Feminists Theorize International Political Economy
Author(s): Kate Bedford and Shirin M. Rai
Source: *Signs*, Vol. 36, No. 1, Feminists Theorize International Political Economy Special Issue Editors Shirin M. Rai and Kate Bedford (Autumn 2010), pp. 1-18
Published by: The University of Chicago Press
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/652910
Accessed: 19-04-2017 01:16 UTC

Kate Bedford
Shirin M. Rai

Feminists Theorize International Political Economy

The crisis of neoliberalism deepened as we developed this special issue. When we started, there was panic in the air as major U.S. and European banks and businesses collapsed or posted huge losses. As we go to print, unemployment remains high in most regions of the world, deficits are unprecedented, capital has become more concentrated in the manufacturing and financial sectors, and there is no clear sense of how long the crisis might last. It continues to be felt acutely in the global North, even while the South posts some growth (especially in the emerging economies there) and has gained greater influence over global economic policy making.[1] Confidence in markets has, at least momentarily, ebbed away, and—protests from the Right notwithstanding—there has been a limited relegitimation of the state's role in managing political-economic life. Faith in endless growth and in the supremacy of the political project of catering to capitalism's flexibility has been shaken. Supporters of free-market reform and deregulated finance capital have been at least temporarily chastened, and the manufacturing, service, and consumption practices of major economies are being violently made over.[2]

One reason we need a special issue of *Signs* on feminist political economy at this juncture is because the gendered consequences of these pro-

We would like to extend our thanks to the reviewers for this special issue, to colleagues who commented on this introduction (Mary Hawkesworth, Ruth Pearson, Georgina Waylen, and Toni Williams), to the authors for their patience and perseverance, and to Karen Alexander, Miranda Outman-Kramer, and Deanna Utroske at *Signs* for supporting us through the process. Shirin Rai would like to dedicate this special issue to the memory of her mother, Satya M. Rai, who, like so many women of her generation, questioned gendered hierarchies, challenged the institutional forms that these took, and inspired numerous others to follow in her footsteps.

[1] Consider, e.g., the growing role of China and India in the Group of Twenty's efforts to secure global economic recovery (Raghuraman 2009).

[2] We note, however, that many countries are undertaking public-spending cuts to reduce deficits in the wake of the crisis, and we see that the banks are back to awarding huge bonuses in the name of "retention of talent."

[*Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 2010, vol. 36, no. 1]

cesses are receiving insufficient attention in mainstream literature. We wished to return, once again, to Cynthia Enloe's insistent question about international politics: "It is always worth asking, 'where are the women?' Answering this question reveals the dependence of most political and economic systems not just on women, but on certain kinds of relations between women and men" (1989, 133). Yet the gendered questions at the heart of international political economy (IPE) continue to be neglected. For example, inadequate weight is being given to what we already know: that African American women and Latinas in the United States were targeted by banks selling subprime mortgages (National Council of Negro Women 2009; see also LeBaron and Roberts, "Toward a Feminist Political Economy of Capitalism and Carcerality," in this issue), that the repossession crisis will have a disproportionate impact on women dealing with personal-relationship breakdown (Nettleton et al. 1999), that shifts in consumption patterns are likely being funded by women working harder inside and outside the home (Moser 1993), that dislocations in production have gendered effects on unemployment.[3] We have seen a proliferation of reductionist biological explanations rather than rigorous analysis of these gendered realities. Multiple commentators have wondered whether more women in banking would have averted the meltdown (see, e.g., Beck, Behr, and Güttler 2009) or whether testosterone explains risk taking (Syed 2008). Can we read this, generously, as an emerging common sense that the dominant formulation of capitalism—which resulted in the crisis—was deeply structured by gender inequality (among other relations of inequality)? Ethnographic accounts of the trading floor have long detailed its gendered and racialized nature (McDowell and Court 1994; Knorr-Cetina and Preda 2005), and there is an awareness in some criticisms of "casino capitalism" that the players are not representative of the broader populace in terms of gender, race, and class.[4] Scholars have also unpacked the ideal of globalized masculinity. Lourdes Benería suggests that recent crises in global capitalism, such as the 1997 East Asian financial crisis, may

[3] See the National Women's Law Center's press release "Unemployment Rate Rises Twice as Fast for Women," Washington, DC, September 5, 2008, http://www.nwlc.org/details.cfm?id=3341&section=newsroom.

[4] The term "casino capitalism," first used by Susan Strange (1986) to characterize, for critical scholars of IPE, the increasing volatility associated with global financial markets, is now used by a range of actors to talk about—and criticize—the recent valorization of risk in finance capital. There has been a spate of editorials and news commentaries lambasting the irresponsible gambling that led to the financial crisis, and President Obama has publically chastised U.S. companies seeking bailout money for holding conferences in Las Vegas. See, e.g., Engler (2009), and "Has Obama Wronged Las Vegas?" (*Economist* 2009).

have brought "Davos Man" (the neoliberal competitive individual) to a turning point, with his selfish excesses increasingly contested (1999, 77). She was prescient in that prediction, and after Enron Man, Lehman Brothers, AIG Man, and Bush/Cheney, her point about the need for critical interrogation of hegemonic racialized capitalist masculinities could not be more pertinent.

A second factor motivating us to stage this debate about feminist political economy was the observation that this capitalist crisis—albeit deep and shocking—is not the first, nor will it be the last. Women and men have survived crises through everyday struggles, and feminists have analyzed and campaigned on economic crises for decades: the gendered impacts of the 1980s debt crisis (Sen and Grown 1987; Sparr 1994), the East Asian crisis (Truong 1999), and the Argentine crisis (RIGC 2003), among others. That history of struggle and analysis in the South must not be lost in our concerns with the current crisis. Consumption in the North (fueled by accumulating debt) has transformed the economies of the developing world, where a new international division of labor has gone hand in hand with an increasing mobilization of female workers and the consolidation of a gendered division of labor (see Jennifer Bair, "On Difference and Capital: Gender and the Globalization of Production," in this issue). The factories where women and men work (sometimes in terrible conditions) in China, India, South Korea, and Malaysia feed the appetite of Northern markets (Sen 1999), and care chains grow longer as migrant laborers provide the domestic and market-based caretaking work necessary to sustain Northern economies (Raijman, Schammah-Gesser, and Kemp 2003). At the same time, these modes of exchange deepen class divisions while creating new metropolises in the South that both cater to the consumer hunger of the North and attract migrant workers from elsewhere in the South in historic proportions. These migrations put incredible pressure on creaking social infrastructures and can result in increased vulnerability and violence. All of these developments have important implications for everyday lives in both the global South and the global North. This special issue, therefore, must ask, What can critical analysts learn from feminist perspectives? And what can feminists responding to the current crisis in North America and Europe learn from others who have been there and done that—those who have seen systems of governance and spectacles of power collapse and who have forged intersectional analyses of political economy? Accordingly, as editors we sought out essays that take transnational and postcolonial approaches to international political economy seriously, even if these analyses are located in a national frame.

Bringing these historical links and power relations on board provides

us with an alternative perspective from which to view the current crisis, a perspective that encourages us to approach systems of production, exchange, consumption, and social reproduction together in a distinctive light. Historically, mainstream IPE has focused on states, markets, and the relations between the two. Further, it has largely assumed the ontological premises of rational-choice individualism. Critical IPE has challenged this mapping of social relations by suggesting that both the state and the market are socially embedded institutions and that this embeddedness reflects the tensions of capitalist relations. Both strands of IPE, however, share some assumptions: both see states and markets as actors, both fold individuals into systemic equations that render them invisible, and both disregard some structural social relations, such as gender, while reifying others, such as competition (Peterson 2005; Waylen 2006). In short, neither mainstream IPE nor critical IPE is able to answer the question that Enloe has posed. The task of answering this question can be accomplished only if scholars address both the structural and the agential elements of social relations in ways that include an interlinked analysis of the capitalist processes of production, social reproduction, and exchange as well as resistance to and within the system. We wanted to give space to the excellent work that does precisely that.

We decided to focus on three broad themes, which the essays in this special issue address and which are open to various interpretations. First, we highlight the gendered regimes of capitalist production and consumption. This, in turn, illuminates the changing relations between nation-states and the global economy; processes of globalized capital accumulation and investment; the nature of social reproduction; the relationship between material production and discursive production and the circulation of goods, services, and knowledges; gendered patterns of consumption; and changing relations between local communities, states, and globalized markets. The second theme is gendered systems of exchange. This necessarily opens to analyses of the gendered international division of labor; the nature of exchange, whether involving care or cash within private and public spheres of the economy; and the effects of monetary exchange in fashioning, challenging, and transforming gendered relations. Finally, the third theme takes up gendered struggles for emancipation and equality. This leads to examinations of challenges to the global capitalist regime in the post–Cold War era; analyses of the class, race, and gender relations underlying particular strategies of empowerment or theoretical critiques of concepts such as emancipation, equality, and transformation; and the place of gender in current critiques of IPE. Many of the articles in this issue have reconfigured these three themes in new ways.

While these three overarching themes drove the call for papers and are central to how the authors in this special issue address issues of feminist political economy, we also found that the stimulating interdisciplinary submissions we received produced new sites of inquiry. In the following sections we therefore map three areas of analysis—governance, social reproduction and work, and sexuality and intimacy—in which alternative feminist perspectives on IPE are clearly evident in ways that, we believe, analytically cut across the production/consumption, exchange, and resistance thematics we have just described. These additional themes are also reflected in the essays in this issue. In drawing attention to such themes as well, we aim to underline both the continuities with and departures from previous debates and to suggest how this new work contributes a feminist response to the current crisis of capitalism.

Gender and governance

Struggles over meanings attached to the term "governance" have characterized debate in both the North and the South. While in the North critical scholarship has challenged the ways in which the concept of governance has become a triumphal shorthand for neoliberal shifts in market-state relations, in the South critical focus has been on challenging governance as institutional medicine for state failure (Nussbaum et al. 2003). With shifts in the regulation of capitalist relations and formulations of social policy, varied new feminist thinking has been articulated on governance.[5] The focus has remained on the changing relationship between states, markets, and civil society and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). While the earliest interventions considered gendered mobilizations outside the state and international institutions (Meyer and Prügl 1999), a strong body of literature on gender mainstreaming also emerged, seeking to unpack the processes through which social policy is framed and transformed within institutions.[6] However, governance as gender mainstreaming has evoked feminist anxieties too. In response to the focus on civil society and NGOs as governance actors, and in a stringent critique of the liberal strand and the cultural turn of second-wave feminism, Nancy Fraser has worried that the "movement's relative success in transforming culture stands in sharp contrast with its relative failure to transform institutions" (Fraser 2009, 98). Fraser also expresses concern that in some

[5] See Brush (2003), Lionnet et al. (2004), Hawkesworth (2006), Rai and Waylen (2008a), and Waylen (2008).

[6] See Hafner-Burton and Pollack (2002), Rai (2003), True (2003), and Walby (2005).

ways feminist successes in the cultural realm are built on the convergence of second-wave feminism's critiques of state-centric capitalism with neoliberal attacks on the state regulation of markets. Finally, in the context of law and social policy, Janet Halley and her coauthors argue that feminist achievements within institutions have become sufficiently successful to warrant the term "governance feminism" (Halley et al. 2006), a form of feminism that actively seeks power within mainstream organizations and often uses the architecture of new governance arrangements such as NGOs to criminalize particular forms of gendered behavior. Aside from raising concerns about which feminisms are made visible within institutions of international governance, and in what terms, Halley and her coauthors' particular critique of feminist institutional politics makes us worry about its apparent rejection of the multiplicity of strategies that feminists have pursued in challenging dominant social relations. Simultaneously, their critique appears to reinforce anti-institutional projects that offer little political challenge to existing gender inequalities.

The state-centric nature of governance analysis has also been challenged. While Shirin Rai and Georgina Waylen have argued that global governance needs to be the focus of our analysis because we "need to historicize the contemporary situation as the state has been reconfigured under globalization/neo liberalism" (2008b, 7), other scholars have challenged state-centric analyses from the perspective of local political spaces. Crucially, some have examined how parallel sovereignties work within the nation-state as parallel legal and carceral systems and how governance of polities and governance of communities are mutually imbricated to reproduce structures of power and oppression through spectacular practices of punishment and exile, in the context of a deepening economic and social crisis (Baxi, Rai, and Ali 2006). While these approaches differ in their focus and conclusions, all acknowledge the multifaceted and complex nature of governance structures and discourses.

The essays in this collection explore the multilayered nature of governance regimes, including at the level of states, international aid organizations, religious actors, and local communities. In particular, three essays (those by Elizabeth Bernstein, Genevieve LeBaron and Adrienne Roberts, and Lynne A. Haney) contribute to the debate on the carceral state. In different ways these essays confirm that prisons are a central means by which neoliberal states govern poor people (see Gilmore 2007; Wacquant 2009) and that governance through punishment and surveillance has leached out of prison buildings and into different facets of our lives, such as welfare surveillance and punitive immigration procedures. Imprisonment works discursively and politically and serves as a means of regulating social con-

flict; it also bridges the division between the governance of polity and the governance of community by making the home a working prison in contexts of violence (Baxi, Rai, and Ali 2006). Putting issues of imprisonment at the heart of IPE returns us, then, to gender, class, and race injustice, as well as to the intersection of profit making, politics, and regimes of punishment and violence. It also highlights the sometimes troubling role of gender advocates in demands for what Bernstein, in this issue, calls "militarized humanitarianism." Feminists committed to building political-economic alternatives to the current order must thus grapple with both definitional parameters of governance and alternative modes of governing.

Social reproduction and work

The discussion of governance outlined above builds, of course, on key feminist debates regarding the public and the private, which shed light on the exclusion of social reproduction from what is recognized as work. Several important interventions have been made during the past decade to develop the concept of social reproduction, and the essays included in this collection further advance these debates. Despite some differences of emphasis in feminist analyses, social reproduction has three key components: first, biological reproduction, the production of future labor, and the provision of sexual, emotional, and affective services (such as are required to maintain family and intimate relationships); second, unpaid production of both goods and services in the home, particularly goods and services of care, as well as social provisioning (by which we mean voluntary work directed at meeting needs in the community); and, third, the reproduction of culture and ideology, which stabilizes dominant social relations.[7] These components are institutionalized through gendered labor, discourses, and the organization of everyday life (Laslett and Brenner 1989). While the family is considered the primary institution engaged in social reproduction, current feminist scholarship is developing the concept of the "care diamond" to examine the provision of the work of social reproduction by the market, the state, the community, and the family (Razavi 2007, 20).

Despite its everyday importance to our lives, social reproduction is rarely included in analytical work done by political economists (be they mainstream or critical), nor is it accounted for in national statistics. However, the significance (conceptually, methodologically, and politically) of what one set of observers terms the "glorious tangle of production and

[7] See Picchio (1992), Elson (1998), Bakker (2007), and Hoskyns and Rai (2007).

reproduction" that characterizes people's lives (Bhavnani, Foran, and Kurian 2003, 8) has long been recognized by feminists (Waring 1988). In particular, they established a powerful critique of 1980s-style neoliberalism on the grounds that it pushed women into the paid labor force while increasing their caring responsibilities (Sparr 1994; Elson 1998). There has been, however, a far less unified response from feminists to subsequent formulations of capitalism. As states and international financial institutions turned away from the savage varieties of neoliberalism imposed via conditionalities and turned toward a post–Washington Consensus understanding about institutional strengthening, good governance, inclusion of the marginalized, and social safety nets, feminist political economists have responded divergently. While some have welcomed the shift, working within the development apparatus on the grounds that gender is being taken far more seriously now (Tinker 2006), others have argued that the anti-indigence projects associated with this new phase of policy have further increased social reproduction burdens on women by institutionalizing their roles—forged under crisis conditions—in securing community and family survival (Truong 1999; Rai 2002; Lind 2005). This raises crucial questions about the extent to which the new poverty programs that characterize "inclusive neoliberalism" are reliant on "female altruism at the service of the state" (Molyneux 2006, 437; see also Auyero 2001; Bedford 2009) and how these may evolve in a crisis context. In the deepening economic crisis—in which production is being restructured; relations of exchange are being transformed by the pressures of unemployment, social cutbacks, and demographic vulnerabilities; and resistance to these shifts is as yet muted—the invisibility of social reproduction labor (in particular, the invisibility of the political economy of care) is acute as policy makers focus on bailing out banking systems, property owners, and Fordist production systems that soak up organized (largely male) labor. What further work needs to be done on social reproduction in order to use this moment of critical openness to push forward intellectual and political agendas?

Several of the essays presented here (e.g., the ones by Jennifer Bair; Julie Graham and Maliha Safri; Christine Keating, Claire Rasmussen, and Pooja Rishi) tackle these themes. Issues of work—paid and unpaid, formal and informal—remain central to feminist IPE debates, and the promise of labor as a route to women's empowerment continues to be critically interrogated. These concerns echo those raised above regarding the relationships between feminism and capitalism and the increasing calls for women to be incorporated into markets, whether through paid labor, microcredit schemes, or migrant remittances.

Intimacy and the household

While debates on governance and social reproduction allow us to analyze the gender of governance and the governance of gender (Brush 2003), the regeneration of policy interest in the family has been, in part, a response to the privatization and individualization of care, with increasing surveillance of parenting in many countries, an economic reframing of child care involving the idea of the investable child (Prentice 2009), and punitive, even criminal, measures to enforce parental (especially fathers') responsibility.[8] Globally, the United Nations' 2009 Commission on the Status of Women meetings focused primarily on the theme of equal sharing of responsibility by men and women, especially in the context of caregiving and HIV/AIDS, in further evidence that familialism is undergoing a resurgence as a model of securing care. Against this, the need to critically interrogate the links between political economy and models of kinship from a queer antiracist perspective was noted nearly fifteen years ago by M. Jacqui Alexander (1994), who identified the heteronormative nature of much feminist political economy as a barrier to comprehensive scholarship on gender and structural adjustment. Other scholars have argued, to use Sasha Roseneil's terminology, for "queering the care imaginary" (2004), or moving outside a heteronormative paradigm for care provision. Roseneil turns attention to what friendship might offer feminists interested in care; others have examined how members of communities bound together by desire might care for one another, how sex may be understood as a form of care (Cooper 2007), how community solidarities and kinship bonds might be rethought outside a racialized model of the family (Safa 1999; Lind 2009), and how normative ideals of family are being restructured by states seeking to increase women's labor-force participation rates (Bedford 2009) or to create obligations within nonconjugal couples (Harder 2009). These debates about what we want as a model of feminist care provision have always been fraught, but they are especially pertinent now, given the increasing interest being taken in family provision by some national and transnational policy agencies addressing the social reproduction dilemma.[9]

[8] On the increased surveillance of parenting, see, e.g., the Parenting Cultures project and its 2007 conference, "Monitoring Parents: Childrearing in the Age of 'Intensive Parenthood,'" Darwin College, University of Kent, May 21–22, http://www.parentingculturestudies.org/conference/programme.pdf.

[9] See, e.g., the European Marxist feminist debates over wages for housework (Edmond and Fleming 1975; Barrett 1980; Malos 1995) and the disputes at the recent UN Commission on the Status of Women meetings over whether informal home-based caregivers (often family members or friends) should be paid for their labor.

However, the challenges to the heteronormative framing of the economy and the policy landscape that are posed from queer perspectives extend beyond a need to sexualize social reproduction debates. A growing body of feminist work on sexuality and IPE has outlined and analyzed the intertwining of markets and sexualities and the complex connections between changing formulations of capitalism and intimacy.[10] Many countries have witnessed the expanded marketization of sexual possibilities—for example, through commercial venues for sexual minority communities or newly legitimate opportunities for purchasing some sorts of sex—while in other cases state and suprastate surveillance of sexual markets has intensified (Ho 2009). As made clear in recent work on the commodification of new reproductive and stem cell technologies (Hodges 2008; Ikemoto 2009) and the immense profits being made from global sex industries, the classic debates over the role of heteronormativity in capitalism (e.g., Butler 1997; Fraser 1997) are far from resolved.[11] We urgently need "to consider the possibilities that contemporary formulations of global capitalism open up for alternative sexual and gender politics as well as the new sexual norms and regulations being forged in the neoliberal world order" (Bedford and Jakobsen 2009, 9). In a similar light, as certain normative queer populations are, to use Jasbir K. Puar's framing, "folded into life" (2007, xii) through state recognition of marriage rights, parenting rights, and so on, other differently racialized, gendered, and sexualized populations are targeted for death, as much through a War on Terror that invokes progressive Western exceptionalism with regard to gender and sexuality as through increasing state violence as migrants move across borders (Puar 2007; Staudt 2008). The complex links and ruptures between these sites and processes are only beginning to be teased out, and there is much to be learned about mobilizing a critical anti-imperialist feminist response—one that refuses the market-celebrating libertarianism of the (nonreligious) Right, the erotophobia of some movements of the Left (Binnie 2009), the militarized humanitarianism of some transnational gender activism, and the continuing heteronormativity of some feminist political economy.

The essays here in this special issue form part of that teasing-out process. They address the questions of household formation and the complex in-

[10] See Rebhun (1999), Hennessy (2000), Kempadoo (2004), Wilson (2004), and Padilla et al. (2007).

[11] This debate, which Judith Butler and Nancy Fraser carried out in the pages of *Social Text*, concerned the extent to which queer politics challenges capitalism, the desirable relationship between sexuality activism and Left mobilizing, and the best way to understand the links between the economic realm and normative heterosexuality.

terplay between restructured kinship and restructured economies while also exploring the political economy behind dominant abolitionist positions on sex trafficking.

Gaps

That said, there are several gaps in this essay collection, which should be read as evidence of the need for more debate on the interactions of crisis, politics, and survival. In this section, we highlight the gaps that appear particularly significant to us.

The collection is geographically—and hence conceptually, historically, empirically, and politically—uneven. It is dominated by authors located in North America, and while it provides coverage of Eastern Europe, the United States, and North and South Asia, it includes little coverage of other regions. Lamenting this underrepresentation is a well-worn path in *Signs*, as in other top-ranked Western journals, and it turns our attention—unsurprisingly—to the political economy of feminist publishing and citation and to the consumption circuits in which academic journals are embedded. In a recent piece on the difficulties of dialogue between feminist economists and feminist social theorists, Julie Nelson (2006) urges feminist social theorists to see the economy as socially embedded; we invite readers to see this discussion of feminist IPE as similarly embedded—socially, geographically, and materially.

Second, there are some obvious omissions in terms of the research fields. For example, despite the fact that there is reasonable agreement among feminists that the costs of financial crises and monetary policy adjustments are disproportionately borne by women (Takhtamanova and Sierminska 2009), the area of finance and monetary policy is not covered by any of the essays in this special issue. The area of development is only patchily addressed, leaving out important topics, such as gender and global trade, upon which many of the key claims about globalization hang (Young and Hoppe 2003; Fontana 2009). Intersections between international relations and IPE—for example, on war, securitization, and empire—are also absent, as are critical issues associated with climate change. In flagging these issues, we not only anticipate critique but also reflect on the particularity of putting together a special issue for a high-impact journal such as *Signs*.

What we do have here, however, are some excellent contributions toward extending critical debates on the generalizability and patterned contingency of gender and IPE approaches, and on the linkages between micro- and macrotrends, institutional forms, and sites of struggle. These

contributions are fruitful to us as we ponder why neoliberal regimes are still extant—albeit in somewhat chastened form—rather than diminishing in the context of the current economic crisis. In particular, we note that these contributions reflect grounded research that refuses the alleged dichotomy of empirical work versus theoretical work, which is sometimes mapped, more perniciously, as a distinction between theoretical work with a universal conceptual reach and empirical research with only local connotations. Feminist IPE has long been characterized by scholarship that is critical, theoretically rich, methodologically radical, and solidly grounded, and this collection contains many such examples.

We close, then, with the dual sense of partiality and accomplishment offered by this crisis-induced exercise in taking stock of feminist theorizations in IPE. Crises are, of course, Janus-faced moments of reflection and potentiality, unsettling past uncertainties, opening up new possibilities, and making visible concerns that may have been elided in celebratory accounts of the now-discredited old order. We invite readers to approach this special issue of *Signs* in that spirit.

A tribute to Julie Graham

Julie Graham passed away as this issue was being finalized. At the time of her death, she was traveling home after attending an academic talk with her friend and collaborator Kathy Gibson.

Julie was a rigorous geographer, but she drew from and contributed to many other fields, including feminist studies, cultural studies, political economy, and development studies. This special issue features her latest thinking, with coauthor Maliha Safri, on migration, development, and the "global household," a concept that brings together insights from these different disciplines. As their article demonstrates, her work focused on teasing out the possibility of new relationships between politics and the economy and on exploring the diversity and contingency of economic relations and processes.

Julie's work could be irreverent and brilliantly provocative; she was able to push against the narrow boundaries of the orthodox Left (e.g., with Gibson, pondering in print whether globalization—as imagined by Marxists and liberals—had an erection; Gibson-Graham 1996). Constant in her work, however, were concerns with social justice, inequality, contesting capitalism, and seeking out, nuturing, and celebrating spaces, places, and experiments that offered an alternative way of living. In her work she forged new intersectional analyses of feminist political economy, especially via queer studies.

Together with Kathy Gibson, as J. K. Gibson-Graham, she forged a model of collaborative feminist scholarship wherein the notion of single-author ownership was disrupted and a model of lifelong friendship and sisterhood was practiced. Julie was not only a rigorous academic but also a political activist. Her model of researcher/activist engagement can be witnessed in the Community Economies Collective, a group of researchers and activists inspired by the work of J. K. Gibson-Graham (http://www.communityeconomies.org/). Her influence is extensive, and she was a huge presence in the community of scholars in the field of feminist political economy. The loss of Jule Graham will be felt across many boundaries over a long period of time.

Kent Law School
University of Kent (Bedford)

Department of Politics and International Studies
University of Warwick (Rai)

References

Alexander, M. Jacqui. 1994. "Not Just (Any) *Body* Can Be a Citizen: The Politics of Law, Sexuality, and Postcoloniality in Trinidad and Tobago and the Bahamas." *Feminist Review* 48 (Autumn): 5–23.

Auyero, Javier. 2001. *Poor People's Politics: Peronist Survival Networks and the Legacy of Evita*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bakker, Isabella. 2007. "Social Reproduction and the Constitution of a Gendered Political Economy." *New Political Economy* 12(4):541–56.

Barrett, Michèle. 1980. *Women's Oppression Today: Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis*. London: NLB.

Baxi, Pratiksha, Shirin M. Rai, and Shaheen Sardar Ali. 2006. "Legacies of Common Law: 'Crimes of Honour' in India and Pakistan." *Third World Quarterly* 27(7):1239–53.

Beck, Thorsten, Patrick Behr, and Andre Güttler. 2009. "Gender and Banking: Are Women Better Loan Officers?" European Banking Center Discussion Paper 2009-19, Tilburg University, the Netherlands.

Bedford, Kate. 2009. *Developing Partnerships: Gender, Sexuality, and the Reformed World Bank*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bedford, Kate, and Janet Jakobsen. 2009. "Towards a Vision of Sexual and Economic Justice." Report, Barnard Center for Research on Women, New York.

Benería, Lourdes. 1999. "Globalization, Gender and the Davos Man." *Feminist Economics* 5(3):61–83.

Bhavnani, Kum-Kum, John Foran, and Priya A. Kurian. 2003. "An Introduction to Women, Culture and Development." In *Feminist Futures: Reimagining*

Women, Culture and Development, ed. Kum-Kum Bhavnani, John Foran, and Priya A. Kurian, 1–21. London: Zed.

Binnie, Jon. 2009. "Envisioning Economic and Sexual Justice Spatially." *Scholar and Feminist Online* 7(3), http://www.barnard.edu/sfonline/sexecon/binnie_01.htm.

Brush, Lisa D. 2003. *Gender and Governance*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira.

Butler, Judith. 1997. "Merely Cultural." *Social Text 52–53* 15(3–4):265–77.

Cooper, Davina. 2007. "'Well, you go there to get off': Visiting Feminist Care Ethics through a Women's Bathhouse." *Feminist Theory* 8(3):243–62.

Economist. 2009. "Has Obama Wronged Las Vegas?" *Economist*, February 13, http://www.economist.com/blogs/gulliver/2009/02/has_obama_wronged_las_vegas.

Edmond, Wendy, and Suzie Fleming, eds. 1975. *All Work and No Pay: Women, Housework, and the Wages Due*. London: Power of Women Collective.

Elson, Diane. 1998. "The Economic, the Political and the Domestic: Businesses, States and Households in the Organisation of Production." *New Political Economy* 3(2):189–208.

Engler, Mark. 2009. "Casino Capitalism as Usual." *Foreign Policy in Focus*, September 30, http://www.fpif.org/articles/casino_capitalism_as_usual.

Enloe, Cynthia. 1989. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. London: Pandora.

Fontana, Marzia. 2009. "The Gender Effects of Trade Liberalization in Developing Countries: A Review of the Literature." In *Gender Aspects of the Trade and Poverty Nexus: A Micro-Macro Approach*, ed. Maurizio Bussolo and Rafael E. De Hoyos, 25–52. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fraser, Nancy. 1997. "Heterosexism, Misrecognition, and Capitalism: A Response to Judith Butler." *Social Text 52–53* 15(3–4):279–89.

———. 2009. "Feminism, Capitalism and the Cunning of History." *New Left Review* 56 (March–April): 97–117.

Gibson-Graham, J. K. 1996. *The End of Capitalism (as We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Gilmore, Ruth Wilson. 2007. *Golden Gulag: Prisons, Surplus, Crisis, and Opposition in Globalizing California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hafner-Burton, Emilie, and Mark A. Pollack. 2002. "Mainstreaming Gender in Global Governance." *European Journal of International Relations* 8(3):339–73.

Halley, Janet, Prabha Kotiswaran, Hila Shamir, and Chantal Thomas. 2006. "From the International to the Local in Feminist Legal Responses to Rape, Prostitution/Sex Work, and Sex Trafficking: Four Studies in Contemporary Governance Feminism." *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender* 29(2):335–423.

Harder, Lois. 2009. "The State and the Friendships of the Nation: The Case of Nonconjugal Relationships in the United States and Canada." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 34(3):633–58.

Hawkesworth, Mary E. 2006. *Globalization and Feminist Activism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Hennessy, Rosemary. 2000. *Profit and Pleasure: Sexual Identities in Late Capitalism*. London: Routledge.

Ho, Josephine. 2009. "Reproduction and Democratization." *Scholar and Feminist Online* 7(3), http://www.barnard.edu/sfonline/sexecon/ho_01.htm.

Hodges, Sarah. 2008. "Of Bio-Trash and Techno-Bling: Umbilical Cord Blood Banking in Chennai." Paper presented at the Commercialisation of Local Knowledge Workshop, Institut Français de Pondichéry, Pondicherry, India, November 5–6.

Hoskyns, Catherine, and Shirin M. Rai. 2007. "Recasting the Global Political Economy: Counting Women's Unpaid Work." *New Political Economy* 12(3): 297–317.

Ikemoto, Lisa C. 2009. "Eggs as Capital: Human Egg Procurement in the Fertility Industry and the Stem Cell Research Enterprise." *Signs* 34(4):763–81.

Kempadoo, Kamala. 2004. *Sexing the Caribbean: Gender, Race, and Sexual Labor*. New York: Routledge.

Knorr-Cetina, Karin, and Alex Preda, eds. 2005. *The Sociology of Financial Markets*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Laslett, Barbara, and Johanna Brenner. 1989. "Gender and Social Reproduction: Historical Perspectives." *Annual Review of Sociology* 15:381–404.

Lind, Amy. 2005. *Gendered Paradoxes: Women's Movements, State Restructuring, and Global Development in Ecuador*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

———, ed. 2009. "Ciudadanías y sexualidades en América Latina" [Citizenships and sexualities in Latin America]. Special issue of *ICONOS*, no. 35.

Lionnet, Françoise, Obioma Nnaemeka, Susan H. Perry, and Celeste Schenck, eds. 2004. "Development Cultures: New Environments, New Realities, New Strategies." Special issue of *Signs* 29, no. 2.

Malos, Ellen, ed. 1995. *The Politics of Housework*. Cheltenham: New Clarion.

McDowell, Linda, and Gillian Court. 1994. "Missing Subjects: Gender, Power, and Sexuality in Merchant Banking." *Economic Geography* 70(3):229–51.

Meyer, Mary K., and Elisabeth Prügl, eds. 1999. *Gender Politics in Global Governance*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Molyneux, Maxine. 2006. "Mothers at the Service of the New Poverty Agenda: Progresa/Oportunidades, Mexico's Conditional Transfer Programme." *Social Policy and Administration* 40(4):425–49.

Moser, Caroline O. N. 1993. *Gender Planning and Development: Theory, Practice, and Training*. New York: Routledge.

National Council of Negro Women. 2009. "Assessing the Double Burden: Examining Racial and Gender Disparities in Mortgage Lending; Part 3—Income Is No Shield." Report, National Council of Negro Women, in partnership with the National Community Reinvestment Coalition, Washington, DC.

Nelson, Julie A. 2006. "Can We Talk? Feminist Economists in Dialogue with Social Theorists." *Signs* 31(4):1051–74.

Nettleton, Sarah, Roger Burrows, Jude England, and Jenny Seavers. 1999. *Losing*

the Family Home: Understanding the Social Consequences of Mortgage Repossession. York: York Publishing Services for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Nussbaum, Martha, Amrita Basu, Yasmin Tambiah, and Niraja Gopal Jayal. 2003. *Essays on Gender and Governance*. New Delhi: United Nations Development Programme (India).

Padilla, Mark B., Jennifer S. Hirsch, Miguel Muñoz-Laboy, Robert E. Sember, and Richard G. Parker, eds. 2007. *Love and Globalization: Transformations of Intimacy in the Contemporary World*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.

Peterson, V. Spike. 2005. "How (the Meaning of) Gender Matters in Political Economy." *New Political Economy* 10(4):499–521.

Picchio, Antonella. 1992. *Social Reproduction: The Political Economy of the Labour Market*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Prentice, Susan. 2009. "High Stakes: The 'Investable' Child and the Economic Reframing of Childcare." *Signs* 34(3):687–710.

Puar, Jasbir K. 2007. *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Raghuraman, Shankar. 2009. "All Eyes to Be on India, China at G20 Summit." *Times of India*, April 1. http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/news/india/All-eyes-to-be-on-India-China-at-G20-summit/articleshow/4342066.cms.

Rai, Shirin M. 2002. *Gender and the Political Economy of Development: From Nationalism to Globalization*. Malden, MA: Polity.

———. 2003. *Mainstreaming Gender, Democratizing the State? National Machineries for the Advancement of Women*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, for the United Nations.

Rai, Shirin M., and Georgina Waylen, eds. 2008a. *Global Governance: Feminist Perspectives*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

———. 2008b. "Introduction: Feminist Perspectives on Analysing and Transforming Global Governance." In Rai and Waylen 2008a, 1–18.

Raijman, Rebeca, Silvina Schammah-Gesser, and Adriana Kemp. 2003. "International Migration, Domestic Work, and Care Work: Undocumented Latina Migrants in Israel." *Gender and Society* 17(5):727–49.

Razavi, Shahra. 2007. "The Political and Social Economy of Care in a Development Context: Conceptual Issues, Research Questions and Policy Options." Gender and Development Programme Paper 3, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, Geneva.

Rebhun, Linda-Anne. 1999. *The Heart Is Unknown Country: Love in the Changing Economy of Northeast Brazil*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

RIGC (Red Internacional de Genero y Comercio; International Gender and Trade Network). 2003. *Argentina: Crisis y resistencias; Voces de mujeres* [Argentina: Crisis and resistances; Women's voices]. Buenos Aires: RIGC, UNIFEM.

Roseneil, Sasha. 2004. "Why We Should Care about Friends: An Argument for Queering the Care Imaginary in Social Policy." *Social Policy and Society* 3(4): 409–19.

Safa, Helen I. 1999. "Free Markets and the Marriage Market: Structural Adjustment, Gender Relations, and Working Conditions among Dominican Women Workers." *Environment and Planning A* 31(2):291–304.

Sen, Gita. 1999. "Gendered Labour Markets and Globalisation in Asia." Occasional Paper UNCTAD/EDM/Misc. 133. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and United Nations Development Programme, Geneva. http://www.unctad.org/en/docs/poedmm133.en.pdf.

Sen, Gita, and Caren Grown. 1987. *Development, Crises, and Alternative Visions: Third World Women's Perspectives.* New York: Monthly Review Press.

Sparr, Pamela, ed. 1994. *Mortgaging Women's Lives: Feminist Critiques of Structural Adjustment.* London: Zed.

Staudt, Kathleen. 2008. "Gender, Governance, and Globalization at Borders: Femicide at the US-Mexico Border." In Rai and Waylen 2008a, 234–53.

Strange, Susan. 1986. *Casino Capitalism.* New York: Blackwell.

Syed, Matthew. 2008. "What Caused the Crunch? Men and Testosterone." *Times Online*, September 30, http://women.timesonline.co.uk/tol/life_and_style/women/the_way_we_live/article4848188.ece.

Takhtamanova, Yelena, and Eva Sierminska. 2009. "Gender, Monetary Policy, and Employment: The Case of Nine OECD Countries." *Feminist Economics* 15(3):323–53.

Tinker, Irene. 2006. "Empowerment Just Happened: The Unexpected Expansion of Women's Organizations." In *Women and Gender Equity in Development Theory and Practice: Institutions, Resources, and Mobilization*, ed. Jane S. Jacquette and Gale Summerfield, 268–301. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

True, Jacqui. 2003. "Mainstreaming Gender in Global Public Policy." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 5(3):368–96.

Truong, Than-Dam. 1999. "The Underbelly of the Tiger: Gender and the Demystification of the Asian Miracle." *Review of International Political Economy* 6(2):133–65.

Wacquant, Loïc. 2009. *Punishing the Poor: The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Walby, Sylvia. 2005. "Introduction: Comparative Gender Mainstreaming in a Global Era." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 7(4):453–70.

Waring, Marilyn. 1988. *If Women Counted: A New Feminist Economics.* San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Waylen, Georgina. 2006. "You Still Don't Understand: Why Troubled Engagements Continue between Feminists and (Critical) IPE." *Review of International Studies* 32(1):145–64.

———. 2008. "Gendering Governance." In *Politics, Gender, and Concepts: Theory and Methodology*, ed. Gary Goertz and Amy G. Mazur, 114–35. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson, Ara. 2004. *The Intimate Economies of Bangkok: Tomboys, Tycoons, and Avon Ladies in the Global City.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Young, Brigitte, and Hella Hoppe. 2003. "The Doha Development Round, Gender and Social Reproduction." Dialogue on Globalization Occasional Paper 7, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Berlin.