revolt in Global Perspective." *New Perspectives on Turkey* 49: 157–72.

Tuhiwai Smith, Linda. 2012. *Decolonizing Methodologies*, 2nd edn. London: Zed Books.

Twine, France Winddance. 1998. *Racism in a Racial Democracy: The Maintenance of White Supremacy in Brazil*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Tynes, Brendesha M., Schuschke, Joshua, Noble, Safiya Umoja. 2016. "Digital Intersectionality Theory and the #BlackLivesMatter Movement," in S. Noble and B. Tynes (eds.). *Intersectional Internet: Race, Sex, and Culture Online*. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 21–40.

UN. 1995. *Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action Adopted by the Fourth World Conference on Women: Action for Equality, Development and Peace*. Beijing: United Nations, September 15. http://www.un.org/womenwa/beijing/platform/declar.htm (http://www.un.org/womenwa/beijing/platform/declar.htm).

Unsettling Minnesota (UM). 2009. *Unsettling Ourselves: Reflections and Resources for Deconstructing Colonial Mentality*. Sourcebook compiled by UM collective. https://unsettlingminnesota.files.wordpress.com/2009/11/um_sourcebook_jan10_revision.pdf (https://unsettlingminnesota.files.wordpress.com/2009/11/um_sourcebook_jan10_revision.pdf).

UNU (United Nations University). 2016. "Is Global Income Inequality Going Up or Down?" https://unu.edu/news/news/global-income-inequality-up-or-down.html (https://unu.edu/news/news/global-income-inequality-up-or-down.html).

Walby, Sylvia. 2007. "Complexity Theory, Systems Theory, and Multiple Intersecting Social Inequalities." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 37: 449–70.

Walia, Harsha. 2014. "100 Key Facts about the Lucia Vega Jimenez Inquest." *Guardian*, October 6. http://themainlander.com/2014/10/06/10-key-facts-about-the-lucia-vega-jimenez-inquest/ (http://themainlander.com/2014/10/06/10-key-facts-about-the-lucia-vega-jimenez-inquest/).

Warren, Mark. 2001. *Dry Bones Rattling: Community Building to Revitalize American Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Watts, Jonathan. 2014. "Anti-World Cup Protests in Brazilian Cities Mark Countdown to Kick-off." *Guardian*, June 12. http://www.theguardian.com/football/2014/jun/12/anti-world-cup-protests-brazilian-cities-sao-paulo-rio-de-janeiro (http://www.theguardian.com/football/2014/jun/12/anti-world-cup-protests-brazilian-cities-sao-paulo-rio-de-janeiro).

WCAR. 2001. *Declaration and Programme of Action*. NGO Forum, World Conference Against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, Durban, South Africa, August 27-September 1, Section 119 (Gender) of the Declaration. http://academic.udayton.edu/race/06hrights/WCAR2001/NGOFORUM/ (http://academic.udayton.edu/race/06hrights/WCAR2001/NGOFORUM/).

Weber, Lynn. 1998. "A Conceptual Framework for Understanding Race, Class, Gender, and Sexuality." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 22: 13–32.

Weber, Lynn, and Fore, Elizabeth. 2007. "Race, Ethnicity, and Health: An Intersectional Approach," in H. Vera and J. Feagin (eds.), *Handbook of the Sociology of Racial and Ethnic Relations*. New York: Springer, pp. 191–218.

"Why We Can't Wait: Women of Color Urge Inclusion in 'My Brother's Keeper.'" 2014. June 17. http://aapf.org/2014/06/wocletter-mbk/ (http://aapf.org/2014/06/wocletter-mbk/).

Wiegman, Robyn. 2012. *Object Lessons*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Wilson, Kapana. 2018. "For Reproductive Justice in an Era of Gates and Modi: The Violence of India's Population Policies." *Feminist Review* 119: 89–105.

Wing-Fai, Leung. 2019. *Digital Entrepreneurship, Gender and Intersectionality: An East Asian Perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.

WIR (World Inequality Report). 2018. Executive Summary. https://wir2018.wid.world/executive-summary.html (https://wir2018.wid.world/executive-summary.html).

Wright Mills, C. 2000 [1959]. *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Yunus, Muhammad. 2007. "Credit for the Poor: Poverty as Distant History." *Harvard International Review* (Fall): 20–7.

Yunus, Muhammad. 2009. "Economic Security for a World in Crisis." *World Policy Journal* (Summer): 5–12.

Yunus, Muhammad. 2014–15. "Muhammad Yunus: Global Visionary." *CUNY Forum* 2: 87–92.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2006. "Intersectionality and Feminist Politics." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13: 193–210.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2011a. "Series Introduction: The Politics of Intersectionality," in A.-M. Hancock, *Solidarity Politics for Millennials: A Guide to Ending the Oppression Olympics*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan, pp. xi–xv.

Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2011b. "Beyond the Recognition and Redistribution Dichotomy: Intersectionality and Stratification," in H. Lutz, M.-T. H. Vivar, and L. Supik (eds.), *Framing Intersectionality: Debates on a Multi-Faceted Concept in Gender Studies*. Burlington: Ashgate.

Zavella, Patricia. 2017. “Intersectional Praxis in the Movement for Reproductive Justice: The Respect ABQ Women Campaign.” *Signs* 42(2): 509–33.

Zinn, Maxine Baca. 2010. “The Family as a Race Institution,” in P. H. Collins and J. Solomos (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Race and Ethnic Studies*. London: Sage, pp. 357–82.

Zinn, Maxine Baca, Cannon, Lynn Weber, Higginbotham, Elizabeth, and Dill, Bonnie Thornton. 1986. “The Cost of Exclusionary Practices in Women’s Studies.” *Signs* 11: 290–303.

Zinn, Maxine Baca, and Zambrana, Ruth. 2019. “Chicanas/Latinas Advance Intersectional Thought and Practice.” *Gender and Society*, June 22. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243219853753 (https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243219853753).

Index

5 Grams: Crack Cocaine, Rap Music, and the War on Drugs (Bogazianos) 173

A

abortion: coalitional politics 124–7
academia/colleges and universities 2–3, 38–9, 54–5, 83
  diversity and access 208–16
  institutional incorporation 97–100
  critical inquiry 40–50
  social movement activism 87–97
activist scholarship 67–8
Adofoli, Grace 121
Africa, reproductive justice in 120–2
African American Policy Forum (AAPF) 59–61, 62
African Americans
  education and pipeline metaphor 205, 206–7
  police tactics 154–5
  women activists 3, 71, 74–8, 80–1, 88
African football players 13
Afro-Brazilian/black women's movement 25–31, 32, 33, 34, 106
Ahmed, Nafeez 17
Ahmed, Sara 198, 212
Algorithms of Oppression (Noble) 130–1
Amar, Paul 154, 159
Amnesty International 133–4
analytical tool 2–31

Anderson, Tanisha 155
Antoine, Rose-Marie Belle 109, 110
Anzaldúa, Gloria 81–2, 85, 88–9
Arab Spring 138, 142
Asian American feminism 83
Asian American hip-hop 175–6
Asian Immigrant Women Advocates (AIWA) 51, 52
Australia: asylum policies 155–6, 160–1

B

Bagilhole, Barbara 98, 107–8
Bambara, Toni Cade 74–5
Bangladesh
  Rana Plaza tragedy 146–52
  rural poverty in 65–6
"banking concept of education" 191–2
Barvosa-Carter, Edwina 184
Beal, Frances 75–6, 86, 99, 178
Ben-Moshe, Liat 161
Bernstein, Elizabeth 161–2
Bilge, Sirma 96, 98, 100, 131, 231, 234
black/Afro-Brazilian women's movement 25–31, 32, 33, 34, 106
black feminism *see* feminism/black feminism
Black Girls Matter report and social media campaign 60–1
Black Movement, Brazil 29–30, 31, 106
Black Twitter 128, 133
The Black Woman (Cade Bambara) 74–5
Bogazianos, Dimitri 173

Borderlands/La Frontera (Anzaldúa) 81–2
The Boundaries of Blackness: Aids and the Breakdown of Black Politics (Cohen) 179
Boylorn, Robin, and Orbe, Mark 168
Brazil
  black/Afro-Brazilian women's movement 25–31, 32, 33, 34, 106
  FIFA World Cup 7–8, 24, 142–3
  prison population and policing 153–4
Britain/UK 85, 107–8, 158
Brown, Tara, and Rodriguez, Louie 68–9, 193
Brown, Wendy 182
Burawoy, Michael 17

C

Caldwell, K. 28, 30
Canadian Border Security Agency (CBSA) 156–8
capitalism 17–18
  and class 20–1
  crisis and poverty 63–5
  and imperialism 85
  and nationalism 9, 11
  racism and sexism 75–6, 78, 85, 86
Caputo, John D. 181
Carter, Prudence 214–15
Castells, Manuel 8, 144–5
Chakravarti, Paromita 154
Chicana/Latina feminist movement 74, 80–3, 88–9
Children's Defense Fund 190
Cho, Sumi, et al. 4–5

Chow, Esther Ngan-Ling 83
Chun, Jennifer Jihye, et al. 51, 189
Civil Wars (Jordan) 88
Clark, Christine, et al. 215
class and capitalism 20–1
climate change and environmental issues 101–2, 164
coalitional identity 186–7
coalitional politics 124–7, 150
coercive turn 141, 152–9
Cohen, Cathy 179
colleges and universities *see* academia/colleges and universities
Collins, Patricia Hill 41, 42, 47, 55, 56, 86, 88, 91, 93, 96, 206, 233
  and Chepp, Valerie 91
colonialism/postcolonialism 43, 83–4, 85, 119
Columbia Law School
  Center for Intersectionality and Social Policy Studies (AAPF) 59–61, 62
  Center for Reproductive Rights 108–13
Combahee River Collective (CRC) 76–9, 89, 93, 170, 178
community-based organizations *see* grassroots/community-based organizations
complexity 34, 235–7
Conference on Inclusive Capitalism, London 17–18, 32
consumer activism 150–1
Cooper, Anna Julia 76–7, 192–3
crack cocaine 173–4
Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams 56–7, 59, 91–4, 97, 104–5, 112, 170, 187
  "coining" of intersectionality 73, 91, 93, 99
  et al. 44, 60–1

criminal justice system 45
see also policing; securitization
Critical Articulations of Race, Gender, and Sexual Orientation (Howard) 167–8
Critical Autoethnography: Intersecting Cultural Identities in Everyday Life (Boylorn and Orbe) 168
critical consciousness 192–4, 197, 216
critical education *see* education
critical inquiry and praxis 37–9
critical inquiry 39–50
critical praxis 50–5
meaning of 70–1
synergy 55–69, 219–21, 223
critical race theory 43–4
Cruz, Jose E. 183
cultural competence 214–15
cultural domains of power 6, 9–12
"cultural straddlers" 214–15

D

da Silva, Benedita 29, 30
Dalit women's movement, India 3–4, 183–4
Daniels, Jessie 70–1, 130, 133
Davis, Angela 27, 88
Davis, Kathy 95–6
Democracy and Education (Dewey) 195
demographic factors in public school re-segregation 202–3
Dewey, John 195
dialogical concept of education 193, 197–8
difference 197–8

digital media and social media 103–4, 127–38
dialogical engagement 193
online feminist publics 129–33
social movements/protests 136–8, 139, 144–5, 146, 150–1
violence against women 58, 61, 133–6
web activism 62
Dill, Bonnie Thornton 40–2, 43, 88, 90, 189
et al. 89
disability 48–9, 178
disciplinary domains of power 6, 12–15
discrimination, concept of 109–10
disenfranchised groups
contributions of 223
experiences and struggles of 42–3
identity politics as victim politics 182–3
diversity
term 198–9, 202
see also under education
Dominican Republic: human rights case 111
"Double Jeopardy: To Be Black and Female" (Beal) 75–6, 86
Dry Bones Rattling: Community Building to Revitalize American Democracy (Warren) 51–2
Dzodan, Flavia 132

E

economic inequality, global 17–25, 32–3, 34, 35, 142
Edelman, Marian Wright 190

education 45, 189–90
diversity
and higher education 208–16
and urban public schools 199–204
and intersectionality: critical convergence 190–9
multicultural 201–2
pipelines metaphor 204–8
and social justice 216–18
see also academia/colleges and universities
Eisenstein, Zillah 20–1
Element AI 133–4
empowerment of communities and individuals 42, 43
environmental issues 101–2, 164
Erevelles, Nirmala 49, 178
essentialism 178–9, 189
European Union (EU) 107–8
Evaristo, Conceição 26–7

F

fair play, myth of 11–12
far-right populism/activism 108, 134, 135–6, 137, 166–7, 223
feminism/black feminism
critiques of 85, 161–2
history of intersectionality *see* social movement activism
intersectionality as branch of 95–6
online 129–33
and WCAR 105–6
Ferguson, Roderick 187–8

Fernandez, Maria, et al. 130
FIFA World Cup 5–17, 24, 32–3, 34, 35, 142–3, 187
The Forbidden Stitch (Lim and Tsutakawa) 83
Franco, Marielle 31
Freire, Paulo 190–2, 193–4, 216

G

garment industry and worker's rights 146–52
Garner, Eric 155
gender
  and sport 9, 11, 13–15, 16–17
  wealth gap 20
Generations Ahead 52
genetic and reproductive technologies 52
Glenn, Evelyn Nakano 48
global broadcasting 9–10
global economic inequality 17–25, 32–3, 34, 35, 142
global reach 101–4
global social protest 141–52
Global South 3–4, 33
  and Global North 150, 160–1, 236–7
  reproductive justice in 113, 120–4
globalization from below 144
Grameen Bank (Muhammad Yunus) 63–9, 193
grassroots/community-based organizations 51–4, 61–3
  coalitional politics 124–7
Guantanamo, Cuba 156

H

Hale, Charles 67–8
Hall, Stuart 99, 167, 232–5
Hamer, Fannie Lou 71
Hankivsky, Olena 46, 53, 98
Harrison, Anthony Kwama 176
hate speech 135–6
health
  maternal and child *see* reproductive justice
  research and policy 45–6, 53, 98
higher education *see* academia/colleges and universities
hip-hop 169–77, 179, 193
Hip-Hop Desis: South Asian Americans, Blackness, and Global Race Consciousness (Sharma) 175–6
Hip-Hop Underground: The Integrity and Ethics of Racial Identification (Harrison) 176
history 72–3
  see also social movement activism
HIV/Aids 179
Hoffman, Christy 150
homeless women's movement, India 154
Hoskins, Tania 151
Howard, Philip, and Hussain, Muzammil 138
Howard, Sheena C. 167–8
human rights 53, 102–3, 104–8
  garment industry and worker's rights 146–52
  Inter-American Human Rights System (IAHRS) symposium 108–13
  suppression of public protest 139–40
  see also reproductive justice
Hurricane Katrina 94–5, 102

I

ICT *see* digital media and social media
identity/identity politics 78–80, 85, 166–9
  academic debates 178–88
  Afro-Brazilian women 28–9, 30–1
  CRC 78–9, 170
  FIFA World Cup 15–16
  hip-hop 169–77, 179, 193
  themes 185–8
immigration control 155–9, 160–1
incarceration/prison 45, 153–4, 161–2, 206–7
INCITE! 61–3, 84
INCLO 140
income inequality 18–19
India
  Dalit women's movement 3–4, 183–4
  Hindu nationalism 163
  reproductive justice in 122–4
  urban homeless movement 154
indigenous knowledges 234–5
indigenous women
  Canada 142
  feminism 78–9, 83–4
  Mexico rape cases 111, 118
Intellectual Empathy: Critical Thinking for Social Justice (Linker) 216
Inter-American Human Rights System (IAHRS) symposium 108–13
interdisciplinary fields 48–50
international courts 111–12

International Sociological Association (ISA) Eighteenth World Congress, Japan 17, 32
internet *see* digital media and social media
interpersonal domains of power 6, 15–17
intersecting power relations *see* power relations
Intersectionalities: A Global Journal of Social Work Analysis, Research, Polity, and Practice 44
intersectionality
  as analytical tool 2–31
  "coining" of term 73, 91, 93, 99
  core ideas 31–6
  definition 1–2, 221
Italian Review of Sociology 96

J

"jeopardy", concept of 86
Jiménez, Lucía Vega 156–8
Jónsson, Ragnar 130
Jordan, June 88

K

Kannabiran, K. 183–4
Keating, AnaLouise 81
Keepin' It Real: School Success Beyond Black and White (Carter) 214–15
King, Deborah 86

L

labor market 19–20
Lagarde, Christine 18
LatCrit theory 43–4

Latina/Chicana feminism 74, 80–3, 88–9

Latina Feminist Group 82–3

Latinidades festival, Brazil 25, 26–8, 31

Latino girls and boys 205, 206

Latino identity, US 184

Latino LGBTQ study 138

lesbianism 77, 78, 81–2

Lim, Shirley Geok-lin, and Tsutakawa, Mayumi 83

Lind, Rebecca Ann 168

Linker, Maureen 216

literacy 193

"lone wolf" terrorists 135–6

Lorde, Audre 88, 197–8

Lowe, Lisa 83

Lumsden, Karen, and Harmer, Emily 134

Luna, Zakiya, and Luker, Kristen. 114, 115

M

"Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color" (Crenshaw) 91–4

mass media 58–9

Matamoros-Fernández, Ariadna 135

maternal and child health *see* reproductive justice

Mexican identity 184

Mexico: rape cases 111, 118

microcredit (Muhammad Yunus/Grameen Bank) 63–9, 193

Mitchell, Eve 180, 181

Monture-Angus, Patricia 78–9

Moraga, Cherrie, and Anzaldúa, Gloria 82, 83

multicultural education 201–2

Muñoz, José Estéban 241

Musiolek, Bettina 151

My Brother's Keeper (MBK) initiative 59–60

N

Naples, Nancy 54, 191

National Black Feminist Organization (NBFO) 77

neoliberalism 22–3

  and coercive policies 141, 154

  and education 192, 194, 199

  and social democracy 23–5, 32–3, 222–3

New Mexico: Respect ABQ Women campaign 124–7

NGO Forum Declaration, WCAR 106–7

Noble, Safiya Umoja 128, 130–1

Norman, Brian 80

NoSomosDelito movement, Spain 139–40

O

Obama, Barack 59–60

Occupy movement 140

Occupying the Academy (Clark) 215

Okolosie, Lola 132

One Billion Rising for Justice movement 57–9, 62

Online Othering: Exploring Digital Violence and Discrimination on the Web (Lumsden and Harmer) 134

Organization of Women of Asian and African Descent (OWAAD), Britain 85

Oxfam 140

P

participatory action research (PAR) 68–9, 193
participatory democracy 194–5, 197
pedagogy in colleges and universities 54, 55
Pedagogy of the Oppressed (Freire) 190–2
Pellow, David Naguib 102
"people of color"
  category 213–14
  pipelines metaphor of education 204–7
  queer and trans 49, 61–2
  women *see* violence against women (of color)
Perry, Imani 176–7
Phule, Savitribai 3–4
pipelines metaphor of education 204–7
"platformed racism" 135
policing 139–40, 152–5, 156–8
  see also securitization
Pope Francis 17, 18, 24–5
population control, India 122–4
power, domains of 6–17, 222
power relations 2, 225–8
  FIFA World Cup 5–17, 32–3, 187
  in schools 194–6, 207–8, 217
pre-kindergarten (pre-K) to prison pipeline 206–7
prison/incarceration 45, 153–4, 161–2, 206–7
public health 45–6, 53, 98
public schools, US 195, 199–203
  and access to higher education 208–16

The Public and Its Problems (Dewey) 195
Puerto Rican identity 183, 184

Q

queer and trans people of color 49, 61–2

R

race
  critical theory 43–4
  FIFA World Cup 13, 14–15
  and re-segregation of public schools 201
  wealth gap 20
race/class/gender studies 40–3, 89–91, 96
  US sociology 46–8
racial democracy, Brazil 25–6, 28–9, 35
racism and sexism, Latinidades 26, 28
Rana Plaza tragedy, Bangladesh 146–52
rape/sexual violence 111, 116–17, 118, 121, 154
re-segregation of public schools 201–3
relationality 33–4, 55–6, 187, 197
reproductive justice 103, 113–19
  and coalitional politics 124–7
  in Global South 113, 120–4
reproductive technologies 52
Respect ABQ Women campaign, New Mexico 124–7
Roberts, Dorothy 114, 115–16
Robinson, Tracy 109–10
Ross, Loretta 113, 117, 118, 124

S

Sarma, Deepika 4

Schradie, Jen 136–7

science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) 204, 205, 206

securitization 159–62

see also policing

sex trafficking 161–2

sexual violence/rape 111, 116–17, 118, 121, 154

Sharma, Nitasha Tamar 175–6

Simon Fraser University's Intersectionality-Based Policy Analysis (IBPA) initiative 46, 53

Sister Outside (Lorde) 88

Smith, Andrea 84, 234–5

Smith, Barbara 77, 78

Smith, Dorothy 54

social context 33, 186, 229–32

social democracy 21–2

and neoliberalism 23–5, 32–3, 222–3

social inequality 32–3, 34, 35, 224–5

social justice 34–5, 237–40

activism 136–8

and critical education 216–18

social media *see* digital media and social media

social movement activism 73, 74–80

inclusion in academia 87–97

multiple narratives 80–6

participatory democracy 195

social protest 139–41
digital media and social media 136–8, 139, 144–5, 146, 150–1
and far-right populism 162–5
global 141–52
social welfare states 21–2, 24–5
social work 44
sociology 46–8
solidarity politics 51
South Africa
2010 World Cup 13
reproductive justice 121–2
South Asian youth 175–6
Spain: virtual protest 139–40
Spivak, Gayatri 186
spoken word poetry 174–5
standpoint epistemology 92
STEM subjects 204, 205, 206
Stitched Up: The Anti-Capitalist Book of Fashion (Hoskins) 151
structural domains of power 6, 7–9, 222

T

Telling to Live: Latina Feminist Testimonios 82–3
Terriquez, Veronica 138
Texas Industrial Area Foundation (IAF) 51–2
theory–practice link 42, 43–4
Third World Women's Alliance 85, 86
This Bridge Called My Back (Moraga and Anzaldúa) 82, 83
Thurman, Erica 60

trade unions 150
trans people of color 49, 61–2
transnational political imaginary 144, 146
Triangle Shirtwaist Factory, New York 147, 149
Triple Jeopardy: Racism, Imperialism, Sexism (Third World Women's Alliance) 85
Truth, Sojourner 76
Tugal, Cihan 144, 145, 152
Twitter 133–4, 136
  Black Twitter 128, 133

U

UK/Britain 85, 107–8, 158
UN Declaration of Human Rights 53, 103
UN World Conference Against Racism (WCAR) 104–7
Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor (Glenn) 48
United States Soccer Federation (USSF) 14
universities *see* academia/colleges and universities
urban homeless movement, India 154
urban public schools *see* public schools, US

V

victim politics 182, 183
violence against women (of color) 56–63, 161–2
  digital media and social media 58, 61, 133–6
  human rights violations 110, 111
  rape/sexual violence 111, 116–17, 118, 121, 154
A Voice from the South: By a Black Woman (Cooper) 76–7, 192–3
voting right 71

W

Walia, Harsha 157

Warren, Mark 51–2

wealth gap 20

web activism 62

“white identity politics” 166–7

white supremacist hate speech 135–6

white supremacist literature 70–1

Wiegman, Robyn 179–80

Wilson, Kapana 122–4

Women, Race and Class (Davis) 88

women of color *see* feminism/black feminism; social movement activism; violence against women (of color)

Women’s March on Washington (2017) 164, 165

World Inequality Report (WIR) 19

Y

Yousafzai, Malala 196–7

youth

- education activism 196–7
- securitization policies 160
- *see also* education; hip-hop

Yunus, Muhammad 63–9, 193

Yuval-Davis, Nira 105, 231–2

Z

Zavella, Patricia 124–6, 127

Zinn, Maxine Baca, et al. 90

Key Concepts Series

Barbara Adam, *Time*

Alan Aldridge, *Consumption*

Alan Aldridge, *The Market*

Jakob Arnoldi, *Risk*

Will Atkinson, *Class*

Colin Barnes and Geof Mercer, *Disability*

Darin Barney, *The Network Society*

Mildred Blaxter, *Health, 2nd edition*

Harriet Bradley, *Gender, 2nd edition*

Harry Brighouse, *Justice*

Mónica Brito Vieira and David Runciman, *Representation*

Steve Bruce, *Fundamentalism, 2nd edition*

Joan Busfield, *Mental Illness*

Damien Cahill and Martijn Konings, *Neoliberalism*

Margaret Canovan, *The People*

Andrew Jason Cohen, *Toleration*

Alejandro Colás, *Empire*

Mary Daly, *Welfare*

Anthony Elliott, *Concepts of the Self, 3rd edition*

Steve Fenton, *Ethnicity, 2nd edition*

Katrin Flikschuh, *Freedom*

Michael Freeman, *Human Rights, 3rd edition*

Russell Hardin, *Trust*

Geoffrey Ingham, *Capitalism*

Fred Inglis, *Culture*

Robert H. Jackson, *Sovereignty*

Jennifer Jackson Preece, *Minority Rights*

Gill Jones, *Youth*

Paul Kelly, *Liberalism*

Anne Mette Kjær, *Governance*

Ruth Lister, *Poverty*

Jon Mandle, *Global Justice*

Cillian McBride, *Recognition*

Anthony Payne and Nicola Phillips, *Development*

Judith Phillips, *Care*

Chris Phillipson, *Ageing*

Robert Reiner, *Crime*

Michael Saward, *Democracy*

William E. Scheuerman, *Civil Disobedience*

John Scott, *Power*

Timothy J. Sinclair, *Global Governance*

Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism, 2nd edition*

Deborah Stevenson, *The City*

Leslie Paul Thiele, *Sustainability, 2nd edition*

Steven Peter Vallas, *Work*

Stuart White, *Equality*

Michael Wyness, *Childhood*

POLITY END USER LICENSE AGREEMENT

Go to www.politybooks.com/eula to access Polity's ebook EULA.