

Oxford Handbooks Online

Coloniality of Gender and Power: From Postcoloniality to Decoloniality

Breny Mendoza

The Oxford Handbook of Feminist Theory

Edited by Lisa Disch and Mary Hawkesworth

Print Publication Date: Feb 2016

Subject: Political Science, Comparative Politics, Political Theory

Online Publication Date: Apr 2015 DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199328581.013.6

Abstract and Keywords

Anticolonial theories analyze complex power relations between the colonizer and the colonized to promote the political project of decolonization. This chapter situates anticolonial feminist theories in relation to two schools of anticolonial thinking, postcolonial and decolonial theory, particularly the strand of decolonial theory developed by the modernity/coloniality school of thought of Latin America. It compares key theoretical arguments and political projects associated with intersectionality, postcolonial feminism, and the decolonial feminism that Maria Lugones has advanced with her notion of the coloniality of gender. The chapter explores the reception of Lugones work in Latin America and the critical insights that decolonial theory offers contemporary social justice projects.

Keywords: intersectionality, postcolonial feminism, decolonial option, decolonial feminism, coloniality of power, coloniality of gender

Introduction

ANTICOLONIAL feminism is a theoretical and a political project that challenges imperialist and colonizing practices, past and present. This chapter provides a genealogy of anticolonial feminist theory, tracing its emergence from rich traditions of anticolonial, postcolonial and decolonial theories, situating it in relation to other women of color feminisms, and examining its distinctive critiques of colonialism, modernity, Eurocentrism, capitalism, nationalism, and racism. Examining key themes in the works of Maria Lugones, Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, and Rita Segato, the chapter concludes with a

discussion of their alternative account of modernity as a violent process intricately tied to the construction and imposition of race and gender hierarchies.

Antecedents

The Anglo academic world has traditionally associated anticolonial struggles with national liberation movements designed to achieve “independence,” and social justice movements that arise in the context of nation-building after the colonial power has been overthrown. Anticolonial theories are associated with such figures as US-born, Pan African thinker and civil rights activist W. E. B. DuBois, renowned critics of French colonialism Aimée Césaire (2000) and Frantz Fanon, and Ghanaian national independence leader Kwame Nkrumah. In 1978, however, Palestinian-American literary theorist Edward Said published his magisterial work, *Orientalism*, expanding the historical (p. 101) frame, the cartography, and the intellectual purchase of colonialism and moving the field from anticolonial to postcolonial theory. In the 1990s, the South Asian Subaltern Studies Group introduced a new generation of postcolonial theorists, including Ranajit Guha, Homi Bhabha, Partha Chatterjee, and Dipesh Chakravorty, and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak.

By contrast to those who focus on the colonial practices of nations in northern Europe, Latin American and Caribbean scholars have emphasized that anticolonial thought originated in the context of a much earlier colonial period, as a reaction against the violent history of Western colonialism inaugurated in 1492. The sixteenth-century Quechua author Felipe Guamán Poma de Ayala, and the Peruvian mestizo Inca Garcilazo de la Vega wrote the first critiques of Spanish colonialism from the perspective of the colonized. The contemporary decolonial turn in the academic world has been led by Latin American and Caribbean scholars initially associated with the Modernity/Coloniality Group, who constructed an archive of texts from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries that offer a radical reinterpretation of the relation between capitalism and race. Rather than argue that colonialism was irrelevant to the development of capitalism, the works of José Carlos Mariátegui (2009), for example, a nonorthodox Marxist from Peru, argued as early as the 1920s that race was central to capitalism and that capitalist accumulation could not be understood without attention to the production of racial hierarchies. In its prime, the modernity/coloniality school of thought argued also that modernity and capitalism were not the result of internal or intra-European historical processes but instead were historical outcomes of colonialism. Decolonial theorists included the Peruvian sociologist Anibal Quijano, who theorized the central decolonial concept, the coloniality of power, as well as Argentinians Enrique Dussel, well known for his philosophy of liberation, and Walter Dignolo, a semiotician who became famous for his book *The Darker Side of the Renaissance* (1995); and Puerto Rican philosopher Nelson Maldonado-Torres, who developed the concept of the coloniality of being.

Emergence and Submergence

Anticolonial feminist theory emerges in this rich intellectual context, yet exists on the margins of these critiques of colonialism and on the margins of feminist theory. The brilliant work of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, for example, is emblematic of complex marginalization. More than one postcolonial theorist has attempted to revoke Spivak's membership in the South Asian Subaltern Studies Group. In the words of Vivek Chibber (2013, 8), with her 1985 essay, "Subaltern Studies: Deconstructing Historiography," Spivak "parachuted" herself into the South Asian Subaltern Studies Group debates "much like an uninvited guest." By contrast, the Modernity/Coloniality Group has been more open to feminist scholarship, often making gestures to integrate the writings of US feminists of color in their works. Walter D. Mignolo, for example, cites Gloria Anzaldúa as the muse for "his concept" of border thinking. Borrowing from Anzaldúa but at the same (p. 102) time ignoring the extensiveness of her theorization, Mignolo conceives border thinking as a decolonial epistemology that originates in the ways of knowing of the colonized. According to Mignolo, border thinking transcends binaries and dichotomous thinking in order to recover subjugated knowledges from the grips of Eurocentrism (Mignolo 2000). Traces of US black feminist thought are also apparent in the Modernity/Coloniality Group's discussions of the mutual constitution of race and gender and the co-constitution of multiple systems of power. Yet, decolonial theorists quickly mute intersectionality as a theoretical framework, replacing it with Kontopoulos's notion of "heterarchies" that purportedly addresses multiple and heterogeneous global hierarchies more adequately by considering the entanglements of social processes at different structural levels (Grosfoguel 2010, 71). Several feminist scholars appear in the anthologies published by the modernity/coloniality school and are cited throughout their narratives, yet gender analytics occupy a liminal space in decolonial theory. Treatment of Maria Lugones's concept of the "coloniality of gender" is a case in point. Inspired partially by the writings of the Modernity/Coloniality Group, Lugones sees gender as being as central to the conceptualization of the coloniality of power as race was to Quijano and hence as something to be equally understood as a colonial construct. While included in many of the Group's publications and given public lip service, few decolonial theorists incorporate Lugones's "coloniality of gender" into their central tenets. In short, feminist theory may inspire particular men to their own flights of theory, but it has not achieved full recognition as "serious" theory in its own right.

Anticolonial feminist scholarship experiences similar marginalization by feminist theorists in the US, Anglo-American, and European academies. With the notable exception of postcolonial feminist scholarship, which has gained great prestige among US feminists, other forms of anticolonial feminist theorization do not occupy a stable position within feminist theory. Black feminist theorists have long argued that their most innovative theoretical concepts are not treated as "theory" within academic feminism. Nikol Alexander Floyd (2012) has argued that intersectional analysis has suffered such metamorphosis in the hands of "whitestream feminism" that it no longer serves its

fundamental purpose of making visible the oppression of women of color in the United States. As May (2014) has argued, the rich concept of intersectionality is actually reduced to a single-axis approach to gender by scholars who reject the focus of intersectionality on black women or question its empirical validity. Other US black feminist scholars find themselves “speaking into a void” or suffering an epistemic backlash within US and European feminist academy (May 2014).

This epistemic backlash is evidenced when the works of Chicana feminists such as Gloria Anzaldúa and Chela Sandoval are caricatured as identity politics or positioned as a fleeting fad, to be superseded by more sophisticated poststructuralist theories (Ortega 2006), or when decolonial feminist theories are qualified as “women of color” feminisms (as opposed to feminisms proper) and segregated in ethnic studies, Latina, Native American, and African American studies programs, where they have largely been ignored or appropriated. The politics of citation in “whitestream feminism” marks the presence of the scholarship of women of color, even as it contorts the content of (p. 103) their ideas, falsifies their genealogies, overrides their contributions to feminist theory, and resubjugates their knowledge (Alexander-Floyd 2012, 9). Works written by “third world feminists” outside of the United States are often deemed unworthy of translation. As a consequence, their work becomes known only after it has been mediated and redeployed by “first world” scholars.

From an anticolonial feminist perspective, theories advanced by women of color are subjected to recolonization as their central ideas and concepts slowly disappear or reappear whitewashed and devoid of their critical impetus. One objective of recent feminist decolonizing discourse is to counter this epistemic backlash by recuperating theoretical work by previously colonized women of color. Part of this effort involves creating a multidimensional lens that can serve as the foundation of decolonial feminism and as a coalitional politics among women of color (Santa Cruz Feminist of Color Collective 2014). Another dimension involves retrieval of overlapping methods and strategies within distinct theorizations by feminists of color that resist global capitalism and neocolonialism (Roshanravan 2014).

When the critique of capitalism and neocolonialism is understood as central to the decolonial feminist project, it becomes clear that women of color feminism is not coterminous with decolonial feminism, despite being an important part of it. Women of color feminists have provided some foundational elements to decolonial feminism, but they do not exhaust them. Women of color scholarship is not a unified genre and does not share a single intellectual or political project (Roshanravan 2014). Nor do the epistemic and substantive claims of women of color necessarily entail decolonizing effects. Thus, identifying what counts as anticolonial feminist theory within and beyond the scholarship of feminists of color is a complicated matter. As Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang (2012, 1) have noted, “decolonial desires articulated by white, non-white, immigrant, postcolonial, and oppressed peoples” often reduce decolonization to a metaphor for vague yearnings for liberation or social transformation. Unclear or inchoate decolonizing discourses run

the risk of reinstating colonial norms, strengthening rather than weakening them (Tuck and Yang 2012). Decolonization is *not* a metaphor for antiracist, anticapitalist critiques, nor for critiques of Eurocentrism.

Anticolonial theories are defined by criteria linked to political projects that lead to decolonization. But the questions, which criteria and political projects lead to decolonization? what counts as decolonization? and which practices succeed in challenging colonialism and coloniality? are intensively debated. Some suggest that the goal of anticolonial feminist theory is primarily to analyze and challenge imperialistic and colonizing impulses within dominant feminist theories. Others suggest that anticolonial theory must influence political practices on the ground. Some anticolonial feminist scholars investigate the relations among race, gender, and colonization and among race, gender, and the modern nation-state. Exactly how intersectional analysis is situated in relation to feminist theorizing of the hierarchies created and sustained by colonialism is a subject of intense contestation.

In the rest of this chapter, I develop a provisional framework for understanding the theoretical and political projects of anticolonial feminisms. To situate intersectionality, (p. 104) postcolonial feminism, and decolonial feminism in relation to the project of decolonization, I begin by first analyzing their ties to mainstream postcolonial and decolonial theory, fields that continue to be dominated by male scholars.

Intersectionality and Anticolonial Theory

Although many feminist scholars consider intersectionality a revolutionary concept that has redefined theoretical, political, and methodological approaches (McCall 2005; Hancock 2011; Cho, Crenshaw and McCall 2013), the concept of intersectionality developed by black feminist thinkers has come under heavy scrutiny over the past decade. Its epistemic value has been called into question by feminist poststructuralist scholars who accuse it of being “merely descriptive” (Jordan-Zachery 2007, cited in Alexander-Floyd 2012, 5). Far from offering anything new, critics have suggested that intersectionality replicates long-standing problems of identity politics, overemphasizing decontextualized categories of identity, focusing too narrowly on a small subset of structural constraints, or overemphasizing racism within feminism. Other critics suggest that intersectionality undermines feminist philosophical and political coherence by challenging the primacy of gender oppression, stigmatizing the category “woman,” or circulating narratives that are unable to address the complexity of the social (Zack 2005; Gunnarson, cited in May 2014, 102).

Some scholars have attempted to “correct” the presumed limitations of intersectional analysis associated with the exclusive focus on the oppression of women of color by redeploying the method for the study of all women or, indeed, all people (Garry 2012). But some black feminist theorists resist the conceptual inflation of intersectionality with

any study of multiple vectors of power (e.g., whiteness, class, and religion) because it has the effect of erasing women of color and returning white women to the center of analysis. Other scholars have attempted to correct the “problems” of intersectionality by recuperating single-axis analyses that investigate gender or class dynamics, or by excavating complex socio-historical contexts, localized dynamics, and institutional processes or by eschewing categorical logics and taking up multivalent and multilevel approaches (May 2014, 104).

Some of these “correctives” involve little more than superficial adoption of an additive approach, which renders unintelligible the co-constitution of systems of power—gender, race, ethnicity, class, sexuality, nationality—thereby undermining the fundamental premise of intersectional analysis. Thus it is not surprising that many black feminist theorists experience these cavalier critiques and misrepresentations of intersectionality as epistemic violence and as a recolonization of black feminist knowledge.

In contrast to rejection and distortion of intersectionality, postcolonial and decolonial studies, both inside and outside the United States, have embraced the concept. (p. 105)

An intersectional framework has been central to third world feminisms critical of colonialism—feminisms typically classified as postcolonial (Mohanty, Russo, and Torres 1991). For example, in *Imperial Leather*, Ann McClintock (1995), a white postcolonial feminist born in Zimbabwe and raised in South Africa, argued that colonialism and imperialism could not be understood without considering the invention of race. For McClintock, intersectional analysis recognizes that systems of power grounded in gender, race, class, and sexuality are not distinct and isolated realms of experience but are dangerously interlocking, not only in British colonialism, but also in anticolonial struggles. As the Santa Cruz Feminist of Color Collective (2014, 33) has noted, anticolonial feminist theory moves intersectionality beyond critiques of state-based legal practices to illuminate “glocalizing” dynamics—interpenetrations of global and local that construct gender, race, class, and sexuality, not as separable categories, but as mutually constituting systems of power that exist in and through contradictory and conflicting relations.

The boundaries of postcolonial feminism have been porous and subject to contestation over the past two decades. Several anthologies include the writings of black and Chicana feminism within postcolonial feminist theory, publishing these classic texts along with writings by third-world feminists aligned with the South Asian Subaltern Studies Group, and those advancing critiques of Orientalism (Lewis and Mills 2003). Such inclusive approaches make it clear that intersectional analysis has always been central to postcolonial feminism. But homogenizing different traditions of feminist theorizing by women of color under the rubric of postcolonial feminism also carries risks, most notably, that of losing sight of what is most central to anticolonial feminist theory. Postcolonial theory entails a unique theoretical and political program that should not be confused with other theoretical approaches. Important differences exist among black feminist, Chicana feminist, and postcolonial feminist theory and practice. These theoretical frameworks originate in different colonial experiences and periods and have different research

agendas. Occupying various subject positions within national, global, and academic frames, scholars and activists contributing to discourses on intersectionality have diverse investments in and relations to coloniality. Emerging from different theoretical traditions and encompassing different political projects, black feminist, Chicana feminist, and postcolonial feminist theory are far from uniform. Rather than assuming shared views, it is important to investigate whether a critique of coloniality and a particular decolonial project underlies specific intersectional analyses.

As has been well documented, the intellectual roots of intersectional analysis are grounded in black feminist theorists' examination of black women's oppression in the United States, which emphasized the complex interrelations of race, class, gender, and dispossession. The concept has been traced to the early nineteenth-century speeches of abolitionist and political agitator Maria Stewart (1803–1880) and later to the scholarship of Anna Julia Cooper (1858–1964), whose worldviews were shaped by the system of slavery established and condoned by US law, as well as the struggle to abolish that system. In the second half of the twentieth century, the Combahee River Collective theorized the intersections of sexuality, race, gender, and class. Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) coined (p. 106) the term "intersectionality" in her investigation of the failure of US courts to recognize discrimination based on both race and gender. Patricia Hill Collins (1990, 1993) theorized a black feminist standpoint as a crucial intellectual tool with which to illuminate the complex oppressions of contemporary black women in the United States. In these contexts, intersectionality served not only to make visible dimensions of black women's oppression that had been masked by assumptions about woman as a unitary category within feminist theory, but to challenge paradigmatic conceptions of race advanced by "malestream" critical race theory. Emphasizing the multidimensional vectors of power that structured both lived identities and social reality, intersectionality illuminated ties between epistemic location and knowledge production, and offered analytic strategies that linked the material, the discursive, and the structural. Demonstrating the inadequacies of "either/or" (binary) ways of thinking and the futility of efforts to rank oppressions, intersectionality reflects lessons that US black feminist theorists drew from black women's lived experiences of enslavement, uprootedness and dispossession, economic and reproductive exploitation, and Jim Crow segregation, sharecropping and domestic labor, lynching, rape, and race riots, second-class citizenship, and systemic racism under the guise of formal equality.

When deployed by many contemporary black, US-based feminist scholars, the political project of intersectionality remains tied to the US settler colonial state. Historians have used intersectional analysis to demonstrate how gender and sexual oppression were essential to the constitution of slavery and the plantation system. Political economists have shown how slavery and the plantation system have provided a persistent blueprint for economic and social relations in the United States, which continue to map ghettoization, educational segregation, and the prison-industrial complex. Social theorists have traced the way legacies of slavery and legal racial apartheid have become attached to black bodies, influencing individual life prospects, sexual relations, family formation, economic opportunities, residential and employment possibilities, forging lasting ties

between the US colonial and postcolonial contexts. Within this historical and intellectual context, intersectionality often fosters political demands for inclusion and equal rights, demands for complete citizenship that are perceived as crucial to living a life in freedom.

Certain inflections of intersectional politics, then, are amenable to a liberal politics of inclusion, which weaken intersectionality's decolonizing potential. Liberal notions of liberty, equality, and justice drawn from the American Declaration of Independence and US Constitution appear as preconditions for the futurity of US black women and men, precisely because they have been so long denied "the blessings of liberty." Yet, in embracing liberal inclusion as a political project, intersectionality suggests strategies of action and preferred outcomes at great remove from other anticolonial struggles outside the United States. Despite their formative influence on postcolonial theorizing, the political aims of US black feminist theorists often diverge significantly from those of anticolonial struggles in most parts of the world.

When adopted as an analytical strategy by anticolonial feminists outside the United States, however, intersectionality identifies new problems and unexpected political (p. 107) possibilities emerging from the complexity of the intersections of gender, race, class, and sexuality in the colonial condition.

Postcolonial/Decolonial Debates and Feminist Theory

Postcolonialism

In the 1990s, the "colonial" reemerged in social, cultural, and political theory. Following the decline of Marxism, the advent of postmodernism/poststructuralism, and post-Marxist cultural theories, postcolonial theory offered sophisticated critiques of capitalism, modernity, and Western colonialism. Inspired by French philosophers such as Michel Foucault and Jacques Derrida, postcolonial theorists changed the terms with which to think about colonialism, capitalism, and nationalism. Focusing on the history of British colonialism and its collapse in the aftermath of World War II, postcolonial thinkers sought to produce an alternative historiography that challenged dominant theories of historical analysis in the West. Supplanting historical materialism with a "history from below" (Chibber 2013), postcolonial scholars created a new theoretical framework for the study of colonial history, which offered an explanation not only of the distinctiveness of colonial capitalism in India, but of the operations of capitalism in other parts of the colonized world. Yet because the South Asian Subaltern Studies Group focused primarily on the colonization of India and other parts of Asia, their views about the relationship between colonialism and capitalism differed dramatically from those of the Latin American Modernity/Coloniality Group, which drew upon earlier phases of Spanish,

Portuguese, and French colonization and decolonization. Key differences in views about coloniality, modernity, and capitalism became a hallmark not only of these two schools—postcolonial and decolonial—of anticolonial scholarship but of their feminist counterparts as well.

“Subalternists,” often considered the core group within postcolonial theory, argued that that capitalism assumed markedly different forms in Europe and in the colonial world. In contrast to the “modernizing” role that capitalism played in Europe, transforming agricultural economies to industrial economies and aligning bourgeois and working-class interests in the overthrow of the feudal aristocracy, capitalism’s effects in South Asia were bifurcated. According to the subalternists, neither the progressive forces nor the universalizing drive materialized fully in the subcontinent because nationalist elites failed to transform the “backwardness” of the peasantry in the process of decolonization (Chibber 2013). In Gramscian terms, the British colonizers and the Indian nationalist capitalist class were unable or unwilling to generalize their particular interests to the subaltern classes that they exploited. Despite superficial changes in law, the old regime and the caste system remained intact. In contrast to the European (p. 108) experience, where the rhetoric of universal rights recruited the exploited working classes to the political project of liberal democracy, in colonial India, capitalist domination involved rule without the consensus of the governed, that is, without hegemony (Chibber 2013, 13). As a consequence of the long history of British colonial domination, liberal views of equality, political freedom, secularism, and contractualism did not take root in India, profoundly altering the postcolonial context. Even following independence, pre-capitalist forms of exploitation and domination remained in place. This “abnormal” development of capitalism split postcolonial society into two political domains, driven by two different and clashing logics: whereas the capitalist class functioned according to the rational pursuit of individual interest, the subaltern was mired in a premodern form of politics, preoccupied with concerns about religion, caste, ethnicity, and community. This unique configuration of classes, according to subalternists, distinguished colonial modernity and capitalism in India, ensuring that they bore little resemblance to European capitalism and modernity. In the absence of hegemony, anticolonial nationalist elites constructed a fictitious form of postcolonial nation-statehood grounded on a spurious legitimacy (Chibber 2013, 17). Precisely because the model of capitalist development in India differed significantly from Europe’s, the subalternists argued that Western categories of analysis, and Marxist theory, in particular, were inappropriate for understanding colonial capitalism in the East.

Informed by poststructural critiques of totalizing theories such as economic determinism, Subaltern Studies advanced an alternative narrative of capitalism that eschewed “grand narratives.” Attentive to the power of discourse, they relied upon textual analyses to devise critiques of colonialism and capitalism that supplemented discussions of exploitation and domination with investigations of marginality and subalternity (Chibber 2013, 8). Echoing certain strains of the poststructuralist critique of modernity, the subalternists’ critique of Eurocentrism rejected universalizing claims and emphasized difference and the local. They highlighted the cultural specificity of “the East,” and used

cultural and historical analysis to theorize “the subaltern” and to raise questions concerning the subaltern’s voice and agency. According to Vivek Chibber (2013, 8), Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, perhaps the best known postcolonial feminist theorist, was indirectly responsible for these unique features of postcolonial critique.

Postcolonial Feminism

A founder of, and at times ostracized from, the South Asian Subaltern Studies Group, Spivak is said to characterize herself as a “practical deconstructionist feminist Marxist gadfly” (Leitch et al. 2010, 2110). Chastising the subalternists for failing to examine gender and sexuality in their accounts of the postcolonial condition, Spivak has advanced analyses of gendered divisions of labor within capitalism, critiques of Eurocentrism in Western literature, interrogations of epistemic and political borders constructed by neoliberal global capitalism, along with trenchant critiques of Western liberal and radical feminist scholarship. Using textual analysis and cultural criticism as her primary (p. 109) analytical tools, Spivak is renowned for her sophisticated critiques of poststructural, postcolonial, and feminist theories as well as for her analyses of colonial capitalism and postcolonial politics.

In her pathbreaking essay, “Can the Subaltern Speak?” Spivak ([1985] 1988) set the terms of feminist postcolonial criticism. Conceptualizing “epistemic violence” as integral to Western knowledge production, Spivak demonstrated how the discursive production of the subaltern, particularly the poor “third world woman,” silenced women of the global South through a form of ventriloquism. Under the guise of giving voice to the oppressed, Western academic and activist discourses substituted Orientalist views of the third world women for the lived realities of subaltern existence. Spivak suggested that every attempt to represent the subaltern woman was a way of asserting the West’s superiority over the non-West. By juxtaposing Western “civilization” against the “barbarism” of “the East,” academics and activists colonized subaltern experience, while reinscribing the superiority of Western knowledge. By locating epistemic violence in the dynamics of representation itself, Spivak raised the possibility that the subaltern woman could never be known in her own terms. In taking that step, Spivak also called into question the validity of practices within the South Asian Subaltern Studies Group. Indeed, she suggested that postcolonial theorists, who positioned themselves as knowers of and spokespersons for the subaltern, violated the fundamental premises of postcolonial critique. Indeed, Spivak claimed that postcolonial theorists not only failed to provide an alternative to the Orientalism of Western theories, but they reproduced Orientalist discourses by conceiving the subaltern as supine, inescapably oppressed, and essentially “Other” than Western subjects.

In “Under Western Eyes,” Chandra Talpade Mohanty brought the full force of postcolonial feminist criticism to bear on Western feminist scholarship. Taking the *Third World Series* published by Zed Press as her point of departure, Mohanty (1991, 56) demonstrated how binary constructions of first-world and third-world women homogenized women on both sides of the binary with particularly negative consequences for third-world women, who

were imagined to be perennially “ignorant, poor, uneducated, tradition-bound, domesticated, family-oriented, victimized.” By contrast, white women were uniformly constructed as “educated, modern, having control over their own bodies and sexualities, and the freedom to make their own decisions.” These discursive oppositions were not only Eurocentric, but as Leela Gandhi (1998) noted, they fortified an image of a redemptive ideological and political plenitude of Western feminism. Paraphrasing Spivak’s denunciation of white men’s accounts of their own colonial acts as benevolent rescue missions in which “white men are saving brown women from brown men,” Mohanty castigated Western academic feminists who imagined themselves as “white women saving brown women from brown men.” Although some scholars criticized Mohanty for homogenizing Western feminism, her analysis was impressively prescient, anticipating the construction of Muslim women as victims of Muslim men in dire need of rescue in post-9/11 discourses circulated not only by leading US feminists but by the US government, Western media, and human rights organizations (Abu-Lughod 2013).

(p. 110) Mohanty also expanded her conception of third-world women beyond the cartographies established by the Subaltern Studies Group. In her analysis of global capitalism, she drew parallels between Western and non-Western capitalist heteropatriarchies, which operated to maximize the exploitation of “third world” women’s labor, whether those women worked in the global South or the global North. In their quest to maximize profits by fostering consumption and providing affluent consumers with cheap consumer goods, Mohanty suggested that multinational corporations increased the precariousness of life, driving down wages of women workers in the South, heightening unemployment in the North, and proliferating sweatshops in global cities North and South. By creating a “common context of political struggles” and fostering “common interests” through brutal exploitation, global capitalism was laying a foundation for transnational solidarity among third world women.

Despite the importance of her contributions to feminist postcolonial theory and to transnational feminism, Mohanty does not resolve the relations of power between first- and third-world women that she so deftly analyzes in “Under Western Eyes” (Mendoza 2002). Although she envisions third-world women as revolutionary subjects, she stops short of explaining how the common interests of third-world women living in the colony and in metropolitan centers can be transformed into common political struggles against the destructiveness of global capitalism. Her emphasis on the potential solidarity between third-world women across borders underestimates the difficulty of transnational feminist mobilizations that attempt to unite first-world and third-world women, or white women and women of color. By suggesting that transformative projects arise from the experience of systemic oppression, Mohanty echoes traditional leftists in the West who imagine that the revolution always begins with the most marginalized, which imposes a huge burden on subaltern women. In focusing on shared oppressions that span national boundaries and the geopolitics of North/South, Mohanty also distances herself from arguments of the Subaltern Studies Group, which position the subaltern as a political actor motivated by a

set of concerns that are radically different from those of the West (Chibber 2013, 22). Rather than engaging the alterity of the subaltern, Mohanty's transnational feminist orientation aligns more closely with conventional Marxist calls for transnational worker solidarity as the ground for social transformation.

In their efforts to address Eurocentrism and racism within Western feminism, postcolonial feminist scholars have developed riveting analyses of Eurocentric bias in popular culture, film, and mass media, as well as potent critiques of racism and racialization in the views of US nationalists and exceptionalists, Zionists, and postcolonial nationalist elites (Shohat and Stam 2006; Fernandes 2013). Investigating the intersection of gender, race, class, sexuality, and nationality, they have provided superb studies of the power dynamics operating in distinct colonial contexts (McClintock 1995; Stoler 2002). By studying the racial systems constructed within particular colonial contexts, postcolonial feminist scholars have also opened possibilities for dialogue with other anticolonial theorists whose work examines Spanish and Portuguese colonialism rather than British and French colonialism or US imperialism (Stam and Shohat 2012). The erudition and the richness of postcolonial feminist research cannot be questioned.

(p. 111) Yet postcolonial feminism also suffers some of the limitations associated with mainstream postcolonial theory and poststructuralism. Like its mainstream counterpart, postcolonial feminist theory has been accused of cultural determinism and historicism. The political project of postcolonial feminists is also hard to grasp. Although they have emphasized the role of the subaltern and transnationalism in struggles against global capitalism, holding out little hope for the emancipatory potential of the West, postcolonial feminist theorists have also expressed growing concerns about the subaltern's capacity to overturn its colonial condition, particularly in its current instantiation as neoliberal global capitalism. Indeed, as Spivak (cited in Paudyal 2011) recently noted in a lecture in Katmandu, Nepal, the subaltern has been "hegemonized to accept its wretchedness as normal." But if this is so, what becomes of the postcolonial intellectual's project to "train the imagination" of the subaltern to help him/her recover the moral compass lost to neoliberal global capitalism? Claims concerning the subaltern's resignation to wretchedness reveal the social distance that separates the postcolonial feminist scholar from the subaltern. They also signal a departure from Foucault's dictum that the intellectual is irremediably implicated in power/knowledge constellations. Whether postcolonial feminist theorists accept Foucault's insight that they can never advance a political program that represents the subaltern or embrace a Gramscian notion of the organic intellectual who can speak for the subaltern, neither the position of the subaltern nor the position of the postcolonial intellectual in the anticolonial struggle is apparent. The question for the subaltern could just as well be asked of the postcolonial critic: does s/he occupy a privileged position in the struggle for decolonization or is s/he doomed to silence?

Decolonial Theory

Although decolonial theory might be characterized as the most recent arrival on the anticolonial scene, it takes a much longer view of colonialism than its predecessors. Decolonial theorists ground their analyses in the Spanish and Portuguese colonization of the Americas, which began in the sixteenth century and ended in the nineteenth century. Decolonial thought draws attention to long histories of Spanish and Portuguese colonialism that had been bracketed in postcolonial debates that focused exclusively on British or French colonialism. In the earliest phase of European colonial expansion, the first colonial universities were founded in Santo Domingo, Lima, and Mexico City as early as 1538 and 1551. These intellectual centers became sites of heated debates over Eurocentric epistemology and historiography. In these debates, *criollo* elites, mestizo, and indigenous intellectuals sought to demonstrate that European knowledge was unable to recognize, much less comprehend, the cultural differences and forms of governance of the vanquished Inca (Mendoza 2014). More than four centuries before the emergence of the South Asian Subaltern Studies Group, scholars at Spanish universities, such as the University of Salamanca and the Colegio San Gregorio, questioned the (p. 112) justness of empire and colonization. In the famous Valladolid debates (1550–1551), for example, Bartolomé de las Casas and Ginés de Sepulveda debated the humanity of the Amerindians, challenging the dehumanizing effects of colonization as well as the rhetoric of salvation deployed by Spanish missionaries (Mendoza 2006). Felipe Guamán Poma de Ayala, a Quechua nobleman, wrote one of the first chronicles in defense of the Amerindians, contending that the Spanish had no right to control Andean affairs. The mestizo descendant of Incan nobility Inca Garcilaso de la Vega tried to recover the voices and preserve the historical memory of the Amerindians at the very moment they were being subjected to genocide. In a suggestive article entitled “Si, el subalterno puede hablar: un análisis breve de la ‘Nueva crónica y buen gobierno’ de Felipe Guamán Poma de Ayala y los ‘Comentarios reales’ ” del Inca Garcilazo de la Vega” (“Yes, the subaltern can speak: a brief analysis of ‘The First New Chronicle and Good Governance’ by Felipe Guamán Poma de Ayala and the ‘Royal Commentaries’ by Inca Garcilaso de la Vega”), Lipi Biswan Sen, a professor of the Nehru University of India, notes that these accounts of the subaltern, theorized in the sixteenth century by Guamán Poma de Ayala and Garcilazo de la Vega, anticipated central arguments of the South Asian Subaltern Studies Group. According to Guamán Poma de Ayala and Garcilazo de la Vega, the Amerindians resisted the binary thinking of Europeans, refusing to accept that colonization was a civilizing process. Indeed, the Amerindians inverted the logic of colonization, identifying the Europeans as barbarians who were destroying the civilizations long established by indigenous peoples. In contrast to South Asian subaltern theory that depicts the subaltern as possessing a political psychology incompatible with Western ways of knowing, Guaman Poma de Ayala and Garcilazo de la Vega insisted that the subaltern developed sophisticated Spanish-language skills and used the tools of the master, such as alphabetic

writing, which the Incas had not previously developed, to subvert the colonizing discourses of the Europeans (Biswan Sen 2009).

The certitude that the subaltern can speak is one distinguishing feature of decolonial theory; but decolonial thinkers differ from postcolonial/subaltern theory and postcolonial feminism in several additional ways. The Modernity/Coloniality Group insist that capitalism is concomitant to colonialism; it is not an autonomous system imported to the Americas on its own. Taking issue with those who claim that capitalism existed in Europe prior to colonization, decolonial theorists argue that colonialism is what made capitalism possible. In marked contrast to those who claim that capitalism failed to develop in the colony due to conditions internal to indigeneity, the Modernity/Coloniality Group insist that capitalism requires the internal conditions of the colony to realize itself.

Decolonial theorists conceptualize colonialism as the dark side of modernity. Contesting the association of modernity with emancipatory developments in Europe, such as the Reformation, the Enlightenment, and the French Revolution, the Modernity/Coloniality Group suggest more complicated causal relations between colonialism, the age of reason, and the age of revolutions. Just as Hegel suggested that the full realization of reason and freedom is inseparable from despotism, slavery and conquest, decolonial thinkers suggest that slavery, forced labor, and the rightslessness of colonized peoples (p. 113) exist in dialectical relation to liberal notions of liberty, equality, justice and free labor. The colony is both the condition of possibility and the proving ground of the Western nation-state, and rights-bearing citizenship tethered to men of property. In other words, the freedom of the European and the colonial settler depends on the unfreedom of the colonized. Precisely because the freedom of some presupposes the subordination of others, decolonization is always an unfinished project. Although colonialism has ended in most parts of the world, the “coloniality of power” continues to define relations between the West and the Rest.

Peruvian sociologist, Anibal Quijano, theorized the coloniality of power as a process of racialization integral to colonization (2010, 2008). Beginning in 1492 with the conquest of the Americas, European conquistadors proclaimed themselves the lords of the world, the “natural” rulers of all “inferior” peoples. Using conquest as proof of their superiority, the conquerors reclassified entire populations in accordance with finely honed hierarchies grounded in religious doctrines, physiognomies, myths about blood and divine mandates to spread the message and means of salvation. Those conquered through violence were condemned to a zone of non-Being, stripped of humanity, rights, and self-determination.

According to Quijano, the idea of race imposed on the colonized originated in debates during the Spanish Inquisition and the Reconquista. The principle of the “purity of blood” was introduced to distinguish “real” Christians from converted Jews and Moors. By inventing a specious notion of unchanging biology that privileged Catholics, the Spanish Church afforded the monarchy grounds to expel the Moors and Jews from Spain. Although the principle of the purity of blood was invoked initially to legitimate a religious hierarchy, the precedent of tying notions of superiority to a biological base with profound

cultural repercussions, proved particularly useful to the colonizing enterprises that followed conquest of the “New World.” Imported to America with colonization, the idea of a naturally superior race, identified through its beliefs and deeds, provided a useful tool to differentiate the colonizers from the Amerindians and the imported slaves from Africa. Once marked as inferiors, conquered and enslaved peoples were subjected not only to edicts issued by the Catholic monarchy of Spain, but to civilizing missions, “salvation” efforts, and brutal labor and sexual exploitation.

The idea of race implicit in debates surrounding “the purity of blood” gave rise to hierarchies that restructured the social organization as well as public and private institutions and practices in the “New World.” Linking notions of biological and cultural inferiority, race provided a versatile substratum for the coloniality of power, justifying a hierarchical social system that accorded control over human and material resources to the colonizers. According to Quijano, race reordered all aspects of indigenous life, including sex, labor, collective authority, subjectivity, and intersubjectivity. Race designated who would become a slave, an indentured laborer, or a free wage laborer. Race determined political status during the colonial era, and subsequently dictated who would have access to full citizenship in the nation-state. As the foundation of Eurocentrism, race defined what counted as history and knowledge, and condemned the colonized to live as peoples without history, without the rights of man, and without human rights. (p. 114) As European knowledge production was accredited as the only valid knowledge, indigenous epistemologies were relegated to the status of primitive superstition or destroyed. Eurocentrism locked intersubjective relations between the European and the non-European in a temporal frame that always positioned the European as more advanced. Whether the opposition pitted the civilized against the barbarians, wage workers against slaves, the modern against the premodern, or the developed against the underdeveloped, the superiority of the European was never questioned (Quijano 2008).

Following Quijano, decolonial thinkers have developed a range of concepts that take the coloniality of power as their point of departure. Like Quijano, decolonial theorists emphasize that coloniality is different from colonialism. In contrast to the historically specific acts of colonialism through which one nation imposes its sovereignty on another, coloniality refers to long-standing patterns of power that emerge in the context of colonialism, which redefine culture, labor, intersubjective relations, aspirations of the self, common sense, and knowledge production in ways that accredit the superiority of the colonizer. Surviving long after colonialism has been overthrown, coloniality permeates consciousness and social relations in contemporary life. Edgardo Lander (2000) has theorized the coloniality of knowledge, examining the diverse practices by which non-Western knowledge has been and continues to be silenced or eradicated. Bearing some resemblance to Spivak’s notion of epistemic violence, Lander analyzes the physical extermination of non-Western knowledge producers, as well as diverse technologies of intellectual genocide. Drawing insights from Walter Mignolo, Nelson Maldonado Torres (2008) reinterprets the core concepts of existential phenomenology as a manifestation of the coloniality of being. Indeed, he traces how the consciousness of the colonizer

structures the Western *cogito* in ways that ensure that those of European ancestry refuse to recognize the full humanity of people of color. Breny Mendoza (2014) theorizes the coloniality of democracy, tracing how the racialization and gendering of non-European men and women has been essential to the construction of white male citizenship and to the perpetuation of white male privilege despite constitutional guarantees of formal equality.

Decolonial Feminism

Decolonial feminism is sometimes traced to the scholarship of Native-American feminists, Chicana feminists, and African feminist anticolonial theory published in the 1960s and 1970s, but the full flowering of this thought is much more recent. Gloria Anzaldúa's *Borderlands/La Frontera* (1987) is often identified as a foundational text of feminist decolonial theory. Her concepts of mestiza consciousness and *pensamiento fronterizo* theorized the subversive character of subjugated knowledges that fracture colonial languages and epistemology in ways that change the terms of debate. Strongly influenced by postcolonial theory, Emma Perez published *The Decolonial Imaginary* in 1999, seeking to challenge the "colonial imaginary" still structuring Chicano, nationalist and patriarchal historiography. Native feminist scholars, such as Paula Gunn Allen (p. 115) (1986), and African anticolonial scholars, such as Oyeronke Oyewumi (1997), have also analyzed both the impact of colonization on women and the colonizing discourses of Western feminism.

Decolonial feminism is gaining in popularity in various cultural and national contexts. Catherine Walsh (2010), who publishes both in English and Spanish, has analyzed interculturality, subjugated knowledges and decoloniality in Ecuador. Her concept of interculturality is particularly important to decolonial theory because it strays away from concepts such as multiculturalism and pluriculturalism which were deployed by the World Bank to promote neoliberal capitalism. For Walsh "critical interculturality" is not about inclusion and "getting along," but a political, ethical, and epistemic project of the indigenous population of the Andes that seeks to create a new rationality and humanity that reverses Eurocentrism and the coloniality of knowledge. Outside the United States, Madina Tlostanova, a feminist scholar originally from Kabardino-Balkaria, a republic of the Russian Federation, who is now based in Moscow, uses a decolonial framework to analyze post-Soviet space and subjectivity. Tlostanova borrows Mignolo's concept of imperial difference to elucidate the position of the Soviet Union within Western narratives of empire. Here the Soviet empire not only originates outside of modernity and appears as a subaltern empire, but its exteriority to modernity and to Europe's imaginary allows this imperial difference to mutate into colonial difference. This determines the types of feminism that emerge in the post-Soviet space that, while defined in terms of coloniality, are not easily understood under "feminisms of color." Most of her work on gender and decoloniality, however, has not been translated into English. German cultural critic, Freya Schiwy also uses a decolonial lens to investigate gender in the Andes and to theorize subjectivity and coloniality in the field of cultural studies (Schiwy 2010).

Decolonial theory is very influential in Latin America and the Caribbean, although some feminist scholars have questioned its content, geographical purchase, and its gendered lacunae. Within feminist circles, decolonial theory has entered into dialog with intersectional, poststructuralist, indigenous, Afro-Latin American, and mestizo feminists, who have developed their own theories outside of the decolonial option. Rita Segato (2001, 2011), an Argentinean feminist anthropologist based in Brazil, for example, integrates elements of decolonial theory in her work, but is critical of the notion of the coloniality of gender because she is not persuaded by Lugones's claim that gender hierarchies were unknown in indigenous societies. Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui, an Aymara feminist sociologist and activist from Bolivia famous for her work in the *Taller de Historia Oral Andina*, has decried decolonial theory as a colonizing discourse originating in US universities, one that is not only divorced from local struggles of the indigenous peoples in Latin America, but that also misappropriates and misrecognizes decades of work on colonization and decolonization that has taken place in the region (Rivera Cusicanqui 2010, 58). Decolonial theory in Latin America has also been subjected to a double feminist critique. One dimension focuses on decolonial theory's—particularly, Quijano's and Dussel's—lack of attention to gender or its inadequate conceptualization of gender (Lugones 2007, 2010; Mendoza 2010).

(p. 116) Decolonial theory is also gaining momentum in the US feminist academy, although it has not had the instant success that postcolonial theory experienced in the 1990s. In two recent published works, “Heterosexualism and the Colonial Modern Gender System” (2007) and “Towards a Decolonial Feminism” (2010), Maria Lugones has introduced decolonial theory to feminist audiences in the United States, while expanding its parameters to encompass the coloniality of gender and sexuality. In her 2007 essay, Lugones combines intersectionality and Quijano's coloniality of power to further develop her own conception of the coloniality of gender. She critiques Quijano's conception of gender on multiple grounds: it is still trapped in biological determinism; it presupposes sexual dimorphism where none existed; it naturalizes heteronormativity in cultures that did not deem homosexuality either a sexual or a social transgression; and it presumes a patriarchal distribution of power in societies where more egalitarian social relations between men and women were prevalent. In Lugones's view, Quijano's understanding of gender is still Eurocentric. Drawing insights from Native feminist scholarship and Oyewumi's work on the Yoruba to correct Quijano's misconceived notion of gender, Lugones argues that indigenous societies did not have “gender” before European intrusion. Gender did not exist as an organizing principle of power in indigenous societies before the process of colonization. Other principles, such as seniority, provided a basis for power and authority, but they were quite distinct from the social construction of gender. Rather than considering gender a perennial feature of social organization, Lugones argues that gender should be understood as a colonial construct, just as race was a European imposition. In the process of colonization, women and men in the colony were both racialized and sexualized as gender was deployed as a powerful tool to destroy the social relations of the colonized by dividing men and women from each other and creating antagonisms between them. European constructions of gender introduced internal

hierarchies that broke down the solidarity between men and women destroying previous ties based on complementarity and reciprocity. In place of harmonious collaboration, European colonizers positioned men and women as antagonists. Through sexual violence, exploitation, and systems of concubinage, the colonizers used gender to break the will of indigenous men and women, imposing new hierarchies that were institutionalized with colonialism. The bodies of women became the terrain on which indigenous men negotiated survival under new colonial conditions. Sacrificing indigenous women to the lust of the conquerors, perversely, became the only means of cultural survival. Lugones labels this systemic sexual violence the dark side of modern/colonial gender system.

Julieta Paredes (2008) advances a critique of Maria Lugones's concept of the coloniality of gender, suggesting that Lugones's analysis misses the centrality of gender to patriarchal indigenous societies prior to European colonization. Lugones carries her analysis a step further in her 2010 essay, "Toward Decolonial Feminism," claiming that the gender system imposed by European colonizers on the colonized differed significantly from the gender system the conquistadors imposed on European women living in the colony. The multifaceted gender system imposed in the colony subordinated European women but dehumanized indigenous, African slave, and poor mestizo men and women. (p. 117)

Accepting the central tenet of coloniality—that the separation of the human from the non-human was concomitant to colonization, Lugones suggests that the racialization of non-Europeans as beasts of burden had critical consequences for the development of complex sex and gender systems. The hierarchical dichotomies that distinguished the civilized human from the natural primitive and culture from nature structured not only the relations between colonizer and colonized, it also legitimated a hierarchy that elevated European men over European women. The human itself was bifurcated: as creatures closer to nature, emotional rather than rational, bound to the animal function of reproduction, European women were lower than men in the great Chain of Being, yet they were still human, marked by culture. Civilized gender involved a hierarchy that subordinated European women to European men, but still marked a gulf between colonizers and colonized. As savages, the colonized manifested biological difference (sex), but they lacked a gender system. Egalitarian relations between indigenous men and women were taken by the Europeans as evidence of barbarity. According to Lugones, then, gender hierarchy marks the civilized status of European women and men; its absence defines the nonhuman, racialized, naturalized non-Europeans, who are sexed but genderless. Whether cast as hypersexualized animals or beasts of burden, indigenous peoples and enslaved peoples were imagined to be a threat to the European gender order. As subhuman beings, the colonized were fit for breeding, brutal labor, exploitation, and/or massacre (Lugones 2010, 206). The coloniality of gender makes clear that gender grants civilized status only to those men and women who inhabit the domain of the human; those who lack gender are subject to gross exploitation or outright genocide. Thus Lugones's theorization of the coloniality of gender as dehumanizing practice that survives colonization helps make sense of contemporary issues such as feminicide, trafficking, and increased violence against non-European women.

In Latin America and the Caribbean, Lugones's analysis of the coloniality of gender has had a mixed reception. Her work has opened the feminist archive to decolonial thinking and produced a respectable group of followers. Yet, her specific claims about the coloniality of gender are controversial among mainstream feminists, indigenous feminists, and feminist scholars working on colonization and decolonization within other theoretical frameworks (Mendoza 2014). Some critiques question the validity of the ethnographic work that Lugones uses to support her arguments. Argentinean anthropologist Rita Laura Segato (2001), for example, draws upon her own research on the Yoruba in Latin America to question Oyewumi's claim that gender was non-existent among the Yoruba. Although she acknowledges that the gender system of the Yoruba is complex and different from European gender and that their form of patriarchy was in many ways less intensive than the European version, Segato provides ample evidence that gender existed as an oppressive status differentiation among the Yoruba. Segato suggests that low intensity patriarchies became more hierarchical when subjected to the logic of gender imposed under colonization—with devastating consequences for Indigenous women. As public and private spheres were separated and gendered, Indigenous women were domesticated and privatized, losing the power they once held in the community. Although Indigenous men retained some communal authority, they were humiliated (p. 118) and symbolically emasculated by the depredations of colonization. Forced to engage the European logic of gender, indigenous men returned to their communities supplementing the old lexicon of power with new hierarchical codes (Segato 2011).

Silvia Rivera Cusicanqui (2004) provides a similar critique grounded in the experiences of Andean society. Although indigenous gender relations were more egalitarian in the private as well as in the public sphere, the Andean gender system was organized around the normative heterosexual couple within a system of complementarity. Kinship systems were bilateral, which afforded men and women equal inheritance rights. Women and men achieved social personhood once they formed a couple and both accumulated prestige as they gained seniority. Cusicanqui notes that all these practices were weakened or destroyed not at the time of colonization but with the advent of republican systems of governance, modernization, and development. Women's roles in the community were weakened but much more recently than Lugones's account of the coloniality of gender suggests (Cusicanqui 2004). According to Cusicanqui, gender relations based on complementarity survived in indigenous communities much longer than has previously been assumed, destroyed in a gradual process of patriarchalization that accompanied modernization and the encroachment of the modern nation-state upon Andean communities.

In Bolivia, since the election of Evo Morales to the presidency, the first indigenous person to hold that office, and in Mexico within Zapatista revolutionary struggles, the debate over whether or not gender preceded colonization has played an important role, influencing revolutionary theories and feminist proposals for state policies, laws, and practices as well as political imaginaries. Outside these political struggles, the question of whether gender is a colonial construct or an ancestral practice may pose a false dilemma. Lugones's concept of the coloniality of gender, Segato's claim that low-intensity

patriarchies prior to conquest were exacerbated by colonization, and Cusicanqui's account of patriarchalization as a consequence of nation-state formation postindependence need not be read as contradictory. All three scholars agree that the imposition of a European gender system had profound effects on relations between men and women in the colony, unleashing lethal forces against Native, enslaved, and poor mestizo women sufficient to be considered genocidal. Lugones' conceptualization of the coloniality of gender is useful precisely because it situates gender in relation to the genocidal logic of the coloniality of power. The racializing logic that Europeans imposed on the colonized robbed non-Europeans not only of their status as human but also of their status as gendered beings. Devoid of humanity and gender, non-Europeans were endlessly exploitable, as well as eliminable. Lugones's insights resemble those of US Native feminist scholars who have long claimed that the settler colonial nation-state operated according to a logic of elimination, which enabled the near complete physical and symbolic disappearance of the Amerindian.

Whether drawn from Lugones, US Native feminist scholars, or Latin American feminist scholars, decolonial thinking has important lessons. The racializing logic introduced into the Americas in 1492 did far more than structure a relation between colonizer and colonized; it established ways of thinking and modes of power that have (p. 119) shaped and continue to shape social and political relations that permeate all aspects of life. Recognizing the profound influence of racialization and gendering is essential to an adequate understanding of the past, to efforts to transform the present, and to strategies to envision and produce a different future.

References

- Abu-Lughod, Lila. 2013. *Do Muslim Women Need Saving?* President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- Alexander-Floyd, Nikol G. 2012. "Disappearing Acts: Reclaiming Intersectionality in the Social Sciences in a Post-Black Feminist Era." *Feminist Formations* 24(1) (Spring): 1-24.
- Césaire, Aimé. 2000. *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Chibber, Vivek. 2013. *Postcolonial Theory and the Specter of Capital*. London: Verso.
- Cho, Sumi, Kimberlé Crenshaw, and Leslie McCall. 2013. "Intersectionality: Theorizing Power, Empowering Theory." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 38(4) (Summer): 785-810.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 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* 140: 139-167.

Coloniality of Gender and Power: From Postcoloniality to Decoloniality

Du Bois, W. E. B. 1976. *The Souls of Black Folks: Essays and Sketches*. Cutchogue, New York: Buccaneer Books.

Dussel, Enrique. 1985. *Philosophy of Liberation*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books.

Fanon, Frantz. 2004. *The Wretched of the Earth*. New York: Grove Press.

Fernandes, Leela. 2013. *Transnational Feminism in the United States*. New York: New York University Press.

Gandhi, Leela. 1998. *Postcolonial Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Garcilaso de la Vega, Inca. 2008. *Comentarios Reales*. In *Diferencia*. Barcelona: Linkgua Ediciones, S. L.

Garry, Ann. 2012. "Who Is included? Intersectionality, Metaphors, and the Multiplicity of Gender" In *Out From the Shadows: Analytical Feminist Contributions to Traditional Philosophy*, edited by Sharon L. Crasnow and Anita M. Superson, 493–530. New York: Oxford University Press.

Grosfoguel, Ramon. 2010. "The Epistemic Decolonial Turn: Beyond Political Economy Paradigms." In *Globalization and the Decolonial Option*, edited by Walter D. Mignolo and Arturo Escobar, 65–77. London and New York: Routledge.

Guamán, Poma de Ayala, Felipe. 1936. *Nueva Corónica y Buen Gobierno*/Paris: Institut d'ethnologie.

Gunn Allen, Paula. 1986. *The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Gunnarson, Lena. 2011. "A Defense of the category 'women.'" In *Feminist Theory* 12(1): 23–27.

Hancock, Ange Marie. 2011. *Beyond the Oppression Olympics: A Politics of Solidarity for the 21st Century*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hill Collins, Patricia. 1993. "Toward a New Vision: Race, Class, and Gender as Categories of Analysis and Connection." In *Race, Gender and Class* 1(1) (Fall): 25–45.

Kontopoulos, Kyriakos. 1993. *The Logic of Social Structures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(p. 120) Lander, Edgardo. 2000. *La colonialidad del saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas Latinoamericanas*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO.

Leitch, Vincent B., Cain E. William, Finke Laurie A., Johnson, Barbara E. eds. 2010. *The Norton Anthology of Theory and Criticism*. New York; London: W.W. Norton.

Lewis, Reina, and Mills, Sara. 2003. *Feminist Postcolonial Theory*. New York: Routledge.

Coloniality of Gender and Power: From Postcoloniality to Decoloniality

- Lugones, Maria. 2007. "Heterosexualism and the Colonial Modern Gender System." *Hypatia* 22(1) (Winter): 186-209.
- Lugones, Maria. 2010. "Towards a Descolonial Feminism." *Hypatia* 25(4) (Fall): 742-759.
- Maldonado-Torres, Nelson. 2008. *Against War: Views from the Underside of Modernity*. Durham: Duke University Press Books.
- Mariátegui, José Carlos. 2009. *Siete ensayos de interpretación de la realidad peruana* In Diferencia. Barcelona: Linkgua Ediciones.
- May, Vivian M. 2014. "'Speaking into the Void'? Intersectionality Critiques and Epistemic Backlash." *Hypatia* 29(1) (Winter): 94-112.
- McCall, Leslie. 2005. "The Complexity of Intersectionality." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 30(3): 1771-1800.
- McClintock, Anne. 1995. *Imperial Leather*. New York: Routledge.
- Mendoza, Breny. 2002. "Transnational Feminisms in Question." *Feminist Theory* 3(3): 295-314.
- Mendoza, Breny. 2006. "The Undemocratic Foundations of Democracy: An Enunciation from Postoccidental Latin America." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 31(4) (Summer): 932-939.
- Mendoza, Breny. 2010. "La epistemología del sur, la colonialidad de género y el feminismo latinoamericano." In *Aproximaciones críticas a las prácticas teórico-políticas del feminismo latinoamericano*, vol. 1, edited by Yuderlys Espinosa Miñoso, 19-36. Buenos Aires: En la frontera.
- Mendoza, Breny. 2014. *Ensayos de Crítica Feminista en Nuestra América*. Mexico D.F.: Editorial Herder.
- Mendoza, Breny. 2014. "La cuestión de la colonialidad de género." In Breny Mendoza *Ensayos de Crítica Feminista en Nuestra América*, 45-71. Mexico D.F.: Editorial Herder.
- Mignolo, Walter. 1995. *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality, and Colonization*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Mignolo, Walter. 2000. *Local Histories/Global Designs. Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Mohanty, Chandra T. 1991. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." In *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*, 51-80. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Coloniality of Gender and Power: From Postcoloniality to Decoloniality

Mohanty, Chandra T., Russo, Ann, and Torres, Lourdes. 1991. *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Nkrumah, Kwame. 1964. *Consciencism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Ortega, Mariana. 2006. "Being Lovingly, Knowingly Ignorant: White Feminism and Women of Color" *Hypatia* 21(3) (Summer): 56-74.

Paredes, Julieta. 2008. *Hilando fino desde el feminismo comunitario*. La Paz, Bolivia: Comunidad Mujeres Creando Comunidad. CEDEC. Asociación Centro de Defensa de la Cultura.

Paudyal, Mahesh. 2011. http://www.ekantipur.com/the-kathmandu-post/2011/12/23/related_articles/the-dream-of-a-borderless-world/229620.html.

Quijano, Anibal. 2008. "Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Social Classification." In *Coloniality at Large*, edited by Marel Moraña et al., 181-224. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

(p. 121) Quijano, Anibal. 2010. "Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality." In *Globalization and the Decolonial Option*, edited by Walter D. Mignolo and Arturo Escobar, 22-32. London and New York: Routledge.

Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia. 2004. 'La noción de "derecho" o las paradojas de la modernidad postcolonial: indígenas y mujeres en Bolivia.' October. 1-9. Ecuador: Revista Aportes Andinos.

Rivera Cusicanqui, Silvia. 2010. *Ch'ixinakax Utxiwa. Una reflexión sobre prácticas y discursos descolonizadores* Buenos Aires: Tinta Limón y Retazos.

Roshanravan, Shireen. 2014. "Motivating Coalition: Women of Color and Epistemic Disobedience." *Hypatia* 29(1) (Winter): 41-58.

Santa Cruz Feminist of Color Collective. 2014. "'Building on Edge of Each Other's Battles': A Feminist of Color Multidimensional Lens." *Hypatia* 29(1) (Winter): 23-40.

Schiwy, Freya. 2010. "Decolonization and the Question of Subjectivity: Gender, Race, and Binary Thinking." In *Globalization and the Decolonial Option*, edited by Walter D. Mignolo and Arturo Escobar, 125-148. London and New York: Routledge.

Segato, Rita. 2001. "The Factor of Gender in the Yoruba Transnational Religious World." Brasilia. <http://www.scribd.com/doc/47347417/THE-FACTOR-OF-GENDER-IN-THE-YORUBA-TRANSNATIONAL-RELIGIOUS-WORLD>. Last retrieved 5/27/2014.

Segato, Rita. 2011. "Género y colonialidad: en busca de claves de lectura y de un vocabulario estratégico descolonial." In *Feminismos y poscolonialidad. Descolonizando el*

Coloniality of Gender and Power: From Postcoloniality to Decoloniality

feminismo desde y en América Latina, edited by Karina Bidaseca y Vanesa Vazquez Laba, 17–48. Buenos Aires: Godot.

Sen, Lipi Biswan. 2009. 'Sí, el subalterno puede hablar: un análisis breve de la "Nueva corónica y buen gobierno" de Felipe Guaman Poma de Ayala y los "Comentarios reales" del Inca Garcilaso de la Vega' Alicante: Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes, 475–502.

Shohat, Ella, and Stam, Robert. 2006. *Flagging Patriotism*. New York: Routledge.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossber, 271–313. London: Macmillan.

Stam, Rober and Shohat, Ella. 2012. *Race in Translation*. New York: New York University Press.

Stoler, Ann Laura. 2002. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tuck, Eve, and Yang, K. Wayne. 2012. "Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1(1): 1–40.

Walsh, Catherine. 2010. "Shifting the Geopolitics of Critical Knowledge: Decolonial Thought and Cultural Studies 'Others' in the Andes." In *Globalization and the Decolonial Option*, edited by Walter D. Mignolo and Arturo Escobar, 78–93. London and New York: Routledge.

Zack, Naomi. 2005. *Inclusive feminism: a third wave theory of women's commonality*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Breny Mendoza

Breny Mendoza, Department of Gender and Women's Studies, California State University, Northridge

