

Gendered Globalization

SUSAN M. ROBERTS

What does gender have to do with globalization? And, what does globalization have to do with gender? Increasingly, feminist scholars and activists are producing powerful and cogent relational analyses of gender dynamics and global processes and are emphatically answering such questions. Their answers include an exciting and varied body of theoretical and empirical work and all sorts of other imaginative political practices. Even so, at times it seems that feminists are bravely swimming against a powerful tide of purported authority on the global that happily dismisses gender. What is it about the global that seems, for many people—political geographers included—to preclude gender? Major recent analyses of globalization, from both left and right, have risen to best-seller status without any serious treatment of gender. For example, neither *New York Times* columnist Thomas Friedman's (1999) very popular *The Lexus and the Olive Tree* nor the heavyweight Marxian *Empire* by Hardt and Negri (2000) has even one single entry in its index under "feminism" or "feminist," "gender," or "woman" or "women." Absence from indexes is an imperfect indicator of absence from a text, but in these cases it is, at the very least, symbolic of a major reluctance to explicitly or critically address how globalization and gender may be related—despite ample opportunity in the two books' (very different) analytical structures for such an engagement.

Gender, Scale, and Binaries

In general, the ignorance of gender by most popular globalization analysts is just one expression of a wider skepticism about how gender might relate to the global. I argue that this situation has several roots. First, in dominant (Western) cognitive schemes, the global is one-half of a well-known commonsense binary: global-local. This binary stands in associative relation with a whole host of other binaries that relate in similar ways to the dominant (heteronormative, Western) gender binary: masculine-feminine. As such, the global-local binary and its relatives work epistemologically to relegate or contain gender. Furthermore, the relegation or containment of gender is achieved largely through implied understandings or refusals around the feminine and, specifically, the category "woman." Gender—and women—get written out, either explicitly or by association, of the global as a social reality and out of analytic attempts to understand it. In a very important article, Freeman (2001) identified at least six interrelated

Table 9.1. Associated Binaries

Global	Local
Economy/market	Culture/nonmarket
Theory	Ethnography
Production	Consumption
Formal sector	Informal sector
Public	Private ^a
Macro	Micro
Modernity	Tradition ^b
Reason/logic	Affect/emotion/belief ^{c,d}
Cause	Effect
Agent/action	Victim/passive ^{b,e}
History	Everyday life
Space	Place ^{f,g}
Abstract	Grounded ^{f,h}
Universal	Particular ⁱ

Note. Sources of inspiration for this table are various but include, for prompting relating to specific binaries, the following: Freeman (2001); ^aYounis (2000); ^bMohanty (1991); ^cNussbaum (1995); Lutz (1995); ^dAlcoff (1995); ^eGibson-Graham (1996); ^fMassey (2002); ^gAgnew (1989); ^hNagar et al. (2002); ⁱPratt (1999, 149). These authors vary in their stances regarding these binaries and might not agree with the argument I am making concerning them.

binaries that work as oppositions or dichotomies to structure this exclusion. These binaries are listed as the first six binaries in Table 9.1. Beneath them are some additional dichotomous binaries that I believe may be usefully put into relation with those Freeman identified.

Of course, what is meant and understood by the terms "local" and "global," as well as what is experienced as "global" and "local," varies (Grewal and Kaplan 1994, 11), and the argument I am making is derived from my own understandings of dominant approaches to the global, the global economy, and globalization in the English-language popular and scholarly media, in which I have noticed these binaries at work. These "most obvious oppositions" (C. Kaplan 1994, 138) cannot necessarily substitute one for another, but exist in slippery yet close association with each other (and more) in discourses surrounding globalization and the global economy. Such slipperiness in combination with the sheer socially congealed power of some of these binaries means that the "equation between the local and the feminine gets reinscribed" over and over again, bringing along with it the corollary equation of the global with the masculine—even in the most critical of analyses (Freeman 2001, 1012). The equation, or even just association, of the global with the masculine takes various forms, as has been noted by many feminists. Chang and Ling, for example, noted how certain "techno-muscular" masculinities are associated with the successful in the global

economy (Chang and Ling 2000; Ling 2000, 250). Benner critically examined the archetype of "Davos Man"—a "global and more contemporary version of economic man" (Benner 1999, 68)—and I have shown how a more "sensitive" cosmopolitan masculine subject is a project of much business school global management training (Roberts 2003). Gibson-Graham (1996) brilliantly critiqued political economy treatments of globalization, likening the way in which men become capitalism and women become capitalism's "other," in narratives of globalization. So, as Freeman (2001, 1008) pointed out, "Two interconnected patterns have emerged: the erasure of gender as integral to social and economic dimensions of globalization when framed at the macro, or 'grand theory,' level and an implicit masculinization of those macrostructural models." Nagar et al. (2002) documented the many ways in which even critical analyses of globalization can end up reproducing masculinist and exclusionary understandings.

So global-local is mapped onto masculine-feminine in pervasive and sometime contradictory ways, and the way in which the global (and the global economy and globalization in particular) is treated as separate from gender dynamics has much to do with its (usually implicit) coding as masculine. However, a second and related point is that some places are more associated with the space of the global than are others. Said differently, there is, underlying the more abstracted global-local and space-place binaries, a definite historical geographic and distinctly colonialist spatialization. The qualities associated with the global are more easily mapped onto the West than the "rest." By virtue of the colonialist cognitive habit of ascribing characteristics to great swaths of global space and all those who inhabit those spaces, the global south and the global north stand in quite different relation to these binaries. Critical scholars of imperialism, colonialism, and development have pointed out how the global south was, and still is, often described and treated in ways that imply its feminization, pathologization, and infantilization (Fabian 1983; Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Visvanathan 1988). These attributes are territorialized and, in the process, differences within each global zone thus designated are denied in favor of emphasizing differences between global zones (Ling 2000; Spivak 1996; Roberts et al. 2003). As Staeheli (2001, 185) noted, feminist political geographers are well positioned to question any straightforward "alignment between identity and place" of this sort.

Third, and relatedly, another root of the dismissal of gender from the global has to do with the ways that scalar relations are either explicitly or implicitly conceptualized. This is a point that Massey (1991, 2002), for one, has been making for more than fifteen years now and that Freeman (2001) also insists on—albeit somewhat differently. When the global is opposed to the local and each is seen as its "other," any opportunity to think about scale as a continuum is lost. More seriously, though, even a continuum understanding of global-local lets each stand as poles—apart and potentially essentialized or naturalized. Moreover, the local is seen as always and only "contained within the global" (Freeman 2001, 1012), which allows the slippage into equating the local with

the derivative effects of social processes and the global with causality and agency. Thus, global processes (or globalization) can have local effects or can play out in places, but it is the global that is the scale that matters. Even those who seek to valorize and champion the significance of place or the local in an era of globalization can end up depicting the local as the playing field on which the global does its stuff. "Every global process is carried out only in and through specific and concrete places" (Kayatekin and Ruccio 1998, 90).

To treat scale as socially constructed, a point that is more or less accepted in critical human geography, at least (Marston 2000), permits a more complex relational understanding of categories such as the global or local. The local and the global can be seen as making sense only in terms of each other (as well as other scales) and one or the other is not prior or overarching. Furthermore, as Massey insisted, such an understanding permits the local and global to be seen as co-constitutive. For Massey, both the global and the local are historico-material but contingent effects of the intersections of multiple and asymmetrical social relations. Such relations (or "paths," "connections," and "inter-relations" [Massey 2002, 24]) make the global and the local just names we give to different aspects of these intersecting relations. Many feminists argue strongly for local or place-based analyses of globalization, typically pointing out the body, the home, and public spaces as appropriate places to analyze gender and globalization in relation (e.g., Harcourt and Escobar 2002, 10). Such local, grounded analyses, would, they claim, counter the more global or space-based perspectives, which are able to ignore gender or be only masculinist (Nagar et al. 2002; Harcourt and Escobar 2002; see also Hyndman 2004 [this volume]). However, I agree with Massey, who pointed out that she is worried about the "tendency to equate the terms local, grounded: everyday, meaningful" (2002, 24). In Massey's work the global is as grounded and is as meaningful as the local is. Unlearning, or relearning, scale in such a way is a major and difficult socioepistemological task. Graham (2002, 19) remarked,

No matter how often we attempt to set localities on a path of freedom, they will tend to be re-inscribed within the global/local binary, and deprived of power and agency in that move. Creative revisionings are not enough to circumvent this drama of recursion. Globalization discourse has produced all of us as local subjects who are subordinated to, and contained within, a "global capitalist economy." Ultimately, then, the problem of locality is a problem of the subject, and the ethical challenge to a politics of place is one of re-subjectification—how to produce ourselves and others as local agents who are economically creative and viable, who are subjects rather than objects of development (however we may want to define that term).

In addition, if we can attempt to relearn (rebecome?) ourselves—which is what Graham thinks is involved in conceiving of the local differently—we also can attempt to rethink the global. Instead of it remaining abstract, universal, and the domain of globe-stomping capital and capitalists, it may be seen as

constituted in a multiplicity of asymmetrically and contradictorily related locales and locals. Thus Massey (2002, 24) said that we ought not to completely take our eyes and minds off what we knew as the global, for "in an age of globalization we need to also be able to 'ground' our international connections, to recognize responsibility at a distance, to appreciate that 'the closest in' maybe should not always be the first priority." (See also Laner 1993, 97.)

The drastic and politically open reconceptualization envisaged by Graham and Massey is not merely a mind game. It will involve, and indeed is involving, real and varied social and political struggles. In the academic subdiscipline to which this volume seeks to contribute—the little world of political geography—we have our own interdisciplinary sociology that has served to perpetuate a mainstream conceptualization of globalization and other things global, notably geopolitics, that has almost totally ignored gender (Kofman 1996; Nagar et al. 2002). However, it should be clear that this has not happened only because of the dynamics at work in political geography, or geography for that matter. The containment of gender at the local has been a widespread and pervasive phenomenon.

Finally, the historical geography of feminism plays some role in the way gender and the global has not been widely taken up in analyses of the contemporary world. Because of the tendency to treat scale (the global-local) as a binary, and to see the global as the realm of the universal and abstract, many feminists who appreciate the forceful critiques of abstraction and universalism—critiques that have linked them with masculinist rationalities—have steered clear of the global, effectively ceding it as a domain of analysis. In addition, few feminists wish to repeat the subtle mistakes of a colonialist Western feminism that presumed "sisterhood is global" while downplaying thorny issues of differences between women. As Grewal and Kaplan (1994, 17) noted, "Conventionally, 'global feminism' has stood for a kind of Western cultural imperialism." However, while we should not forget the history of feminisms, I agree with Grewal and Kaplan's argument for a feminism that "address[es] the concerns of women around the world in the historicized particularity of their relationship to multiple patriarchies as well as to international economic hegemonies" (1994, 17; see also Prugl 1999, 149–51). My direction in this chapter accords with such feminists' insistence on the importance of analyses that see social relations, in all their unevenness and in all the ways they work through differentiation and categorization, as integral to the global, to globalization, and to the global economy (see Staehel 2001, 186).

Gender and the Global Economy

I hope it is clear that I am not proposing to somehow correct for the masculinist bias heretofore displayed in understandings of the global by instead concentrating on the right-hand side of the binaries listed in Table 9.1. As I argued previously, a focus on the local can unwittingly leave the structuring binaries intact.

Conversely, if scale—and specifically the global—is seen in a more contingent, social, and radically open way, then there is room to identify gender at work in all relations, institutions, spaces, and places, be they ordinarily designated global, local, or something else. We can thus come to see the interrelations of gender at work as much in the policies and practices of, say, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) as we can recognize them at work in a person's home. This moves beyond adding and specifying women in the right-hand side of the binary logics I identified previously. Moreover, in such an understanding all locales and all women are not assumed, unless proved otherwise, to be victims of globalization or simply as experiencing the effects of globalization as if it were raining down on them. This is not to deny that many locales and most women are indeed negatively affected in some ways by processes commonly identified as part of globalization. What it emphasizes instead is an openness to see how gender works in the construction and projection of such processes and how gender (along with race, age, and other key axes of social differentiation) mediates how people experience the global and their own subjectivities (see also Elson 1998; Bergeron 2001).

The Global Economy

Many have pointed out that there is no such thing (in naturalistic or essentialist ontological terms) as *the*, or even *an*, economy. What we think of as the economy is a socially and historically created and demarcated bundle of social relations. Or, as analysts who draw on the language and concepts of Actor Network Theory might put it, the global economy is a relational effect—it is the apparent crystallization of multiple material relations and social enactments (e.g., Law and Hetherington 2001). Benería (1999) showed how the global economy has been socially made (and is sustained as a purportedly coherent entity) through a lot of labor—entailing cultural as well as more obviously economic work. Benería argued that—just as Polanyi (1944) showed how the national economy, or national market society, was socially created through identifiable moments, such as the establishment of key laws by the modern territorial nation-state—we can see how the global economy has been made and is presently sustained.

Much work has demonstrated that, like the national economy, the global economy did not just somehow come about naturally as some inevitable stage of history (or its end) or of capitalism. Although there are tendencies in the global economy that work to limit the potential power of states, the contemporary global economy is, contradictorily, a child of the modern territorial state.¹ Specifically, it was largely shaped by key Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development states and the interests of social groups associated with different types of capital expressed within them (see, for example, Weber 1998). Helleiner (1994), for instance, conclusively showed how the global financial system—supposedly the most freewheeling and quintessential globalized market—was the creation of key states' actions. The architecture of the old regulatory regime

known as the Bretton Woods system (1944–1973, roughly) was systematically dismantled. In its place has arisen a less regulated, more dynamic plethora of financial markets and products. These comprise the multiplying international financial circuits we live with today. The contemporary international financial system is only one part of the global economy. The gendered geographies of the extraction and exchange of minerals and commodities should not be forgotten. More visible might be the constantly restructuring gendered geographies of production. The adding of value (or the extraction of surplus value) in production and the ways new spaces and populations have been incorporated into the circuits of production and trade have garnered considerable critical attention, including that from feminists (e.g., Pearson 1998; Prugl 1999; Runyan 1996; Marchand 1996). The associated travels of millions of transnational migrants, men and women looking for work, are another salient feature of the global economy, a feature that has also received some attention (e.g., contributions in Kofman et al. 2000). In this chapter I instead focus on the financial system, in part because it has been relatively less well studied by feminists (see previous arguments about why this is so) and in part because it is crucial to the way globalization works, hand in hand with neoliberalism as a program or ideology to create and congeal inequalities and sociospatial asymmetries.

Global Finance

The staggering growth of financial markets, so that now the value of trade in financial “products” outweighs the value of trade in goods, has not always been the most visible of changes in the global economy—compared, say, to the drastic changes in the physical and social landscape wrought by the setting up of export processing zones—but it is a key change that is complexly related to the more tangible trends in the global economy. To give a sense of just how fast and big the international financial markets have grown, I quote from a recent survey by Eatwell and Taylor (2000, 3–4), who delineate the growth in the markets trading in foreign exchange:

In 1973 daily foreign exchange trading around the world varied between \$10 billion and \$20 billion per day. The ratio of foreign exchange trading to world trade did not exceed 2/1. By 1980 . . . foreign exchange trading had reached a daily average of \$80 billion, and the ratio of foreign exchange trading to world trade was about 10/1. By 1992 daily trading averaged \$880 billion, a ratio to world trade of 50/1. In 1995 the amount was \$1260 billion, a ratio to world trade of nearly 70/1, equal to the entire world's official gold and foreign exchange reserves.

It should be pointed out that world merchandise trade did not shrink in volume or value during this period; in fact, during the 1970s and 1980s it grew at an average annual rate of more than 40 percent. It is just that the foreign exchange markets grew much, much faster (Dicken 1998, 25). In addition to the speculative and very short-term foreign exchange market, international markets for bonds, stocks and shares, futures, and repackaged

debt of all sorts have been established, have grown, and have gotten more complex over the past few decades. These financial markets appear to thrive on risk and volatility and have been associated with a series of spatialized crises, from the so-called Third World debt crisis of 1982 onward to the Mexican crisis of 1994 and the Asian financial crisis of 1997, events that have had severe and persistent effects.

The rise of international finance has had a differentiated global historical geography, of course. The deregulation of internal national markets, and also somewhat of their borders, was central to these efforts in the global north during the Thatcher-Reagan years, for example. Meanwhile, in the highly asymmetrical geography of deregulation and liberalization, countries of the global south were more or less forced or cajoled into extreme deregulation and liberalization. Such pressures were brought to bear by international institutions (most significantly the IMF) and found their most obvious expression in so-called structural adjustment programs (Floro 1995; Aslanbeigui et al. 1994; Singh and Zammitt 2000). Indeed, the so-called Third World debt crisis and the pursuant structural adjustment programs gave the IMF a greater role than it had had before in the regulation of the world economy (Stiglitz 2002). Together with the Bank for International Settlements (Roberts 1995), the IMF is a major regulatory authority with purview over global financial markets. In addition to the IMF and the Bank for International Settlements, key formal institutions would include the World Bank as well as the World Trade Organization, which superseded the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1995. These are the major formal institutions that seek (contradictorily) to regulate and promote the global economy. They operate in conjunction with other less formal, but still powerful groups, such as the World Economic Forum, whose meetings in Davos are often cited as a significant forum for powerful global elites. These international institutions are related to states but are not states themselves.

We now live (in different ways in different places, and in different ways in every place) in or with a world economy that is bigger, faster, and more integrated than it was even ten years ago. It is an economic spatialization that does not have an exact formal political correlate, in the way that it used to be considered that the national economy and the modern state mapped onto one another congruently. In general, there has been a shift from states-based multilateral regulation of global economic dynamics (such as in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) to a more international institution-coordinated and law-based regime of regulation and surveillance. This change in the regulation of the global economy is associated with the rise of international law and the increasing pervasiveness and effectiveness of rights discourse. Human rights, and hegemonic understandings of what they are, have been encoded in a series of multinational conventions and have become a major structuring global discourse (Dezalay and Garth 2002). Furthermore, the whole emerging regime of international law and of rights discourse has been encoded in ways that are

neither wholly positive nor unambiguous in their relation to any kind of feminism (Charlesworth 1996; Romany 2000; Buss and Herman 2003).

The Global Economy as a Patchwork of Neoliberalizing Spaces?

Globalization is not just a series of material shifts in trade, finance, production, reproduction, migration, and regulation dynamics (to name but a few). It is riddled with interests and agendas, and it can be thought of as a project or program—albeit a contradictory and never completed one (McMichael 2000). Neoliberalism is a shorthand term used to identify the bundle of discourses and social practices that in large part animate the dynamics of the contemporary global economy. It stresses, first, the opening of markets through the dismantling of legal barriers to trade (e.g., tariffs, quotas), practices pushed by the World Trade Organization for example. Second, neoliberalism promotes the extension of markets (marketization) through the privatization of previously socially or communally held assets (such as land, water, electricity) and the commodification of previously un- or less-commodified things and practices (such as genetic materials or knowledges—what neoliberalism understands to be “intellectual property”). These projects of neoliberalism are justified on the basis that they are “good” and will ensure “progress” for participants.

Thus, neoliberalism is, like development or colonialism or imperialism, an ideological and programmatic exercise, which entails as a core element the job of “object constitution” (Rumyan 1999; drawing on Spivak 1996). Neoliberalism has several key objects, such as the crucial “market.” To a large degree neoliberalism’s “success depends on promoting new ways of representing the world, new discourses, new subjectivities that establish the legitimacy of the market economy, the disciplinary state, and enterprise culture” (Jessop 2002, 467). Social categories such as women also can be understood as being objects (and, in a limited way, subjects) that neoliberalism seeks to frame or constitute in certain ways. Women are objects of neoliberalism in at least four ways. First, and somewhat contradictorily, they are not actually constituted as a group but rather seen simply as individual market actors, a characterization that in neoliberalism is linked clearly to liberal political identities (Tickner 1992, 71–78). As such, according to neoliberalism, women, like any other actors, are freer subjects when able to make more or less rational decisions in unregulated markets when they are, in Milton Friedman’s words, “free to choose” (Friedman and Friedman 1980). Second, women (especially, but not exclusively, in the so-called developing world) are human capital. As units of human capital they can be developed (through education, training, health care, and so on) so that they may more productively participate in (formal) labor markets. Third, as political subjects, women in neoliberalism are seen as having rights, human rights, although human rights and women’s rights do not coexist without contradiction and conflict (Charlesworth 1996; Romany 2000). Fourth, they are also, in latter-day versions of neoliberalism, seen as important components of “social capital” as

members and organizers of formalized civil society, specifically, of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) (Lang 2000).

In neoliberalism the state is deliberately shrunk, leaving factions of capital to grab what were previously socially held assets (like water in many places) and at the same time devolving many social services (such as health) to a burgeoning NGO sector. Indeed, the growth of NGOs of all sorts, but especially of formal neocorporate NGOs, has been a major feature of neoliberalism and has presented feminists with particular opportunities and dilemmas (Eade and Ligerengen 2001; Mawdsley et al. 2002). Problematically, the growing prevalence of NGOs and their increasing incorporation into (or co-option by) the major neoliberal institutions such as the World Bank have occurred hand in hand with the social turn in neoliberalism and the emphasis on social capital (Bergeron 2003; Tinker 1999). That is, women as a social category have been mainstreamed in these institutions, at the same time that NGOs have been promoted as appropriate organizational forms for the enactment of social agendas. This has led to the proliferation of women's NGOs or woman-identified NGOs, and the Beijing Conference and linked NGO Forum of 1995 highlighted just such organizations assembling under the imprimatur of the United Nations. The conference and forum, although they were heterogeneous events, showcased for critics what was becoming of feminism under neoliberalism's global governance regime with its emphasis on NGOs as vectors of social development and inclusion (Bergeron 2003; Lang 2000; Runyan 1999).

Although I am claiming that neoliberalism is quite powerful, I do not wish to create an analysis that reifies neoliberalism. Certainly, like any other project, it is always contingent, and it requires a great deal of work (economic, political, social, cultural) to sustain it. As Milanovic (2003) pointed out, there is tremendous ingenuity and a lot of sheer hard work entailed in keeping the neoliberal story at all plausible. The contemporary shifts in the nature of neoliberalism underscore this point rather well.

Post-Washington Consensus on Neoliberalism

Although some protagonists in the debates would not care to admit it, it appears there has been some change in the way neoliberalism is currently formulated. What used to be identified as the Washington Consensus (Manzo 1999) seems to have been modified in ways that change the processes of gendered object constitution it entails. Based in large part on dominant thinking in (U.S.) economics, neoliberalism has taken from so-called New Growth Theory discipline lessons about market imperfections and how these are handled by market participants and thus by markets themselves. In part, the new economics is a neo-Keynesian approach, at least as exemplified by the work of Joseph Stiglitz. For geographers and feminists, Stiglitz's (2002) analysis seems to be better than much neoliberal economics because it retains an insistence on difference—social and spatial. That is to say, Stiglitz's analyses run counter to earlier, cruder

Washington Consensus neoliberalism with its insistence on a one-size-fits-all approach to development, in which each economy is treated as if it were more or less the same as every other economy. This approach was exemplified in structural adjustment programs and then taken to a higher order in the behavior of the IMF in post-1997 Southeast Asia, where symptoms and cures were more or less read off economic theory as rendered in neoliberal dogma. No account was taken of the particular and quite different circumstances of, for example, the crisis in Malaysia and Indonesia (Stiglitz 2002).

In general, the attention by Stiglitz and other economists to social, political, and historical attributes (even if they are rendered as factors) may be seen as hopeful. When such emphases are found at work in institutions such as the World Bank, though, it is clear that they very quickly get folded into habitually neoliberal framings (see Surin 2003; Bergeron 2003). Fine (2002) went further and argued that claims of a consolidating Post-Washington Consensus in economics are (throughout attention to social issues, for example) facilitating an even more virulent colonizing attack on other social sciences by economics that threatens to foreclose on critical analysis (Fine 2002, 2059). This could be interpreted as a parallel argument to that made by Peck and Tickell (2002), wherein they identified the present as an era of expansive "roll-out" neoliberalism.

Neoliberalized Gender and Gendered Neoliberalism

All in all, and as many critics have noted, neoliberalism and deregulated global financial flows are not somehow gender neutral—in either the discursive or the more obviously material practices with which they are associated. In particular, feminists have noted that at the very heart (in the form of the constitutive outside) of neoliberalism is the nonmarket. The outside in neoliberalism is that which is not the market. In roll-out neoliberalism the tendency might be to colonize such realms as just more imperfect markets. However, in neoliberalism as it is enacted in states' and transnational institutions' policies and regulatory practices, such activities as the work of informal economies, shadow economies, unpaid labor, subsistence work, barter, social reproduction, and care get treated as nonmarketized. Recalling Table 9.1 makes clear that such a demarcation is associated with gendered assumptions about what counts as the economy. Furthermore, such a realm can hardly be banished from sight. Even though unrecognized by neoliberalism, the so-called nonmarket realm is deeply imbricated in the ongoing practices of neoliberalism. For example, as many critics have insisted, women, whether neatly organized into formal NGOs or taking care of ensuring the survival of families and households, are relied on as the social safety net in neoliberalism. This is a particularly noticeable situation in times of recession and crisis—times that are recurrent (and, one could say, permanent in most parts of the world) in a volatile world economy. As a United Nations Report explained,

Characterized by unregulated financial flows, the international economic environment tends to reduce, on the one hand, economic stability, and on the other,

the ability of countries to deploy counter-cyclical policies to fight recessions. Such trends tend to affect women disproportionately because recessions hit them harder, for two reasons. First, in the formal sector women tend to lose their jobs faster than men and usually have lower unemployment and social security benefits. Second, compared to men they assume greater responsibilities in cushioning their families from the negative effects of recession. They work harder at home, spend more time shopping for bargains, and provide more work as caregivers. (United Nations 1999, 46)

All these effects are made more severe by the fact that women do not typically have the same potential cushion provided by assets (such as land) that men often have (see, e.g., Deere and Leon 2003). The so-called Third World debt crisis, structural adjustment programs, and the various financial crises that have occurred in different regions have all been shown to be far from gender neutral (Aslanbeigui et al. 1994; Aslanbeigui and Summerfield 2000; Marchand and Runyan 2000). In every case, women (and children) have largely been unacknowledged but have nonetheless been relied on to be the providers of last resort. As such, they have been the safety net for the neoliberalizing global economy. And, even when there is not a situation designated as a crisis, women are among those who are caught in the pincers of neoliberalism in its business-as-usual mode.

Conclusions

The sorts of tracings of the gendering of the global economy that the foregoing discussion of neoliberalism points toward can be attempted for other more or less taken-for-granted aspects of the contemporary global economy. As I argued at the beginning of this chapter, such a critical, analytical, and feminist understanding of global processes is for the most part missing from political geography. Scholars in other fields such as international relations, international political economy, development studies, and even economics have contributed mightily to feminist analytics of the global, and I cited many of them in this chapter. It is true that there are wonderful analyses of the global economy that are critical and feminist and that are especially alert to the gendered political-geographic dynamics at work, and I also cited these here. However, there is so much scope for many more such contributions.

Diverse feminist scholarship joins with various feminist social activists in different places to chart and change the way neoliberalism is reworking interrelations between places and their inhabitants in deeply gendered ways. Indeed, feminists are among the growing number of people and groups across the globe who recognize the spatial and social asymmetries inherent in the global economy, including in the international financial markets, and are organizing around these issues. Third World debt is still a focus of much heterogeneous activism. The IMF and the World Bank have become targets of antiglobalization groups as well as more specifically targeted actions seeking the institutions'

reform or abolition. The linked issue of World Bank bonds has also been receiving attention as groups seek to raise awareness of this financial market and to encourage divestment movements. Even the often-ignored international tax system, with its growing injustices and inequalities, has begun to stir organizations. For example, in 1998 ATTAC (Action pour une Taxe Tobin d'aide aux Citoyens or, as it has been translated by English-speaking members, the Association for the Taxation of Financial Transactions for the Aid of Citizens) was formed in Paris. ATTAC was initially one of a number of groups seeking to push the Tobin Tax (see also War on Want). The Tobin Tax (proposed by Nobel laureate economist James Tobin) is a small (0.5 percent or 1 percent) tax on transactions in the foreign exchange market. This is the huge speculative market that I detailed earlier in this chapter. However, like other groups such as the Global Tax Justice Network, ATTAC now has a broad platform, adopted in 1998, that starts with the following statement:

Financial globalisation increases economic insecurity and social inequality. It bypasses and devalues people's choices, democratic institutions, and sovereign nations responsible for the common good. In their place it puts a logic that is purely speculative and only expresses the interests of multinational corporations and financial markets. (ATTAC 2003)

Characterizing the international tax regime as a "machine of inequality, between North and South as well as inside the developing countries themselves" (ATTAC 2003), ATTAC seeks to mobilize support for campaigns and actions designed to alter substantially the way the globalizing financial system works. In addition to promoting the idea of the Tobin Tax on currency speculation, ATTAC also campaigns against offshore financial centers, against the privatization of state pension funds, for the cancellation of Third World debt, and for the reform or abolition of the World Trade Organization. These are steps toward, in ATTAC's words, the "recapture [of] the democratic space that has been lost to the financial world" (ATTAC 2003).

Although ATTAC is not an explicitly feminist organization,³ it and other groups are increasingly making strong arguments for major reforms in the international financial arena, based on the goal of social justice. Such arguments and, increasingly, direct actions may seem far removed from feminist concerns with the gendered inequalities that are part and parcel of globalization. However, to echo an earlier call, "Finance is a feminist issue!"—as I hope this chapter has shown. Changes in the patterns of finance and the associated geographies through which they work are gendered and are promising avenues for feminist theorizing, analysis, and action—challenging the heart of globalizing neoliberalism. Neoliberalized finance is also a political issue and a geographical issue. I have not claimed in this chapter that finance is the most significant feminist issue arising from the contemporary neoliberal global economy, certainly, but it is an arena in which we may find the quotidian

global and the quotidian local in relation in ways that shape the asymmetries of social relations and, as such, is a potential arena of (feminist geographic) theory and politics.

Notes

1. It may seem odd that in the discussion of global-local so far, the state has been barely mentioned. States certainly are a (or *the*) focus of political geography, and states are key institutional sites that at once differentially structure the global and the local. Yet, with Youngs (2000a) we should refuse, in a more relational scalar epistemology (what she calls a new "spatial ontology," actually), to accept the state as the only, or even natural, space of politics. Nor should we accept it as unitary or as somehow apart from social struggles.
2. This phrase is borrowed from Peck and Tickell (2002).
3. There is a significant feminist component in many ATTAC groups. See, for example, ATTAC Austria's Web site for details of a group called feministAttac (ATTAC Austria 2003).

10

Territory, Territoriality, and Boundaries

DORIS WASTL-WALTER AND LYNN A. STAEBELI

The concepts of territory, territoriality, and boundaries have long been featured in political geography, highlighting as they do the geographical expression of social power (Sack 1986; Hassner 1997; Paasi 2003); in fact, Cox (2003) went so far as to argue that the study of territory and territoriality is the primary contribution that political geography makes to the discipline of geography. In this chapter we wish to begin our discussion of territory, territoriality, and boundaries with a brief reprise of the ways in which the concepts have been used in much of political geography. We argue that in many studies territory is operationalized as the area governed by the state, and boundaries delimit those areas. We argue further that studies of territoriality and of boundaries have often been centered on big issues of sovereignty and security in ways that seem to make gender irrelevant to the concepts. Following feminist arguments, however, we demonstrate the ways in which territory and boundaries are inextricably linked with ideas and practices associated with difference (see Nagar 2004 [this volume] and Martin 2004 [this volume]). As expressions of social power, territory and boundaries are ways of enforcing ideas about who and what belongs in particular places and the kinds of activities and practices that belong to a place or are seen as being appropriate (Cresswell 1996); as such, questions of identity and difference are critical to the ways in which territory and boundaries are constructed. Without denying the important role of the state in structuring and enforcing ideas about territory and boundaries, we also argue that the state is not the sole institution through which social power is given geographic expression (see Fincher 2004 [this volume] and Cope 2004 [this volume]). As such, we broaden the discussion of territory and boundaries to include other sites and scales in which territorial expressions of inclusion and exclusion are formed.

Territory, Territoriality, and Boundaries: How Are They Gendered?

As with many ideas in political geography, the concepts of territory, territoriality, and boundaries draw from a range of influences, not all of which are obviously political or gendered. For example, some ways of thinking about territory can be traced to human ecology, which emphasizes biological and genetic influences