

This is the submitted manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Politics, Groups, and Identities on 20 Oct 2017, available online: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2017.1385494>.

Access to this work was provided by the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (UMBC) ScholarWorks@UMBC digital repository on the Maryland Shared Open Access (MD-SOAR) platform.

Please provide feedback

Please support the ScholarWorks@UMBC repository by emailing scholarworks-group@umbc.edu and telling us what having access to this work means to you and why it's important to you. Thank you.

F. Tormos

Politics, Groups, and Identities

REVIEW ESSAY

Intersectional Solidarity

F. Tormos¹

Scholars Strategy Network, Cambridge, Massachusetts, United States

Intersectionality has gone global. The application and adoption of the concept cuts across disciplinary and territorial boundaries. How can intersectionality inform the work of social justice in the 21st century? This essay focuses on the practical implications of intersectionality for social movements. First, this essay reviews prominent definitions of intersectionality, identifies a series of tenets, and presents a brief history of the notion of intersectionality. Second, the essay reviews extant explanations of solidarity. This review ends with a proposal for enacting solidarity that is viable for articulating intersectionally-conscious forms of solidarity—intersectional solidarity—suitable for scholars of global politics.

Keywords: intersectionality, solidarity, oppression, social justice, social movements, feminism

¹ fernando@scholars.org

Introduction

Has intersectionality gone global? Intersectionality is now a global analytical framework for understanding issues of social justice and human rights (Davis 2008; Yuval-Davis 2006) and an organizing strategy within social movements (Chun, Lipsitz, and Shin 2013; Collins and Bilge 2016; Greenwood 2008; Hancock 2016; Laperrière and Lépinard 2016; Roberts and Jesudason 2013). The application and adoption of the concept transcends disciplinary, institutional, and territorial boundaries. Beginning with the writings of Maria Stewart in 1831, Savitribai Phule's intersectional advocacy in India, and Sojourner Truth's speech at the Ohio Women's Convention in 1851, the acknowledgement of the interacting, simultaneous effects of multiple axes of oppression is considered to be the most important theoretical contribution to women's and gender studies to date (Collins and Bilge 2016; Davis 2008; Hancock 2016; McCall 2005, 1771). The term's current popularity is the legacy of discursive and activist struggles by black and mestiza feminist scholars and activists that aimed to shed light over subjugated forms of knowledge production and silenced voices within advocacy efforts (Collins 1990; Combahee River Collective [1977] 1995; Crenshaw 1991; hooks 1981).

This essay focuses on the practical implications of intersectionality for transnational social movements and details the ways in which intersectionality informs global social justice work of in the 21st century. In this essay, I first identify a series of tenets of intersectionality and present a

brief history of intersectionality. Next, I review extant explanations of solidarity in the context of intersectionality. In the final section I propose an intersectionally-conscious political praxis suitable for movements engaged in transnational contentious politics.

Intersectionality

Broadly defined, intersectionality is the idea that disadvantage is conditioned by multiple interacting systems of oppression. Feminists of color developed the idea of intersectionality to disrupt the subjugation of their knowledge and to avoid the erasure of their voices (Alexander-Floyd 2012). Below, I review the major definitions and tenets of intersectionality and provide a brief historiography of intersectionality.

The term has multiple definitions and its definition is often contested (Alexander-Floyd 2012; Collins and Chepp 2013; Hankivsky 2012; Nash 2008). Patricia Hill Collins and Valerie Chepp (2013, 58) provide a working definition of intersectionality:

“[I]ntersectionality consists of an assemblage of ideas and practices that maintain that gender, race, class, sexuality, age, ethnicity, ability, and similar phenomena cannot be analytically understood in isolation from one another; instead, these constructs signal an intersecting constellation of power relationships that produce unequal material realities and distinctive social experiences for individuals and groups positioned within them.”¹

The notion of intersectionality encompasses various tenets, which reflect particular focal points of feminist debates around the understanding of oppression and identity.² First, intersectionality reveals and addresses policy silences and challenges experienced by marginalized groups, particularly among those whose marginalization is shaped by interacting forms of disadvantage (Cohen 1999; Crenshaw 1989; Hancock 2011; Strolovitch 2007). Second, intersectionality breaks with essentialist views of social groups by avoiding biological, static, and additive notions identity (Hancock 2007; Weldon 2006a) and proposes that the social structures that position people in multiple different groups (e.g., race, gender) interact to produce distinct lived experiences.³ Essentialism and intersectionality are at odds because, when essentialism is practiced in efforts of devising policies and political strategies, some voices are silenced in order to privilege others (Cohen 1999). Intersectional analyses of lived experiences are open to identifying suppressed or previously unrecognized forms of marginalization by approaching relationships between different identity categories as open research questions (Hancock 2011; Hankivsky 2012). Moreover, intersectionality rejects the practice of willful blindness—the political strategy of not recognizing the privilege of one categorical group membership (e.g., a dominant race) while stressing one categorical group membership associated to oppression (e.g., a dominant gender; Hancock 2011).

Shifting nomenclatures: A brief history of intersectionality

Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw coined the term intersectionality in 1989 to stress the importance of accounting for “multiple grounds of identity when considering how the social world is constructed” (Crenshaw 1989; 1991). Yet, the notion behind the term had already been articulated in Maria Stewart’s writings in the 1930s and Sojourner Truth’s 1851 speech at the Women’s Rights Convention in Akron, Ohio and enacted by Savitribai Phule’s advocacy in India (Brah and Phoenix 2004; Collins and Bilge 2016; Hancock 2016). Sojourner Truth’s speech foreshadowed campaigns by black feminists more than a century later, who referenced her challenge of black women’s double bind, which in her case entailed countering notions of women as weaker than men and that enslaved black women were not real women (Brah and Phoenix 2004).

The intellectual and political project of intersectionality grew significantly with the radical feminist indictment of second-wave feminism by black feminist scholars and activists, such as the Combahee River Collective ([1977] 1995), Audre Lorde (1984), and bell hooks (1981). The project of intersectionality consisted of black, Mestiza, post-colonial, queer, and Indigenous feminists pushing social movements and scholarship to recognize previously ignored subject positions and identities (Anzaldúa 1987; Bunjun 2010; Cohen 1997; Collins 1990; Hankivsky 2014; Valdes 1997; Van Herk, Smith, & Andrew 2011). These critiques of second-wave feminism challenged the tendency to explain the experiences of women of

color in an additive way (i.e., black women's oppression equals the lived experiences of black men *plus* problems of White women) (Hancock 2007; Weldon 2008).⁴

Intersectionally-positioned feminist scholars also pointed to the obstacles that women of color faced in ascending to leadership roles within activist-oriented organizations and particularly within civil rights and women's movements (Combahee River Collective [1977] 1995; Crenshaw 1991; Harris 1990; Moraga 2002; Rosser-Mims 2011). Feminist and anti-racist struggles tended to privilege the experience of men of color and White women over the voices of women of color. The tendency to assume an essentialist, unitary notion of women has suppressed issues that lie at the intersection of gender and race (Crenshaw 1991; Harris 1990). Both within civil rights and women's movements, feminist women of color have pushed advocacy groups to (a) recognize variability in the experiences of women and people of color and (b) adapt political strategies and policies to reflect this variability. Their efforts to recognize within-group difference have been heralded as the most important theoretical development of second wave feminism (Nicholson 1997).

The Combahee River Collective Statement documented a rich history of such efforts. Though the Statement decried the lack of inclusion of black lesbian feminists in the leadership of women's and civil rights movements, it did not call for separating from these movements. Instead, the Collective claimed for recognition, solidarity across differences, and inclusion within

progressive movements. Overcoming oppression in the many forms that black women experienced it, they argued, was only to be achieved through coalition-building efforts with progressive organizations and movements (Combahee River Collective [1977] 1995). The Statement affirms that they “...do not advocate the fractionalization that white women who are separatists demand...[W]e reject the stance of lesbian separatism because it is not a viable political analysis or strategy. It leaves [out] too much and far too many people, particularly black men, women, and children.” Combahee River Collective organizers Beverly and Barbara Smith ([1981] 2002, 138-139) reiterated this stance in their contribution to Cherríe Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa’s *This Bridge Called My Back*: “A solution to tokenism is not racial separatism...[T]he strongest politics are coalition politics that cover a broad range of issues. There is no way that one oppressed group is going to topple a system by itself. Forming principled coalitions around specific issues is very important.”

The Globalization of Intersectionality

Intersectionality is not a static product of feminist debates and activism. Consequently, the term carries a contested theoretical and methodological baggage that shows both promises and limitations for understanding global phenomena. In recent times, intersectionality has been explicitly deployed to analyze global phenomena and agency (Blackwell and Naber 2002; Chan-Tiberghien 2004; Collins and Bilge 2016; Perry 2016;

Townsend-Bell 2011), prompting the observation that intersectionality has gone global.⁵

A key moment for the globalization of intersectionality was the United Nations World Conference against Racism in Durban, in which intersectionality scholars and activists continued a tradition of transgressing the institutional confines of higher education and reaffirmed intersectionality's relevance as a project for social transformation (Grzanka 2014; cited in Collins and Bilge 2016). In her position paper at the Durban conference, Crenshaw (2000) affirmed that intersectionality had expanded to a human rights framework within a transnational context (Collins and Bilge 2016). Yet, intellectual histories of intersectionality recognize that intersectionality was always global (Collins and Bilge 2016; Hancock 2016).⁶ Activists and intellectuals in the Global South used intersectionality without naming it as such and articulated a systemic critique of global capitalism that called for solidarity with anti-colonialist and anti-imperialist resistance to oppression (Aguilar 2012; Collins and Bilge 2016).

This discussion of intersectionality has important implications for political projects of building inclusive movements for social justice. Social movement scholars have emphasized the importance of shared identities for movements (Taylor and Whittier 1992), but intersectional scholarship problematizes these same identities. How can feminist, anti-racist, and other movements build solidarity without erasing the voices and perspectives intersectional research uncovers? The sections below review prominent

explanations of solidarity and discuss how intersectionality problematizes existing accounts of how social movement identities emerge and strengthen collective action.

Solidarity

Scholars define solidarity in multiple, and at times contradictory, ways. While some explain solidarity as a result of shared identities (Taylor and Whittier 1992), others point to the presence of shared interests (Anner 2011; Keck and Sikkink 1998) or shifting opportunity structures (Bair and Palpacuer 2012; Bieler and Ingemar 2011; Kay 2011; Williams 2010) as the drivers of solidarity (Weldon 2006b). Yet, multiple studies on solidarity in women's, queer, global justice, and labor movements identify an approach to solidarity that is more congruent with an intersectional social movement organizing approach (Caraway 1991; Cohen 1997; Cole 2008; Fantasia 1988; Greenwood 2008; Marx Ferree and Ewig 2013; Smith 2008; Waterman 2001; Weldon 2006b). Below I review prominent explanations of solidarity (i.e., shared identities, shared interests, political opportunity structures) and propose an intersectional approach to solidarity.

Shared Identities

One explanation for solidarity is that shared identities are the basis of solidarity and political mobilization (Taylor and Whittier 1992). On this view, solidarity emerges in contexts in which social movement participants share identities. Yet, feminists, democratic theorists, queer theorists, social policy,

and social movement scholars have criticized this explanation of solidarity. Social groups and their members' identities are not homogeneous, but rather, people identify in relation to multiple intersections of gender, class, race, sexuality, region, and nationality (Butler 1990; Epstein and Straub 1995; Rupp and Taylor 1999; Weldon 2006a). Diversity does not necessarily corrode solidarity, as social movements and policies can be structured in ways that enable groups to cope with their differences (Kymlicka and Banting 2006; Weldon 2006b). Moreover, a notion of shared identities as a basis of solidarity tends to privilege the voice and preferences of dominant groups within movements. Failing to account for social group differences has been detrimental to the sustainability and success of social movements that attempt to mobilize across group differences. Queer movements, which recognize and encourage the fluidity of sexual expression and explicitly seek to destabilize collective identities, are examples of agency and solidarity that has not developed on the basis of shared identity (Cohen 1997).

A perspective constructed in relation to social structures is a better way of understanding the process by which movement participants deliberate, constitute a group or "series," and build solidarity (Weldon 2011; Young 1997, 2000). Such structures provide a basis for social connection that cuts across group differences yet positions group members differently in relation to the intersections of their identities and lived experiences. Political mobilization is often guided by a reflective consciousness or reflexivity in practice (Frundt 2005; Rai n.d.), which construct identities in the process of

political mobilization and deliberation (Collins and Bilge 2016; Weldon 2006a). These constructed identities, however, are not claimed to be in existence prior to a process of political mobilization (Weldon 2006b). For the explanation of shared identities to account for the movement's success, movement participants must share identities prior to the movement's major policy achievement.

Shared interests

Scholarship on international solidarity has argued that bonds of solidarity emerge as a rational expression of shared interests (Waterman 2001; Wilde 2007). Social movement scholars add that, much like corporations, the interests of international unions can make a difference in how solidarity develops (Dreiling and Robinson 1998; Frundt 2005). Critics of this explanation point to the disparate material interests that underlie transnational political mobilization, among other modalities of coordinated social movement agency that cut across social group differences and mobilize groups from disparate material backgrounds. The transnational anti-sweatshop, environmental, LGBTQ, and human rights movements provide examples of movements that have sustained mobilization while building solidarity across multiple social group interests and identities.

Political Opportunity Structures

Political opportunity structure theorists do not assume shared identities or material interests, instead arguing that shifts in the structural context in which movements operate provide a basis for solidarity and political

mobilization (Tarrow 1994). This prominent approach to understanding collective action, however, lacks a common definition of which structures are the most influential in shaping a movement's ability to coordinate action and promote policy change. Whereas some argue that regional trade agreements (e.g., NAFTA) contextualized the solidary actions between groups across national boundaries and social group differences (Kay 2011), others credit international trade systems emerging after WWII.

An Intersectional Approach to Solidarity

Scholars have discussed the implications of intersectionality for different forms of collective action under distinct titles: political intersectionality (Cho, Crenshaw, and McCall 2013), intersectional conceptual approach to coalition-building (Collins and Chepp 2013), intersectional praxis (Townsend-Bell 2011), intersectional solidarity (Hancock 2011), and deep political solidarity (Hancock 2011). This notion is not novel within various social movements. In fact, the term itself is informed by a history of feminist activist experiences (Combahee River Collective [1977] 1995; Davis 2008).

This essay proposes an intersectional approach to solidarity, which consists of an ongoing process of creating ties and coalitions across social group differences by negotiating power asymmetries. An intersectionally-conscious political praxis requires recognizing and representing intersectionally-marginalized social groups formed by multiple interactions

and linkages between different social structures and lived experiences. Moreover, an intersectional approach to solidarity may improve a movements' ability to sustain solidarity across group differences and their transformative potential (Weldon 2006b). Intersectional forms of solidarity adopt a strategy of affirmative advocacy (Strolovitch 2007), which entails redirecting the political agenda of social movement organizations, interest groups, and advocacy groups to the issues that affect intersectionally marginalized groups. Enacting affirmative advocacy requires that organizations allocate resources to issues that affect intersectionally marginalized social groups (Strolovitch 2007).⁷

Invoking intersectional approaches and understandings in the context of social movements is a useful heuristic for activists and advocates of disadvantaged groups that underscores the detrimental effects of essentialists notions of social groups and the consequent silencing of disadvantaged voices within movements and advocacy groups (Collins and Bilge 2016; Crenshaw 1991; Strolovitch 2007; Weldon 2006). The idea of intersectional solidarity suggests that activists may act with an intersectional consciousness—a recognition of oppression as constituted by multiple and interacting social structures. Intersectionally-conscious social movements may reassess their structures, internal norms, and practices in light of the recognition of social group differences (for example, see Greenwood 2008). A collective that recognizes the intersectional contour of oppression may reassess its practices in various forms: by organizing an inclusive decision-

making structure and leadership, supporting the autonomous organization of distinct social groups within the movement, and advocating for social policies that address multiple forms of oppression (Laperrière and Lépinard 2016; Roberts and Jesudason 2013; Weldon 2006b).

Intersectionality scholars have produced important insights for social movements and activists in their discussions of 'political intersectionality.' Cho et al. (2013, 800) define the term as "a dual concern for resisting the systemic forces that significantly shape the differential life chances of intersectionality's subjects and for reshaping modes of resistance beyond allegedly universal, single-axis approaches." Furthermore, the authors see political intersectionality as an application of the insights of intersectionality, which offer a framework for contesting power and thereby linking theory to existent and emergent social and political struggles. Such a framework reflects a synthesis between theory and practice and open up possibilities for the development of both theoretical and practical knowledge. Cho et al. (786) recognize that throughout the history of the term, praxis "has been a key site of intersectional critique and intervention." Their definition of praxis is wide, so as to include multiple forms of agency, including: movements to demand greater economic justice for low-income women of color (e.g., Carastathis 2013; Chun et al. 2013); legal and policy advocacy that seeks to remedy gender and racial discrimination (e.g., Carbado 2013; Verloo 2013); and state-targeted movements to abolish prisons, immigration restrictions, and military interventions that are nominally neutral with respect to

race/ethnicity, gender, class, sexuality, and nationality but are in fact disproportionately harmful to communities of color, women, and non-heteronormative groups (Spade 2013).

In their analysis of the activist work of the organization Asian Immigrant Women Advocates (AIWA), Chun et al. (2013) consider the implications of intersectionality for social movements and activism. The authors stress the importance of negotiating differences when forging coalitions within and across identity groups. Intersectionality, they argue, can be used strategically as an analytic tool “to take inventory of differences, to identify potential contradictions and conflicts, and to recognize split and conflicting identities not as obstacles to solidarity but as valuable evidence about problems unsolved and as new coalitions that need to be formed” (923). Chun et al. recognize the importance of creating collective or group identities for achieving mobilization, yet, they warn against minimizing differences within the group. Intersectionality may acknowledge both the plurality and diversity of identities that comprise any group and the common concerns that create aggregate identities (Chun et al. 2013).

Under the title of “intersectional activism,” Doetsch-Kidder (2012) examined activism that addresses more than one structure of oppression or form of discrimination (racism, classism, sexism, heterosexism, transphobia, ableism, nationalism, etc.). Doetsch-Kidder rejected the notion that engaging in solidarity across group differences is a mere strategic decision. Doetsch-Kidder (2012) echoed Sandoval (2000) to affirm that intersectional activism

is a reflection of love. The notion of fighting oppression out of love for the other is not foreign to radical activism. Research on intersectional activism demonstrates how activists conceptualize their own agency as emerging out of love, spirituality, and an intersectional consciousness (Doetsch-Kidder 2012; Greenwood). In a similar vein, Barvosa (2008) contends that a subject's location at the intersection of multiple disadvantaged social groups may lead them to think critically and develop ways of bridging divides within activist collectives.

Conclusion

Intersectionality has provided scholars and activists with analytical and practical tools for understanding subject positions in national and transnational contexts and identifying assemblages of lived experiences besides gender and race that conspire to oppress a group (Collins and Chepp 2013; McCall 2005; Purkayastha 2010; Weldon 2008). Collins and Chepp (2013, 72) argued that "detaching intersectionality from studies of gender might lead to other productive sites of inquiry of intersecting systems of power."

Yet, despite the politically transformative and intellectually promising trajectory and potential of intersectionality, intersectionality faces multiple challenges. These include gaps in the literature and persistent silences in social movement organizational agendas. Intersectionality also faces challenges due to limited interpretations or inadequate deployments of the

term (Alexander-Floyd 2012). Below, I discuss these challenges and encourage harnessing the intellectual and political promise of intersectionality, or what Patricia Hill Collins refers to as “sharpening intersectionality’s critical edge.”

Recent reviews of intersectionality have identified a series of gaps in the literature and have argued that intersectionality research has given more attention to gender, race, and class than to other types of experiences emerging from intersecting frameworks of religion, spirituality, culture, geography, place, and age (Doetsch-Kidder 2012; Hankivsky 2012). Others have called for more attention to the experience of women in the global South, domestic and global divides among women, and marginalized immigrant populations within developed nations, what some have called the ‘inner Global South’ (Crenshaw 1991; Paxton, Kunovich, and Hughes 2007, 276; Tripp 2000; Weldon 2006b). Yet, recent work has begun to fill these gaps. For instance, Wadsworth’s (2011) work on religion as a basis of mobilization, identity construction, and its role in justifying and reifying racial stratification and heteronormativity is an important corrective to the lack of attention to the interaction between religion and other aspects of identity. Scholars have also addressed the gap that existed in the study of intersectionality and agency, resiliency, and resistance to domination (Cole 2008; Hankivsky et al. 2010; Kurtz 2002; Laperrière and Lépinard 2016; Spade 2013; Strolovitch 2007; Verloo 2013) and around questions of privilege, including whiteness and middle-classness (Hankivsky 2012;

Purkayastha 2010).

Others have seen the concept of intersectionality as fundamentally flawed (e.g., Dhamoon 2011; Puar 2007) and have argued that “[w]e are not simply oppressed but produced through ... discourses, a production that is historically complex, contingent, and occurs through formations that do not honor analytically distinct identity categories” (Brown 1997, 86-87). Puar (2007) encourages embracing the continued mobility of subject positions that result in the continuous demands for the fine tunings of intersectionality. Yet, it is precisely this fluidity of identity and subject formation that Cohen (1997) sees as transformative and not precluding of transverse solidarity and the formation of anti-oppressive coalitions.

Such fluidity and continued motion of subject formations may lead to contradictory practical applications of intersectionality in the policymaking process. On the one hand, some have argued that it is precisely the vagueness and open-endedness of intersectionality that is responsible for its success (Davis 2008). Drawing on the insight of Murray S. Davis (1971; 1986), who argued that successful theories benefit from a degree of ambiguity and incompleteness, Davis (2008, 70) contends that intersectionality’s success is due to “its focus on a pervasive and fundamental concern in feminist theory, its provision of novelty, its appeal to the generalists as well as the specialists of the discipline, and its inherent ambiguity and open-endedness that beg for further critique and elaboration.” Davis (2008) finds that the term encourages complexity, stimulates creativity, and avoids premature closure,

tantalizing feminist scholars to raise new questions and explore uncharted territory.

Conversely, some find ambiguity to be problematic, especially for how it may challenge efforts to mainstream the term and because it may affect its policy influence. Townsend-Bell (2014) reviews intersectionality's footprint in state policies and, while she recognizes the opportunities that a state's attention to intersectionality opens, she also encourages discussions in the public sphere that specify the meaning of intersectionality in each particular and historic context. In encouraging these discussions, Townsend-Bell (2014, 142) finds that "discussion over what groups constitute the most marginalized members of society and how state and nonstate actors ought to engage with and prioritize the needs of society is minimal." While many intersectionality, and feminist scholars more generally, have called for attention to the historical and contextual nuances that shape lived experiences of marginalized groups (Brown 1997; Cohen 1997; Collins and Chepp 2013; Puar 2007), perhaps it would be best to avoid a discussion over which groups constitute the most marginalized members of society, so as to avoid what Hancock (2011) and others have referred to as the Oppression Olympics. Such a discussion could be divisive for sectors that could otherwise recognize differences and reconstruct collective political claims accordingly. Smith and Smith (2002), for example, recall that black feminism has opted to avoid ranking and isolating forms of oppression in favor of targeting systems impinging on marginalized groups.

Many would like to see intersectionality as a work in progress and still hold to the promise of the concept (Hancock 2007, Weldon 2006a). However, others highlighted the promise of intersectionality research for social inquiry but argue that key questions remain unanswered. The continued practical relevance of intersectionality research will depend on the theoretical and methodological coherence employed in studies informed by intersectionality in years to come (Choo and Ferree 2010).

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Tiffany Willoughby-Herard, S. Laurel Weldon, and two anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and feedback.

References

- Aguilar, Delia. 2012. "From Triple Jeopardy to Intersectionality: The Feminist Perplex." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 32: 415-428.
- Alexander-Floyd, Nikol G. 2012. "Disappearing Acts: Reclaiming Intersectionality in the Social Sciences in a Post-Black Feminist Era." *Feminist Formations* 24 (1): 1-25.
- Anner, Mark. 2011. *Solidarity Transformed: Labor Responses to Globalization and Crisis in Latin America*. Ithaca: ILR Press, an imprint of Cornell University Press.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria. 1987. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.
- Bair, Jennifer and Florence Palpacuer. 2012. "From Varieties of Capitalism to Varieties of Activism: The Antisweatshop Movement in Comparative Perspective." *Social Problems* 59 (4): 522-543.
- Barvosa, Edwina. 2008. *Wealth of Selves: Multiple Identities, Mestiza Consciousness, and the Subject of Politics*. Texas: Texas A&M University Press.
- Bieler, Andreas and Lindberg, Ingemar. 2011. *Global Restructuring, Labour and the Challenges for Transnational Solidarity*.
- Blackwell, Maylei and Nadine Naber. 2002. "Intersectionality in an Era of Globalization: The Implications of the UN World Conference against Racism for Transnational Feminist Practices—A Conference Report." *Meridians: feminism, race, transnationalism* 2 (2): 237-48.

- Brah, A. and A. Phoenix (2004) 'Ain't I a Woman? Revisiting Intersectionality', *Journal of International Women's Studies* 5(3): 75–86.
- Brown, Wendy. 1997. The impossibility of women's studies. *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 9 (3): 79-101.
- Bunjun, B. 2010. "Feminist organizations and intersectionality: Contesting hegemonic feminism." *Atlantis* 34 (2): 115-126.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Carastathis, Anna. 2013. "Identity Categories as Potential Coalitions." *Signs* 38 (4): 941–65.
- Caraway, Nancie. 1991. *Segregated Sisterhood: Racism and the Politics of American Feminism*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press.
- Carbado, Devon W. 2013. "Colorblind Intersectionality." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38 (4): 811-845.
- Chan-Tiberghien, Jennifer. 2004. "Gender-Skepticism or Gender Boom: Poststructural Feminisms, Transnational Feminisms, and the World Conference Against Racism." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 6 (3): 454-484.
- Choo, Hae Yeon and Myra Marx Ferree. 2010. "Practicing Intersectionality in Sociological Research: A Critical Analysis of Inclusions, Interactions and Institutions in the Study of Inequalities." *Sociological Theory* 28 (2): 129-149.
- Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, and Leslie McCall. 2013. "Toward a Field of Intersectionality Studies: Theory, Applications, and Praxis." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38 (4): 785-810.
- Chun, Jennifer Jihye, George Lipsitz, and Young Shin. 2013. "Intersectionality as a Social Movement Strategy: Asian Immigrant Women Advocates." *Signs* 38 (4): 917–40.
- Cohen, Cathy J. 1997. "Punks, Bulldaggers, and Welfare Queens: The Radical Potential of Queer Politics? *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 3: 437-465.
- Cohen, Cathy J. 1999. *The Boundaries of Blackness: AIDS and the Breakdown of Black Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Cole, Elizabeth R. 2008. "Coalitions as a Model for Intersectionality: From Practice to Theory." *Sex Roles* 59: 443–453.
- Collins, Patricia H. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- Collins, Patricia H. and Sirma Bilge. 2016. *Intersectionality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Collins, Patricia H. and Valerie Chepp. 2013. "Intersectionality" in the *Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics*, eds. Georgina Waylen, Karen Celis, Johanna Kantola, and S. Laurel Weldon. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Combahee River Collective. [1977] 1995. "A Black Feminist Statement." In *Words of Fire: An Anthology of African American Feminist Thought*, ed. Beverly Guy-Sheftall: 232–40. New York: New Press.

- Crenshaw, Kimberlé W. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum*: 138–67.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé W. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics and Violence Against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review* 43: 1241–99.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé W. 2000. *Background Paper for the Expert Meeting on Gender-Related Aspects of Race Discriminations*. Zagreb: WCAR (World Conference on Racism) Documents, 21-24 November.
- Davis, Murray S. 1971) "That's Interesting! Towards a Phenomenology of Sociology and a Sociology of Phenomenology." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 1: 309–44.
- Davis, Murray S. 1986 "'That's Classic!' The Phenomenology and Rhetoric of Successful Social Theories." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 16: 285–301.
- Davis, Kathy. 2008. "Intersectionality as buzzword: A sociology of science perspective on what makes a feminist theory successful." *Feminist Theory* 9(1): 67–85.
- Dhamoon, Rita Kaur. 2011. "Considerations on Mainstreaming Intersectionality." *Political Research Quarterly* 64(1): 230–243.
- Doetsch-Kidder, Sharon. 2012. *Social Change and Intersectional Activism: The Spirit of Social Movement*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dreiling, Michael and Ian Robinson. 1998. "Union Responses to NAFTA in the USA and Canada: Explaining Intra- and International Variations." *Mobilization* 3 (October): 163–84.
- Drysdale Walsh, Shannon and Christina Xydias 2014. "Women's organizing and intersectional policy-making in comparative perspective: evidence from Guatemala and Germany." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 2 (4): 549–572.
- Epstein, Julia, and Kristina Straub, eds. 1995. *Body guards: The cultural politics of gender ambiguity*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Fantasia, Rick. 1988. *Cultures of solidarity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Frundt, Henry, J. 2005. "Movement Theory and International Labor Solidarity." *Labor Studies Journal* 30 (2): 19-40.
- Frye, Marilyn. 1983. *The Politics of Reality*. New York: The Crossing Press.
- Greenwood, Ronnie M. 2008. Intersectional political consciousness: Appreciation for intragroup differences and solidarity in diverse groups. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 32:36-47.
- Grzanka, Patrick R. 2014. *Intersectionality: A Foundations and Frontiers Reader*. Philadelphia: Westview Press.
- Harris, Angela. 1990. "Race and Essentialism in Feminist Legal Theory." *Stanford Law Review* 42 (February): 581–616.

- Hancock, Ange-Marie 2007. "When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition: Examining Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm." *Perspectives on Politics* 5 (1): 63-79.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2011. *Solidarity Politics for Millennials: A Guide to Ending the Oppression Olympics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hancock, Ange-Marie. 2016. *Intersectionality: An Intellectual History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hankivsky, Olena, Reid, C., Cormier, R., Varcoe, C., Clark, N., Benoit, C. 2010. Exploring the promises of intersectionality for advancing women's health research. *International Journal for Equity in Health* 9(5): 1-15.
- Hankivsky, Olena. 2012. "Women's health, men's health, and gender and health: Implications of intersectionality." *Social Science & Medicine* 74: 1712-1720.
- Hankivsky, Olena. 2014. "Intersectionality 101." The Institute for Intersectionality Research & Policy, SFU.
- hooks, bell. 1981. *Ain't I a Woman: Black Women and Feminism*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Kay, Tamara. 2011. *NAFTA and the Politics of Labor Transnationalism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Keck, Margaret E. and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kurtz, Sharon. 2002. *Workplace Justice: Organizing Multi-Identity Movements*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press.
- Kymlicka, Will and Keith Banting. 2006. "Immigration, Multiculturalism, and the Welfare State." *Ethics and International Affairs* 20 (3) 281-304.
- Laperrière, Marie and Eléonore Lépinard. 2016. "Intersectionality as a tool for social movements: Strategies of inclusion and representation in the Québécois women's movement." *Politics* 36 (4): 374-382.
- Lorde, Audre. 1984. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. California: Crossing Press.
- McCall, Leslie. 2005. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs: A Journal of Women and Culture in Society* 30 (3): 1771-1800.
- Ewig, Christina, and Myra Marx Ferree. 2013. "Feminist Organizing: What's Old, What's New? History, Trends, and Issues." Pp. 437-461 in Georgina Waylan, Karen Celis, Johanna Kantola, and Laurel Weldon (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Gender and Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Moraga, Cherríe L. 2002. "From Inside the First World." Pp. xv-xliii in *This Bridge Called My Back* eds, Cherríe L. Moraga and Gloria E. Anzaldúa. Berkeley: Third Woman Press Women of Color Series.
- Nash, Jennifer C. 2008. "Re-thinking Intersectionality." *Feminist Review* 89: 1-15.
- Nicholson, Linda. 1997. "Introduction." 1-6 in *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory* ed. Linda Nicholson. New York: Routledge.

- Paxton, Pamela, Sheri Kunovich, and Melanie M. Hughes. 2007. "Gender in Politics." *Annual Review of Sociology* 33: 263-284.
- Perry, Keisha-Khan Y. 2016. "Geographies of Power: Black Women Mobilizing Intersectionality in Brazil." *Meridians: feminism, race, transnationalism* 14 (1): 94-120.
- Purkayastha, Bandana. 2010. "Interrogating intersectionality: Contemporary globalization and racialized gendering in the lives of highly educated South Asian Americans and their children." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 31: 29-47.
- Rai, Shirin. M. N.d. "The Good Life and the Bad : Dialectics of Solidarity." *Social Politics* forthcoming.
- Roberts, Dorothy and Sujatha Jesudason. 2013. "Movement Intersectionality: The Case of Race, Gender, Disability, and Genetic Technologies." *Du Bois Review* 10 (2): 313-328.
- Rosser-Mims, D. 2011. *How and Why Black Women Are Elected to Political Office*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Rupp, Leila J. and Verta Taylor. 1999. "Forging Feminist Identity in an International Movement: A Collective Identity Approach to Twentieth-Century Feminism." *Signs* (24) 2: 363-386.
- Sandoval, Chela. 2000. *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Spade, Dean. 2013. "Intersectional Resistance and Law Reform." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38 (4): 1031-055.
- Smith, Jackie. 2008. *Social Movements for Global Democracy*. Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, Barbara and Beverly Smith [1981] 2002. "Across the Kitchen Table: A Sister-to-Sister Dialogue." In *This Bridge Called My Back* eds, Cherríe L. Moraga and Gloria E. Anzaldúa. Berkeley: Third Woman Press Women of Color Series.
- Strolovitch, Dara. 2007. *Affirmative Advocacy: Race, Class, and Gender in Interest Group Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tarrow, Sidney. 1994. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, Verta, and Nancy E. Whittier. 1992. "Collective Identity in Social Movement Communities: Lesbian Feminist Mobilization." Pp. 104-129 in *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. Eds, Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClurg Mueller. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Townsend-Bell, Erica. 2011. "What Is Relevance? Defining Intersectional Praxis in Uruguay." *Political Research Quarterly* 64 (1): 187-199.
- Townsend-Bell, Erica. 2014. "Ambivalent Intersectionality." *Politics and Gender* 10 (1): 137-142.
- Tripp, Aili Mari. "Rethinking 'Difference': Comparative Perspectives from Africa." *Signs: A Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 25 (3): 649-675.

- Valdes, Francisco. 1997. "Foreword: Poised at the Cusp: LatCrit Theory Outsider Jurisprudence and Latina/o Self-Empowerment." *Harvard Latino L. Rev.* 2 (1): 56-59.
- Van Herk, Kimberley A., Dawn Smith, and Caroline Andrew. 2011 "Examining our privileges and oppressions: incorporating an intersectionality paradigm into nursing." *Nursing Inquiry* 18 (1): 29-39.
- Verloo, Mieke. 2013. "Intersectional and Cross-Movement Politics and Policies: Reflections on Current Practices and Debates." *Signs: A Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38 (4): 893-915.
- Wadsworth, Nancy D. 2011. "Intersectionality in California's Same-Sex Marriage Battles: A Complex Proposition." *Political Research Quarterly* 64 (1): 200-216.
- Waterman, P. 2001. *Globalization, Social Movements and the New Internationalisms*. London: Continuum.
- Weldon, Sirje L. 2006a. "The Structure of Intersectionality: A Comparative Politics of Gender." *Politics and Gender* 2 (2): 235-248.
- Weldon, Sirje L. 2006b. "Inclusion, Solidarity and Social Movements: The Global Movement on Gender Violence" *Perspectives on Politics* 4 (1) (March): 55-74.
- Weldon, Sirje L. 2008. "Intersectionality." Pp. 193-218 in *Politics, Gender, and Concepts: Theory and Methodology*. Eds. Gary Goertz and Amy Mazur. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weldon, Sirje L. 2011. *When Protest Makes Policy: How Social Movements Represent Disadvantaged Groups*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Wilde, Lawrence. 2007. "The Concept of Solidarity: Emerging from the Theoretical Shadows?" *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9: 171-181.
- Williams, Matthew S. 2010. "Strategizing Against Sweatshops: The Anti-Sweatshop Movement and the Global Economy." PhD Dissertation. Boston College.
- Young, Iris M. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2006. "Intersectionality and Feminist Politics." *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13 (3): 193-209.

¹ Leslie McCall (2005, 1771) provides a broader albeit contested definition of intersectionality as "the relationships among multiple dimensions and modalities of social relations and subject formations." See Alexander-Floyd (2012) for a critique of McCall's (2005) broad conceptualization of intersectionality.

² Olena Hankivsky (2012, 1713) delineates a series of tenets for understanding intersectionality: "[H]uman lives cannot be reduced to single characteristics; human experiences cannot be accurately understood by prioritizing any one single factor or constellation of factors; social categories such as race/ethnicity, gender, class, sexuality, and ability are socially constructed, fluid, and flexible; and social locations are inseparable and

shaped by the interacting and mutually constituting social processes and structures that are influenced by both time and place.”

³ Essentialist notions of social groups assume that there is a unitary, “essential” women’s experience that can be isolated and described independently of race, class, sexual orientation, and other realities of experience (Harris 1990, 585). Social groups are collectives of persons differentiated from at least one other group by cultural forms, practices, or lived experiences (Young 2011, 43). On this view, people have multiple social group memberships and one social group membership does not define personal identity (Young 2000, 99). Individuals may have affinities with more than one social group because of the intersecting social group experiences of persons, social groups do not have unified identities (Crenshaw 1991; Young 2000). Individual identity is unique and actively constituted by social relations. Individuals are agents that constitute their own identity and are conditioned by their position in structured social relations (Young 2000, 101). The positioning of individuals occurs through processes of social interaction in which individuals identify themselves in relation to others and enforce norms and expectations in relation to one another (Young 2000, 100).

⁴ A noteworthy effort to account for the interaction of multiple social structures in the production of oppression had also been presented by Marilyn Frye’s (1983) notion of oppression as a birdcage.

⁵ The journal *Intersectionalities: A Global Journal of Social Work Analysis, Research, Polity, and Practice* seeks to share knowledge and facilitate collaborative discourse amongst social work theorists, activists, educators, practitioners and the communities they serve within local, regional, and global contexts.

⁶ Collins and Bilge (2016, 3) state “intersectionality as an analytic tool is neither confined to nations of North American and Europe nor is it a new phenomenon. People in the Global South have used intersectionality as an analytic tool, often without naming it as such.” Moreover, the authors cite 19th century Indian feminist Savitribai Phule’s anti-caste, worker, and women’s rights advocacy as an example of early intersectional political activism.

⁷ Dara Strolovitch (2007, 11) proposes the following series of practices that movements can adopt to accomplish this redistribution of attention and resources: “[C]reating decision rules that elevate issues affecting disadvantaged minorities on organizational agendas; using internal processes and practices to improve the status of intersectionally disadvantaged groups within the organization; forging stronger ties to state and local advocacy groups; promoting “descriptive representation” by making sure that staff and boards include members of intersectionally marginalized subgroups of their constituencies; resisting the silencing effects of public and constituent opinion that are biased against disadvantaged subgroups; and cultivating among advantaged subgroups of their constituencies the understanding that their interests are inextricably linked to the well-being of intersectionally disadvantaged constituents.”