
OUTLINES - CRITICAL PRACTICE STUDIES

• Vol. 14, No. 2 • 2013 • (130-159) •
<http://www.outlines.dk>

Assessing the Transformative Significance of Movements & Activism: Lessons from *A Postcapitalist Politics*

Dorothy Holland & Diana Gómez Correal

Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill,
North Carolina, USA

Abstract

How do researchers and/or practitioners know when change efforts are bringing about significant transformation? Here we draw on a theory of change put forward by the feminist economic geographers, Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson. Proposing “a postcapitalist politics” that builds on possibility rather than probability, they direct theoretical attention and community engaged action research to recognizing and supporting non-capitalist economic practices and sensibilities that already exist despite the dominance of capitalism that keeps them hidden and ignored and to understanding the “reluctant subject” of change efforts. We enter into a conversation with their theory of change by inferring criteria for assessing significance and using those criteria in dialogue with two social movements we have researched: the feminist movement in Bogotá in the 1970s and 1980s and the contemporary local food movement in North Carolina. Lessons from these movements, in turn, help refine the criteria. Gibson-Graham are unusual – and consequently resonant with cultural-historical activity theory and related social practice theories of identity – in that they bring into dialogue theorists of the political and those interested in embodiment and the micro-politics of everyday life enabling both to better understand and support conditions for positive social and economic transformation.

Introduction

In their ground-breaking book, *A Postcapitalist Politics*, the feminist economic geographers writing as the collective Gibson-Graham (2006), build on second-wave feminist thinking and ten years of community-engaged research/action to present an expansive politics for change. The authors, in a move remarkable for theorists of political economy and the political, pay close attention to the micro-politics of social and economic change, to the processes of embodiment and subjectivation that go on in local spaces of practice and, though less examined in their book, to the self-authoring and cultural

production that shape history-in-person and contribute to the formation of intimate and collective identities (Holland et al., 1998). We see in their work a general theory of the necessary elements of significant, ground-up social and economic change that resonates with our findings and we draw upon their book to infer a set of criteria that can be used by activists and academics alike to assess and reflect upon the significance of a given social movement. We enter into a conversation with Gibson-Graham using the inferred criteria to assess the significance and lessons of the feminist movement in Bogotá in the 1970s and 1980s and the contemporary local food movement in North Carolina.¹

Apropos the articles in this special volume, Gibson-Graham not only conducted community engaged research, they brought the lessons from their participatory research back into academic theory, modelling a transformative activist stance toward the production and circulation of socio-critical knowledge. We, too, take such a stance both in conceptualizing human development and change and in understanding the transformative potential of social science: We see our efforts as resonant with those of other researchers/activists who use their activism and disciplinary training—anthropology in our case—to produce socio-critical knowledge that contributes to a “collaborative historical becoming” (Stetsenko 2008:471) through on-going efforts to build a just and equal society (Stetsenko 2008:471, Langemeyer and Schmachtel-Maxfield this issue, Langemeyer 2011:156).² Our first goal is to develop an analysis that can be used for reflection by participants in contemporary feminist and local food movements.³ As argued in Casas-Cortés, et al. (2008), we recognize social movements and activism as producing socio-critical knowledge alongside, sometimes with, sometimes against, researchers. In tandem with the first, our second goal is to establish and develop the “criteria” derived from Gibson-Graham’s work and ours as an aid for discussion among researchers and activists about the social and economic significance of any change effort especially those undertaken by social movements.

Criteria for Assessing Significance: A “Politics of Possibility” Theory of Change

Gibson-Graham’s 2006 book, *A Postcapitalist Politics*, is a response to what some intellectuals have named “a crisis of the model of civilization” (Santos, 2006). Working in

¹ An earlier version of this paper was presented in the invited session: “Capitalism, Feminism, and the Politics of the Possible: Engaged Research in Honor of J.K. Gibson-Graham” at the November 2011, American Anthropological Association conference, Montreal. We are grateful for the questions and comments posed by panel’s organizer, Joshua Fisher, the discussants and audience, by Don Nonini, Jennifer Walker, and Justine Williams, by Ines Langemeyer and Stefanie Schmachtel-Maxfield, and an anonymous reviewer. Alice Brooke Wilson, a movement activist and an accomplished scholar of agrarian movements, has been an especially important teacher and interlocutor for the section on the local food movement. Our revisions will not satisfy all their concerns, but the article is stronger for the comments.

² Note that these societal goals are not conceptualized as having a universal content. As the editors wrote in their call for the special issue: “It [the socio-critical science] needs to be developed, as Vygotsky maintains, in many contexts and by many people. There is no predetermined objective and no ultimate solution. We need to be dialecticians – addressing the challenges of a changing world each time anew.

³ We also take responsibility for circulating our comments to activists.

that context, looking for options, Gibson-Graham proposed a politics that not only aims to challenge the hegemony of capitalism as an economic system, but also to think about politics in a different way—as a politics of possibility. Both of these objectives entail a vision of social transformation that challenges the perspectives and actors heard from most often—those from the Left and the academy—in discussions about social movements. A message of the book is that counter to the usual view from the Left, the transformation will not be only or mainly the result of predetermined changes in the “context” or “structural conditions” and that it is not necessary to wait for a full transformation of the capitalist system. Drawing instead on ideas emerging from the World Social Forums and from movements such as the feminist and Zapatista movements, Gibson-Graham focuses more on possibility than on probability, on acting ourselves into alternative worlds. They believe in the paths that hope, dream and utopia open for those that have been situated *abajo y a la izquierda* (from below and to the left as the Zapatistas positioned themselves).

Bypassing older ideas of how the social transformation of capitalism might occur, Gibson-Graham proposes a new ontological framework that goes beyond modernist conceptions. They recognize in the Zapatista and other movements the emergence of a new political imaginary. This new political imaginary entails a progressive politics, a reconfiguration of the subject’s position and role, as well as a shift in the grounds for assessing the efficacy of political movements and initiatives (2006: xix). They emphasize, in contrast to waiting until control of the state is secured, practicing a politics of the here-and-now. In order to construct alternatives, non-capitalist economies must be enacted in the present (2006: xxi) so as to enable processes of becoming in place.

Gibson-Graham’s tripartite political vision includes a politics of language, a politics of the subject, and a politics of collective action. These politics are aimed at destabilizing capitalism in the first place by crediting the poststructuralist recognition of the importance of discourse. They insist on denaturalizing the “economy” and the dominance of capitalist discourse. This process entails re-theorizing capitalism and seeing economic difference in a double move that 1) acknowledges the existence of economic alternatives left invisible by a hegemonic ontology that admits only capitalism as the sole, current economic possibility, and 2) supports the emergence and expansion of alternatives through the development of a language of economic difference. Liberating and cultivating ‘non-capitalist’ economic practices involves “widening the field of intelligibility to enlarge the scope of possibility”, while at the same time dislocating the (discursive) dominance of capitalism (2006: xxxiv).

For Gibson-Graham, besides the need for a new language of economy, there is need for new selves and new practices. Destabilizing capitalism requires the self-cultivation of subjects who have greater openness to change and who can desire and enact other economies. Determined not to reify “capitalism” as academics are accustomed to doing and always vigilant for likely human experimentation and diversity, the authors nonetheless recognize the attachments and on-going seductions of capitalist practices and discourses; they devote considerable attention to the “reluctant subject” (the would-be convert—whether community member or theorist—who has trouble letting go of capitalist discourses and subjectivities). They theorize the need for practices of ethical commitment and self-transformation to help the subject overcome attachments to the old economy.

Finally, with regard to collective action, there must be a collaborative pursuit of economic experimentation both within the community and more broadly with supporters from beyond the community such as academic researchers (2006: xxiii).

To reiterate: Gibson-Graham are unusual—and consequently resonant with cultural-historical activity theory and related social practice theories of identity—in that they bring into dialogue theorists of the political and those interested in embodiment and the micro-politics of everyday life enabling both to better understand and support conditions for positive social and economic transformation.

The Criteria

Nowhere in *A Postcapitalist Politics* does Gibson-Graham distil what they consider to be key elements of social and economic transformation. In the interest of promoting reflection on change efforts, we have inferred such a list from their theoretical arguments and from their discussions and rationales for the community engaged research and interventions they conducted. Briefly stated, social change activated by those in less powerful positions depends upon a critical mass becoming mindful of their discontent and concerned to act upon that dissatisfaction. The criteria spell out the shifts theorized as crucial to this process of politicization and change.⁴ (See Table 1.)

Table 1: Key Elements of Social & Economic Transformation As Derived from Gibson-Graham's *A Postcapitalist Politics*

Must occur for a critical mass undergoing politicization:
1. Recognition of a structure of domination, some of its elements or at least critical reflection on a crisis of the status quo and its interrelation with other structures of domination
2. Identification and enactment of a politics of possibility
3. Creation of alternative discourses/visions
4. Orientation to a collective and a building of community – an “us”
5. Changes made in daily life and everyday practices
6. Cultivation of subjects with the desires and capacities for sociability, happiness & action offered by alternative social and economic arrangements
7. Ethical commitment and self-cultivation
8. Shifts in subjectivities and identities

⁴ Some US readers associate “politics” and “politicization” primarily with the disgraced behaviour that currently characterizes US politicians in state and federal arenas. Here, in accord with the feminist theory that Gibson-Graham and others employ, we use the terms more broadly. These broader terms encompass efforts to change federal policy, but also struggles in inter-personal and intra-personal arenas as well.

Although the Gibson-Graham book focuses on a *postcapitalist* politics, we have read the elements of transformation as a pathway to significant change no matter what the domain. We are thinking then of a “Post X Politics” where “X” in Diana Gómez’s case is a “post patriarchal” politics and, in Dorothy Holland’s case, a “post agro-industrial” politics.⁵ Using the Gibson-Graham list of critical elements for transformative social change, we consider the extent to which the feminists active in the Bogotá of the 1970s and 1980s brought about significant change in the patriarchal gender relations they confronted. In the case of the contemporary food activists in North Carolina, we debate the extent to which they have undertaken a politics of possibility and significantly transformed the social and economic arrangements of the food system.

In the following we bring our respective cases into dialogue with the criteria and in comparison to each other asking how well the criteria help us assess the significance of the change efforts. We conclude by asking to what degree the Gibson-Graham criteria themselves fall short. The most common criticism of the Gibson-Graham book is that it pays too much attention to agency and insufficiently accounts for the dialectical relationship between it and structure. In the conclusions, in the face of a common difficulty—one that has to do with structural constraints that we encountered in the two vastly different cases we analysed--we suggest two additional criteria.

The Feminist Movement in Bogotá in the 1970s and 1980s

As a part of the women’s movement and other social movements in Colombia, I (Diana Gómez) started my master research in 2003.⁶ I focused on the formation and trajectories of the second wave of the feminist movement in Bogotá, the capital of Colombia. Situated in the 21st century, I decided to look toward the past, and with questions relevant for the present, explore the processes of politicization of women who identified themselves as feminists, their contributions to the Colombian society, their main goals and demands, and their internal discussions. I decided to concentrate my attention on the processes of politicization and on the trajectories of the movement in order to comprehend how the feminists of the period contributed to social change.

I understand politicization as the process by which women identify their subordination and exclusion, and “decide” to transform collectively that reality. Although social change and transformation are intrinsic parts of society, I am interested in social transformation that moves toward emancipation. Emancipatory social transformation is the result of a process, and, as Gutiérrez (2012) enunciates, it implies breaking a relationship of subjection. In this sense, emancipation always requires critical subjects. I am following the notion of

⁵ I.e., we have highlighted the *processes* necessary for significant change. Another route would be to (also) infer a list of achievements specified by *content*. See, for example, the Community Economies Collective website--www.communityeconomies.org which moves toward inferring the key content features that Gibson-Graham considered necessary for a post capitalist economy.

⁶ In 2011, a revised version of the thesis was published as a book by the Universidad Nacional de Colombia, under the title *Dinámicas del movimiento feminista bogotano: vivencias de cuarto, salón y calle, historias de vida. 1970-1991*. [Dynamics of the Feminist Movement of Bogotá: Experiences of the Bedroom, Living Room, and the Street] (Gómez 2011). The book reconstructs the history of the movement through the life histories of ten feminists.

reflexive emancipation (x emancipates herself from y) that Gutiérrez proposes. As the author states, emancipation “is the recurrent upheaval and escape from what is imposed on us as actuality and destiny” (2012: 57). Therefore, it is a permanent process that always requires critical subjects.

In dialogue with Gibson-Graham’s contribution, I first briefly describe the feminist movement of the 1970s and 1980s; then I identify the criteria for social change from Gibson-Graham that play a significant role in this movement, concentrating mainly on two of them; and finally I situate the movement in a broader context that further illuminates the success and failures of the movement in bringing about social change.

Becoming feminist/s

Some of Gibson-Graham key elements for social transformation are present in the history of the second wave of feminism in Bogotá. Especially important is **shifts in subjectivities and identities** (criterion #8). Women’s gender identities, products as they were of specific spaces of practice, personal trajectories and figured worlds (Holland, et al. 1998) and “imaginaries” of womanhood, started to undergo transformation in the beginning of the 1970s. Activists were creating new political activities that entertained circulating feminist discourses (criteria #2, 3). This process of personal and collective becoming started with the recognition in the feminists’ own lives, or in the lives of women close to them, of the consequences of being female in a patriarchal society.

They observed this reality not only in their homes, schools and neighborhoods, but also in the Leftist political parties and in movements that were part of a counter-hegemonic terrain in the 1970s in Colombia. In addition, for many of these women their first romantic relationships inevitably raised questions about equality between genders. They quickly found that the scripts of patriarchy were still reproduced in those men who seemed to be more politically progressive. Thus, feminists recognized through their **critical reflection on the status quo** the existence of a concrete **structure of domination and some of its central elements** (criterion #1) between the genders.

During the 1970s, feminists spent time with other women in the context of consciousness-raising groups. The circulation of feminist discourses was essential in this new political activity for verbalizing, explaining and historicizing women’s domination (criteria #2, 3). In these encounters with similar “Others”, they started to recognize the existence of a collective experience of historical discrimination and to denaturalize women’s oppression. The encounter with other women made possible the enunciation and construction of a **collective “us”** (criterion #4) that entailed political struggle, social mobilization and commitment to change. Self-recognition as a feminist implied making a decision to pursue change, which at the same time involved a process of awareness. As some of the feminists stated:

“[The activities of consciousness raising groups]... consisted in reading, testimonies, discussions ... [of how some of us] understood each topic, how each of us live them ... For me, this were really important ... In our political movement we achieved meetings exclusively for militant women. Just for that, to be able to tell stories, to be able to talk about daily life” (Ramírez interview 2007).

“Self-awareness was something really difficult because it was to look ... inwards and to take all those patriarchal things, acknowledge all the patriarchal things that we had within our bone marrow, and to do a critique and be conscious. I think it is wonderful. It is like doing

psychoanalysis, but collectively, and they were really hard experiences. There were all types of novel things, exercises, psychodramas ... and really profound things were removed and some really profound damage emerged because all was an experimentation” (Riascos interview 2007).

“... We started to talk about our lives, of when our period came for the first time, of what we felt, what we thought, about love relationships, we talked about absolutely everything. It was like therapy. Then we made conclusions and started to see that it was not a problem that I was clumsy in my affective relationships, that I did not find the right man but that there were not right men. About sexual life... we started to reflect about the right to orgasm, the right to pleasure ... But that for the Left was a scandal ... Thus, we, in the consciousness raising groups, learned to reflect about our lives... In that moment, we just narrated our lives and felt what our lives were worth; it gave us a lot of affirmation, but it also allowed a reflection about many things... At that moment, it was very much in vogue corporeal recognition and exploration. We obtained many of those tools to make an auto exam ... and then we did exercises with women in stretchers in order to look at our bodies, to see our uterus, our vulvas ... because we discover that we have not observed those things and that it was a serious problem” (Quiñónez interview 2006).⁷

During this process of becoming, the **daily lives** (criterion #5) of feminists began to be transformed. They opted for less conventional romantic relationships; they made conscious efforts to raise their children in different ways; and they imagined and enacted new forms of politics and new types of relations between women and within feminist organizations. Becoming feminist involved the use of a specific gaze to observe the world. Through that gaze, feminists not only scrutinized the street and spaces of encounter with the Left, but also the bedroom and their own organizations.

This process of becoming was not without pain. Sometimes it signified an intensification of their existential condition. Embracing a feminist identity meant realizing the way they were culturally constructed and the fact that they themselves had reproduced patriarchy and contributed to its maintenance. Feminist awareness sometimes included a heavy conscious that interrogated almost every aspect of daily life. To question class oppression and to have “class hate” was one thing; it was another to talk about an oppression that crossed personal relations marked by love and symbolic and material dependence.

Lessons from the Movement

The feminists of the 1970s and 1980s movement learned that change is a difficult process in many ways. They provide us with at least three important reflections relevant to the criteria presented in Table 1. The first is about subjective transformation, the second about power, and the last about the significance of structure and context for social transformation. The amended table we present at the end of the article reflects these dialogues of our findings with the Gibson-Graham criteria.

Violeta says:

⁷ These lines make evident that criteria # 6 and #7 were a central part of the feminist movement in Bogotá. These criteria refer to the cultivation of new subjects; and ethical commitment and self-cultivation. Both of them are the result of long processes and in the case of the feminist movement implied important challenges for the movement that I discuss later.

“I was very subordinate ... affectively. [He] played a really important affective role for me, both sexually and emotionally. The patriarch was almost always there, but my conviction was also present to be able to transform the patriarch... I believe that I was always seeing the patriarchal signs with... the eyes of amorousness ... I believe that my relationship with him... was a relationship in which in everything that was not fundamental I ended up giving... I think I developed fears ... subtle fears, fears of skin ... I believe I was a really subordinate woman in the emotional dimension ... Feminism allowed me to consolidate my desire for autonomy, but not to change the deeper relation of subordination with him, no ... The feminist’s theories did not allow me to experience affect in other ways; I had the theories but I lived affect as my history needed it ... When I discovered myself as subordinate as I was, I reached to think that theories were not useful for anything ... I did not have the change that I imagined for my love relationship” (Violeta Interview).⁸

For feminists, changes in daily life were central (criterion #5), and led to transformation of their personal identities. Notwithstanding, as Violeta mentions, cultivation of self as a new subject was not an easy process. Thus, challenges to discourses of transformation that emphasize subject and personal change emerged. Identity and subjective construction are not mainly or solely a conscious and voluntary process. As subjects we undergo long periods of construction by the discourses that enable certain structures of domination – in this case patriarchy – and the everyday practices that make them possible. To counteract the impacts of these discourses on our subjectivities and identities is not a simple process; it requires as the feminist movement realized, at least partially, individual and collective reflection.

Subjective transformation is not an autonomous project since it involves others, some of whom hold power in the very structures of domination we aim to eliminate. For the emergence of new subjectivities it is not enough to declare the necessity of personal transformation or even a change one’s practices. Nor is it useful to postulate a single feminist identity, as was common in the second wave of feminism. In my analysis, the construction of new ethical subjects requires acknowledging the many possibilities of being feminist and the specific necessities and desires of each woman. In the case of the movement, the construction and reinforcement of a universal feminist subject was problematic. It led to the failure of some diverse *becomings* making them less successful and enjoyable and more heavy and painful than they needed to be. Thus, the 6th criterion should not be understood as the cultivation of one specific subject, rather it implies the cultivation of a plurality of subject possibilities.

On the other hand, and this is a second reflection about transformation, all subjects hold power and power constructs subjects. In consequence the transformation of feminist subjectivities inevitably has to include a reflection on the power that women perform in their relations with men and other women; the kinds of power and practices feminists have interiorized; the manners in which patriarchal power and other powers construct women and are reproduced; and the ways in which an “emancipatory” power can be used.

Although the feminist activists of the 1970s and 1980s openly discussed power relationships and criticized traditional political practices and methodologies, followed

⁸ For me the protection of identity of the women I interviewed was important. I used the pseudonym of Violeta when I considered it necessary to hide their identities. Violeta, purple in English, is the color of feminism and is the name that I gave to the collective subject of the second wave of feminism in Bogotá.

principles such as horizontality, autonomy, and collective construction, and used methodologies that encouraged the participation of all women under equal conditions; they reproduced in subtle ways “traditional” power relationships.

The feminist gaze was used to analyze and condemn the reproduction of power within their organizations, which sometimes made the meetings and the interactions between participants arduous. During this second wave of feminism, women demonized hierarchical kinds of power without openly acknowledging that they themselves desired to “have power,” that power is productive and can be so in a “positive” way. They also forgot the collective dimension of power, the “emancipatory” power that contains the dimension of “I can”, “you can”, “we can”. Two of the feminists that I interviewed made clear the kind of discussions about power that were present in the movement and the way they conceptualized it:

“The main discussions of the Colectivo [de mujeres de Bogotá] were about the organizational structures of the women movement; thus it became a common reflection that a feminist named “the tyranny of structurelessness.” All of us accepted the story, I especially swallowed it, that we would be able to make a difference in the patriarchal structures of Leftist’s parties, in the patriarchal structures of syndicalism, and in the patriarchal structures of the State, that [we] would be able to create a structure without power and without the existence of hierarchies” (Quiñónez interview 2007).

“Knowledge is elitist ... and it was a point of strong discussion and it continues to be... There were power rivalries for knowledge but also rivalries for styles ... There were crises of that which we never talk about, there were relationships of power of which I have not told you, such as the power of academic knowledge and the power of the quotidian knowledge” (Barreto interview 2007).

As Valcárcel (1997) states, those who acquire symbolic and material power to which they were previously denied access, do not want to lose it. Fanon’s (1961) idea that the dominated want to be like the dominant is evident in the history of second wave feminism in Bogotá. From my perspective “desire for the power of the dominant” is a dimension of power that should be addressed in the constitution of new subjects and in political practice. This analysis, even today, is almost absent in feminist political struggles and in general in the Left. We need to acknowledge that power is something that is difficult to perceive and to transform, that it is not enough to name it or simply admit its existence. It is mandatory to comprehend that all subjects have power, and that subjectivity can only be transformed if the range of powers that constitute us as subjects are addressed.

The third reflection concerns contexts and the structural features of Colombia as a modern/colonial territory. Born in the midst of injustices, social movements look to transform a reality that is perceived as unfair. These injustices are the product of a concrete context and reality; they result in the interaction between structure and agency that creates specific arrangements. These arrangements sometimes potentiate and other times limit the struggles of the movement. To grasp the achievements of the feminist movement it is necessary to comprehend the context in which it took place, as well as to consider its consequences carefully in order to avoid misrecognizing important contributions to social change. The next segment of my analysis is addressed to the context and its relationship to identity construction and subjective transformation and to the ways in which the context affected the politics of feminism. The politics of feminism is constituted by its demands and actions, as well as the internal dynamics of the

organizations that are part of the movement. These three aspects, context, identity construction and subjective transformation, shed light on the limitations of the significance of the movement for social emancipatory transformation.

The second wave of the feminist movement in Bogotá unfolded in a conservative country strongly influenced by the Catholic Church. The Concordat – the agreement between the Church and the state which gave the Church the power to decide the educational content of the public schools and the right to regulate marriage-related issues and civil legislation – was in effect until 1991. During the two preceding decades throughout which the feminist movement emerged, Colombia was also characterized by the cultural configuration of a patriarchal society with specific gender roles that subordinated women in multiple spheres of life. The conservative and violent character of the Colombian society intensified this social formation.

Colombia has been marked by violence since the constitution of the Nation-state, and even before that.⁹ In decolonial terms, the country is an expression of a modern/colonial system (Quijano 2007, Escobar 2007, Mignolo 2009), which emerged with the Conquest of the New World by Europeans. Colombia has also been characterized as having constituted a “genocidal” (Giraldo 1996) and “illiberal democracy” (Zakaria 1997), in which the State committed human rights violations and excluded a significant segment of the population from democratic competition.

At the same time, during the second half of the 20th century, the country lived a process of modernization that opened up possibilities for women alongside the gains of the first wave of the feminist movement. This first wave achieved equal access for both sexes to secondary and high education and opened up spaces in the political arena and the job market for women especially those of high and middle classes. These changes enabled a significant number of women to join the political opposition in the 1970s, a decade that witnessed the appearance of the New Left and an important articulation of a variety of social movement struggles in the country.

Since the 1960s, Colombia has experienced academic and political debates as well as the influence of social movements and revolutionary processes reaching its boundaries from around the world including May 1968 from Europe, the movements against Vietnam War, and the Cuban and Sandinista revolutions. These two factors impacted the intellectual and political life of the generation of women who were born around the end of the first half of the 20th century. It was into this complex, multi-stranded context that feminist discourses started to circulate in Colombia at the very beginning of the 1970s.

⁹ After a period called “Violence” in which the two traditional parties: the Conservative and the Liberal lived in armed confrontation between one another around the country, a political pact - “El Frente Nacional” (National Front) – was signed between the two parties for the period of 1958-1974. This pact excluded the Left and all other alternative affiliations from the legal political arena. This exclusion continued informally with some small openings of the system until the declaration of the New Constitution of 1991. In that context, leftist guerrilla groups started to appear in 1964, followed by a more organized crack down by the State on political alternatives in the 1970s. Drug trafficking also led to violence during this period, as did more formalized paramilitaries. This violence took place under the Doctrine of National Security and the idea of “the internal enemy” that consolidated during the Cold War.

Because the feminist movement was localized in Bogotá, the capital of the country, and not the smaller cities or rural areas, it had access to a vigorous intellectual and political life, a more liberal culture, and certain privileges that a centralized State implied. It had, for instance, access to financial support and a more direct interlocution with State's institutions.

The national, international and local contexts all favoured the constitution of the movement, and both empowered and limited feminists' struggles. Thus, the gains of the first feminist wave, the participation of women in the Left during the 60s and 70s, the conditions providing for Colombia's modernization and the resources of Bogotá as the capital of the country, as well as the circulation in Latin America of discourses of second wave feminists, among other conditions, allowed the development of the second wave in Bogotá.

In a system first formally and then informally closed to all political alternatives other than the conservative and liberal parties, feminists became active on counter hegemonic political terrain. During this period of time—the 1970s and 1980s, feminists availed themselves of some of the “windows of opportunity”¹⁰ that the system offered in order to maintain for Colombia the label and status of “democracy.” The Colombian government adopted some of the internationally popular legislation for women and associated public policies. Women were able to participate during President Betancur's period (1982-1986), in the peace negotiation process. There was a slow democratic opening in the 1980s, and the formulation of the New Constitution of 1991.

Through their efforts in these developments feminists achieved important goals that contributed to the improvement of the situation of women in the country. However, the goals most threatening to the patriarchy were difficult to reach. Women's demand for the right to abortion, for example, was impossible to realize during these two decades. The conservative and patriarchal character of the society, as reified by the State, made it impossible for women to decide when to have children and to autonomously manage their bodies.

When analyzing the success of a movement it is important to realize the scope of its demands. In the case of the feminist movement we have to acknowledge its demands for a deeper transformation. Feminists “dreamed” of a completely different world, a world in which the relationships and logics that made women's oppression possible no longer existed. They wanted changes in intimate spaces, in institutions such as the school, in family relations, and in disciplines such as economics, medicine, and psychology that misrecognized and/or pathologized them.

The “new” world was difficult to achieve not only because of the challenging nature of feminists claims, but also because of Colombia's particularities and the fact that feminists were not able to escape the structures of domination that produced the discriminations, oppressions, powers, and violence that they aimed to eliminate. In relation to Colombia's

¹⁰ This idea resonates with the notion of political opportunity structure developed by Sidney Tarrow and other authors. I use this concept in my conceptualization of reality as resulting from the interaction between agency and structure. The “windows of opportunity” are not understood here as concessions of hegemonic subjects, but as the result of tensions in contentious time-spaces.

specificities, feminists' political practice was crossed by the political culture of the country—a culture generated by a patchwork quilt of local fiefdoms governed by clientelistic logics. The Colombian State and traditional political parties had only a limited role in the orientation and mediation of difference in the society (Archila 2003). What was won for the segments of society in power was not necessarily won for the entire population. Though feminists of the second wave did not participate in the traditional parties, their struggles developed in that scenario. Their politics were affected and influenced by the logics of participation and representation characteristics of Colombian democracy as reflected by the parties.

The same dynamic characterized the relationship that feminists had with the Left. While the Left made important contributions to the politicization and democratization of Colombia, some of its logics and discussions impacted the feminist movement negatively. Leftist parties contributed to the increasing polarization around the armed struggle in the country and to the growing popular contempt and distrust of “democracy” and the State. The Colombian Left was embedded in a historical theology and an orthodox reading of reality that was marked by the idea of the *elected subject* who would lead the revolution. It was authoritarian with its grassroots organizations often undergoing subordination and exploitation (Múnera 1998). Also sectarian, the Left had difficulty finding points of commonality and reaching a consensus. This Left, the part of the political spectrum to which the feminists were the closest, was also myopic with respect to the demands of other historically neglected subjects such as the indigenous population, Afro-descendants, women and non-heterosexual people. These issues often generated conflicts in these movements with stagnation rather than advance a frequent outcome of their struggles.

Additionally, Colombia has a history of turning a blind eye to difference favoring violence as a frequent tool of negation. It is an example of a modern/colonial place. Focusing on the promises that modernity brought to them, trapped in the context of violence that has characterized modern/colonial Colombia and affected by other aspects of the broader context that I described, the feminists of the 1970s and 1980s were unable to solve some of the internal conflicts shaping the dynamics of their movement. This situation debilitated their strength as a political actor.¹¹

In order to understand the successes and limitations of the movement in generating social change it is essential to discuss the organizational dynamics of the movement, and its internal contradictions. Some of these internal contradictions had to do with the structure of the organizations and the movement, the uses of power within them, the treatment of differences, the discussions around “double-militancy”,¹² the definition of what is to be a feminist (the “us”), and the conceptions of politics and change.

Notions from the Left infused the dynamics within the feminist movement in diverse ways. In part, the feminists replicated the idea of the “elected subject” in their conception of a feminist. The feminist was conceived as the “real revolutionary subject”, the true agent of change, the one who had the truth and worked to spread it. Feminists replicated

¹¹ For example, during the formulation of the New Constitution some of the internal debates caused a division within the movement that from my perspective weakened their political force at this important juncture.

¹² Double militancy (*doble militancia*) was the phrase that feminists coined to refer to participation in both the Left and the feminist movement.

the idea of a universal woman, which often prevented them from recognizing the diversity of women (black, indigenous, poor)¹³ and thus the diversity of exclusions and experiences that being a woman implied. In this process, some differences were translated as inequalities and/or made invisible. The movement was blind to the negative loadings of skin color, ethnic membership and geographical origin that figured into inequality. Nor were inequalities related to class membership and access to knowledge (and its associated power) sufficiently recognized and openly debated as sources of conflict.

Class discourse generated and polarized intra- and inter-movement dynamics. First and foremost, the Left argued that class struggle was central; changes for women would materialize after the revolution. Second, especially for feminists of the double militancy, it was important to include as many women as possible in the feminist movement, particularly those women “oppressed” for their class position. Third, in a move away from discussions around class, parts of the movement edged far away from the Left, generating a feminism extremely centered on itself.

Class, a structural feature of the larger society, generated limitations for the movement. Leftist parties used the class discourse to divide women’s demands. It was easy to equate feminism with tendencies of the “bourgeoisie”, and so transform feminist demands into object of dispute. But it was not only about class but also about power between the genders. The parties within the Left were not abstract entities; they were real women and men with the latter of the two controlling political decisions and having certain privileges at stake.¹⁴ On the other hand, although feminism is a rebel daughter of modernity, feminists were “trapped” in the limitations that the modern discourse supposes for emancipation, such as the idea of a universal subject.

Even though feminists across the board recognized one structure of domination – patriarchy – they lacked consensus about the other structures of domination that needed to be addressed. The debate around double-militancy replicated a dichotomist vision of reality that riveted attention on the oppressive pair of class/gender. One of the teachings of feminism after this second wave has been that many women experience a range of oppressions and that the entire set must be considered. In these senses, I see the movement as limited by their unquestioning acceptance of the modern/colonial system. For social change to occur it is important not only to recognize the closest structure of domination, but also how it is interrelated with others and the kind of oppression they configure together.

Here, in the case of feminism in Latin America, it is important to reflect on the ways in which the modern/colonial system has shaped the construction of subjectivities and the kind of powers it generates. The way feminists faced their conflicts not only replicated Colombian “political culture” but also the frameworks in which they had been constituted

¹³ Because of their connections with the Left they did pay attention to poor women. This work with the “popular sectors” was not far from the Leftist idea of a “revolutionary vanguard,” something not exclusive to the feminists of the double militancy.

¹⁴ Men on the Left disliked women’s challenges to their hegemony and power, something that in a patriarchal society they had. They did not like feminist demands because they impacted gender configurations not only in the parties, but also in the streets, in the bedrooms, and in other spaces where they daily related to women.

as subjects through patriarchal culture as well as the way in which power had been constructed in the historically particular modernity/coloniality that Colombia represents.

Summarizing: The experience of the second wave of feminists in Bogotá shows a process of becoming feminist that is in itself a political and ethical decision and transformation on intimate terrain. While there are some identifiable elements in the becoming, it is neither a linear nor complete process. The processes of subjective transformation and the cultivation of ethical subjects entailed personal confrontations, sometimes pain, rage, laziness and discouragement; the deconstruction of imaginaries, discourses, and practices; and the desire to hold the power that oppresses. Overall, personal transformation was a slow process, that had to be addressed daily, in the interaction with the material, in the transformation of spaces and roles, and in the reshaping of cultural imaginaries.

Any social change also supposes a politics of politics, a critical view of what we are doing as social movements or as a community in the fulfillment of certain intentions. This politics of politics entails questions about women and men's constitution as gendered subjects and as political subjects. This subject constitution includes the ways we interiorize the power that dominated us as a part of our identity. It requires a conscious questioning and practicing of how to deconstruct those kinds of subjectivities and powers for domination, and how to construct new ones for emancipation. If we are imagining new worlds, we must imagine new subjects, alternative forms of power and the ways those subjects will be constructed.

Social movements, from my perspective, must attend not only to the arguably reductionist psychodynamic processes of identity and subjective change that Gibson-Graham emphasized, but also to an analysis of how subjects are constructed beyond psychodynamic forces in relation to power. Questions such as the following are important: how have power and certain structures of domination constructed subjects? How can we change this logic of domination? How do the identities of subordinates emerge in daily life and in our political life? I call for reflections that help each movement and individuals find their own "methodologies" for a dynamic and plural process of becoming. Therefore, what I construe as significant change—social emancipatory transformation, implies a dialectical conversation between discourses and practices that impact social movement's actions and identity.

This dialectical conversation is something that movements frequently fail to carry out in relation to subjectivity and power. Feminists have been one of the main political actors to make struggles with identity and subjective transformation central to their movement. Likewise they have focused on power. Nonetheless, feminist movements continue to preempt such discussions too soon; they need to produce more knowledge about the *how* of these processes and elements that are constituent of personal and collective lives. In the dialectical interaction between discourses and practices attention to the ways in which structures of domination and the power relationships that constituted them are being recoded and re-established to the detriment of movement goals is essential. Consequently, a dialectical conversation between context, action, the individual and the collective is also necessary.

I do not want to conclude this section without acknowledging the contributions that feminists made to the creation of a different society for Colombians, and especially for women. Profound change is a process; it is not something that societies achieve from one day to the next. The second wave of feminism transformed not only the Violetas of their

generation but also the lives of Violetas like me and of many other women, some of whom do not recognize all that the feminists have done for our gender and for the politicization of Colombian society. As Gibson-Graham asked: Why can feminists have a revolution now while Marxist has to wait?

Contemporary Food Activism in North Carolina

Turning from the feminist movement of the 1970s and 1980s in Bogotá, to the contemporary local food movement in North Carolina, we see a movement that is in a more formative stage and more activity-focused than analysis/reflection-centered. In danger of engulfment, the movement provokes questions about its significance: Is it simply a consumer trend generating yet another niche market with entrepreneurially inclined farmers seeking to satisfy newly emerging tastes primarily for profit? Or, is it building local food systems based on more community-economy, less capitalist, values? Is the movement fertile ground for a new systemic design for the production and distribution of food, or mere “projectism” (Alperovitz 2013) that will leave untouched the power of the global agro-industry to maximize profit regardless of hidden costs to human health and the environment? Will current food activism reduce the chronic food insecurity faced by a growing segment of the US population, or simply leave aside such issues? And, what insights emerge from a dialogue between the case and the key elements of transformation from *A Postcapitalist Politics*? Drawing primarily on recently completed research¹⁵, I (Dorothy Holland) offer some preliminary answers to these questions.

In many parts of the United States and beyond, there is heightened interest in “local food” and in the widely circulating ideas that food produced on small farms in the vicinity of its consumption is not only better tasting than that produced by the globally sourced agro-industry, but morally superior on the grounds of health, environmental and community benefits. The activism began in the US on the West Coast in the 1960s with the sustainable agriculture movement. Activists decried the global agro-industry’s gigantic scale, heavy petroleum-based inputs, widespread labor exploitation, environmental degradation, confined animal feeding operations, and significant contribution to diet-related health issues. Some twenty years later, the “community food security movement” emerged, also in California. This second strand focused on community-level challenges to food sufficiency and sought better food for those of limited means. North Carolina began to develop as a significant site of food activism in the late 1990s with alternative food organizations (AFOs) developing in various urban areas and some smaller locales.¹⁶

¹⁵ The team, led by Donald Nonini and me, included Sarah Johnson, Marilyn Marks, Patrick Linder, Kevin McDonough, Jennifer Walker, Hollis Wild, Willie Wright, Jasper Lynch and Carol Lewald. The team enabled the analysis here, and many of the ideas have come from our discussions. A co-authored book is in process. Thanks also go to the National Science Foundation for funding (BCS-0922229) and to those in the four sites who put up with the questions and presence of ethnographers at their events.

¹⁶ The second, smaller strand of the movement has not been widely replicated in North Carolina. Further, a pivotal national group, the Community Food Security Coalition, disbanded in 2012. Because we inventoried food activism in each site as opposed to concentrating on a particular AFO, we learned about activism directed at rebuilding local food systems *and* about activism directed the food insecure. Faith-based groups conducted most of the latter.

The Local Food Movement Through the Lens of the Gibson-Graham Criteria

In contrast to the feminist movement, **structures of domination** important in criterion #1 of the Gibson-Graham list received little collective attention in the local food movement in our sites. Concurrently, activities related to escaping the subjective effects of hegemonic structures through **self-cultivation** (criterion #7) were not in evidence. I begin by discussing the soft-pedaling of talk about the global agro-industry and the practice, nonetheless, of a flourishing **politics of possibility** (criterion #2).

Collectively, activists were working hard to increase the availability of local food. They were enthusiastically organizing a range of vibrant local food-related activities, most prominently farmer's markets, community supported agriculture arrangements (CSAs), campaigns to expand markets for local food to area restaurants, schools and hospitals, farm tours and other educational events, and community and school gardens. And yet, contrary to what might be expected from the Gibson-Graham criteria, we heard few discussions in activist meetings or community events about the agro-industry dominated food regime.¹⁷ No one seemed to require a dismantling of the self-congratulatory discourses of the corporate food industry before she could embrace the idea that local food is better. Multiple discourses circulated about local food's positive goods including better health, denser community relations, better environmental stewardship, and more humane treatment of animals. A **politics of possibility** was palpable. There was every sense—expressed through widely circulating discourses and actions—that better food could be produced in better ways and that local efforts could make that production happen. The movement's **alternative vision** (criterion #3) and related activity held that local food systems could lessen dependency on the globally sourced agro-food industry and decrease vulnerability to its harms.

Moreover, the media and a significant portion of the public seemed to be on board. Locally produced food received good press. The food, the activities, and the imaginaries of the local food movement all had broad appeal. Farmers markets drew seemingly happy crowds; the luscious German Johnson and other heritage tomatoes sold for premium prices, and the importance of getting to “know your farmer” was frequently repeated at the events. Eating properly grown local food had become for many a marker of good taste (in both the social and gustatory senses) and positive moral value.

It was true that negative allusions to the globalized, corporatized food regime were commonplace. And it is fair to say that many who engaged in the local food activities tended to be distrusting if not antagonistic to the agro-industry and its products. Outside of meetings when giving personal interviews and commentaries many activists conveyed strong discomfort and disharmony with the contemporary food system. But, such commentaries rarely became a focus of meetings or the community events we witnessed. There was little or no in-depth discussion in the deliberations of the local organizations, for example, about agro-industry's domination of expectations when it comes to the seasonality of food or the material threat of contamination by the industry's genetically modified crops. Sustained critiques of structures of domination were by and large left, if spoken at all, to visiting speakers and media from the outside. Critiques were not put into

¹⁷ Apropos of the previous footnote, while local food activists were trying to bypass the global agro-industry, activists concerned about the food insecure, or, at least those engaged in social justice efforts, sought to thwart structures of inequality.

a collective *local* voice. In other words, critical examination of the consolidated agro-industry, its hold on the possibilities of the local food system, its lobbying for the farm subsidies that crowd out small farmers, and its environmental and other "externalities" received little elaboration in the alternative vision of local food. "Local" was discussed as though it were capable of creating pockets of good farming and good eating despite the machinations of the larger food regime.¹⁸

Moreover, as already alluded, there were few movement-generated activities that entailed difficult self-transformations to a new food economy as might be expected from Gibson-Graham's sixth and seventh criteria or as was abundantly evident in the feminist movement. At best, alternative values were implicit in the *performances* of those engaged in the new agricultural activities, marketing practices and projects and in the honoring and cultivation of tastes for local food and community events featuring food and agriculture.

As a result, efforts to solve problems, with few exceptions, remained within status quo economic arrangements. There was strong concern for low-resource farmers, for example, but not much thinking about how to do anything more for farmers than improve their business skills and expand their markets. There was no thinking about how a community, for example, might help small farmers obtain health insurance.¹⁹

Per criterion #7, there were **shifts in subjectivities and identities**, but not of the "reluctant subject" sort that Gibson-Graham encountered or Gómez described. Granted for farmers, the transition to new growing methods and new relationships with customers demanded shifts in subjectivity, but for the non-farmer activists and the eaters, how difficult is it to experience the superior taste of grass-fed beef or learn the exquisite differences among heritage tomatoes? In the "Lessons Learned" section below, we suggest that this relatively non-oppositionary collective stance is likely connected to the socio-historical, cultural terrain of neoliberalism on which the movement has formed.

Three of the criteria remain to be discussed. The first, **orientation to a collective and a building of community—an us**, criterion (#4), links to the capacity of the movement to undertake collective action and highlights contradictions and contentious internal differences which potentially devolve into antagonistic factions that animate one another.

Not surprisingly, voice was rarely, if ever, given to an "us" composed of everyone dependent upon and dominated by the current food regime. Instead, the "us" was set by the theme of localness. An "us" was construed around Durham, the High Country (a recognized rural area in the mountains), or some other place-based "community" or "area".

¹⁸ For most, the vision and discourses looked inward. Formal ties linking local to trans-local organizations were few. There was little take up of "civic agriculture" (Lyson 2005), for example, or other nationally circulating critical discourses as a basis for action. There were regional conferences, workshops, and speakers, but they usually addressed ideas for a new farmers markets or techniques for slaughtering chickens, for example, rather than critical analyses of structural restraints on local community economies or efforts to change bureaucratic barriers to the use of EBT (food stamps) and/or WIC (Women, Infant and Children) vouchers at farmers markets.

¹⁹ One AFO—one that was exceptional in several ways—in the western mountains did talk at several points about the need for health insurance. Their suggestions met silence in the larger community.

Against these local collectivities were arrayed several confounding divisions. The most pronounced fault lines were not between localities as might be imagined, but, reminiscent of the feminist movement in Bogotá, along culturally coded lines of class and race. The movement's principle object—locally produced food—was by definition dependent on local farmers and the market was considered, as already described, the primary means for organizing the production and distribution of local food. Thus, the (re)building of local food systems was happening amidst assumptions of market privileges for the wealthy on the one hand and their lack by those subject to structurally induced poverty on the other. And, the systems were understood to rest perforce on the economic viability of small farmers.

These wealth disparities lay at the heart of several disconnections among activists. How were the potential benefactors of the local food system to be morally prioritized? Who was the most morally deserving? Was she the small farmer dealing with economic insecurities? The low-income, single parent struggling to find good food for his kids? Or, was it the consumer with means to buy good food, but little choice beyond the tasteless and often unhealthy products of corporate agriculture?

For those focused on the availability of local food for the consumer, low-income members of the community—other than limited-resource farmers—were often out of sight and out of mind. At times, the small farmer was pitted, in effect, against the low-income person. Taken-for-granted market logic led those concerned about small farmers and small farmers themselves to seek out high-end shoppers leaving low-wealth shoppers without access to local food.²⁰ An alternative means of this moral prioritizing heard from some was the “ugly tomato” solution: sell misshapen, about-to-expire produce to low-end customers at discounted prices.

For those activists concerned about poverty, hunger and the consequences of low-cost diets, low-income people were the moral priority. Despite the lack of familiarity in the general US public with Marxist or any other conceptualization of structural forces, a number of activists in the movement did concern themselves with those affected by high rates of structurally produced food insecurity and by high incidences of obesity, diabetes and other diet-related illnesses associated with cheap, mass produced high-fructose-corn-syrup heavy diets. Those activists and others with liberal religious values felt called upon to help those in need. For some, including community members of lesser means in the rebuilding of the local food system was important. These “social justice activists” or “food justice advocates” made the low-income population an issue in mixed meetings and conferences. They made it difficult to forget those excluded from the benefits of local food because of limited means.²¹ These activists also tended to experiment with alternative economic arrangements as will be discussed shortly.

Another difficulty spawned by class issues concerned the social image of the movement. Enough high-end shoppers were sufficiently disaffected from agro-industry food that they valued alternative agriculture and desired organic and now locally grown produce and meats. The social image of these high-end shoppers, who tended to be wealthy, white, and middle- or upper-class, had become attached to the social identity of the “foodie”—

²⁰ An activist/anthropologist from one of the sites poignantly made this point in a local zine; Wilson 2009.

²¹ Some groups tried to prioritize sustainable agriculture *and* food security for low-income people.

someone who is (or aspires to be) an enthusiastic connoisseur of good food, which now includes local food. This social image, apart from expectations of high prices, tended to repel those who dis-identified with such demographics or feared being mistaken for a (want-to-be) foodie (Guthman 2008).²²

Race provided another potent division of the collective “us”. In North Carolina, and the US in general, class and race/ethnicity are entangled such that disproportionate numbers of African-Americans, Latinos and American Indians are low-income. The distinctive histories of race relationships in our sites surfaced in food activism, but a cross-site commonality involved a tendency to informal segregation. Especially in eastern North Carolina, for example, food activism tended to run on different tracks—one black, one white—especially in eastern North Carolina.

In sum, the cultural imaginaries associated with sustainable agriculture and the raced and classed “foodie” differed greatly from the imaginaries associated with food insecurity and the “food justice advocate”. There were tensions between the motivations and concerns of the two worlds as well as differences over the moral priority of supporting the small farmer versus serving those who are food insecure versus increasing the availability of local food for the consumer. These points of contradictions derived from entanglements with class and race. Despite these tensions and as might be imagined given the neoliberal cultural terrain with its blurring of power, celebration of the market, fetishisation of “choice” and deflection of structural questions, there was relatively little enunciated conflict. Participants put their energy into organizations and activities according to their interests, attractions and personal relationships and animosities. Instead of working through these contradictions, members tended to avoid conflict simply drifting away from disagreement.

The next criterion is #6, **cultivation of subjects with the desires and capacities for sociability, happiness and action offered by alternative economic arrangements**: Perhaps the most intriguing and potentially transformative edge of the local food movement we saw was its experimentation with food-related activities and practices. Some of these experiments were home grown; others such as Community Supported Agriculture (CSA) and Community Food Assessments (CFAs) had been pioneered elsewhere. Among the considerable variety, some encouraged alternative relationships to industrial food production (e.g., community gardens, container gardens); others, alternative relationships to food producers (e.g., farmers markets, CSAs); others, alternatives to food-related labor (e.g., crop mob); others, to people who were food insecure (e.g., community restaurants, plant an extra row); others, to food consumption itself (e.g., the slow food movement). Some of these practices, if sustained over time, may well become embodied and emancipatory, transforming participants’ sensitivities and sensibilities.

Indicative of openness to many possibilities, these experiments are too numerous to describe here. Nor does frequency dictate which to analyze in depth; none, at the time of

²² Political maneuvers exacerbated this connection. In national debates over free and reduced school lunches, for example, conservatives played on the “elitist” aspect of the foodie image. They charged the celebrity chefs arguing for higher school lunch budgets with trying to pass their rarefied tastes off on everyone else (Wilson and Holland 2009).

the study, had been widely adopted across the movement. A brief look at two of these will provide a sense of the range.

Community gardens were potentially the most transformative of the experiments. By engaging participants in common labor and the challenges and joys of growing food, shared gardening spaces bring people into fellowship. Significantly, the costs of using the garden space are usually low, reducing the problem of differential wealth. We learned about many projects organized around community gardens.²³ However, generalizing the results of particular gardens is unwise as they were set up in diverse ways and, even more importantly, associated with many different imaginaries. Some were conceived as spaces of rehabilitation for troubled young men. Others were created to be a source of qualities food for low-income people. Still others were expected to create collective affect with the power to build bridges across class and race/ethnicity. Another idea, more common among African-American activists, concerned re-creating a place for inter-generational knowledge transfer.

The “Crop Mob”—an organization that has since 2008 emerged in other US locations—developed in Durham. It supplied farmers and gardeners with a non-capitalist form of labor exchange and was seen by its founders as “building community through shared work.”²⁴ This organization, which emphasized that it was about doing things instead of meeting/talking, alerted its members to a crop mob event at a particular farm or garden. Those who were able showed up sometimes 20 or 30 strong to carry out the needed work. The hosting member provided a meal, but no wages. An event we witnessed on a family farm pooled labor in another unusual way. Attendees at a conference/workshop held on the farm raised a hoop house and constructed a large composting platform.

Changes made in daily life and everyday practices (Criteria #5) In 2008, sales of locally produced food in the US, had grown to \$4.8 billion. While only a fraction of the \$1.229 trillion food sales in the US (Hauter 2012), the figure does signal a change in food purchasing patterns. Activists in our sites had, at least in part, shifted their purchasing habits along these lines and activist farmers, had shifted their growing practices. Beyond those shifts, those participating in the experiments just described were plausibly changing some of their everyday practices as well.

Lessons from the Movement

Especially in comparison with Gómez’s case, the significance of the alternative food movement in North Carolina as judged by the inferred criteria is equivocal. The activism, at the time of the study, had delivered many projects of interest, but fewer achievements of significant systemic social or economic transformation than might be imagined. True, in each of our sites enormous amounts of energy had gone into (re)building the economic, material, social and cultural infrastructures necessary to supply local food markets. Activist efforts had increased the availability of locally grown produce and locally raised meat and raised awareness of the benefits of such food. Moreover, some had increased the availability of local food in the food pantries that serve the hungry. But, by and large, the

²³ Even in the site with the most rigid race relations, a retired white firefighter managed to create a community garden in a low-income, African-American neighborhood that brought together black and white gardeners.

²⁴ Quote from an unpublished manuscript by Alice Brooke Wilson on her 2009 research on the crop mob.

AFOs in our research sites had yet to address collectively systemic design issues or begin the trans-local political work necessary to protect local production from the machinations of the corporate food giants. Few activists, whether based in grassroots groups or government positions, had become engaged in mobilizing for state and national efforts to support the small and middle-sized farms that serve local and regional markets, break up monopolization by large-scale corporations of food production and distribution, ensure that genetically modified plants do not contaminate non-GM crops, regulate the dangerous over-use of antibiotics on factory farms, or otherwise pursue trans-local politics. Nor had they made substantial headway in addressing structural poverty or the ongoing racial tensions that limit local food access. These are in part the effects of trans-local institutional arrangements that intrude on local food systems.²⁵

When viewed through the lens of the Gibson-Graham criteria, the movement is puzzlingly uneven. It embraces a politics of possibility (#2), is replete with alternative discourses and visions (#3), and shifts tastes and identification (#6) to alternative practices of food, farming and community. Yet, while repugnance to the dominant food regime (#1) is voiced, there is little sense of encroachment or danger from the power of that regime to negatively interfere with local efforts. The movement could be described as not having yet coalesced around a counter-hegemonic collective identity nor developed a core set of *critical* discourses to guide its actions. At a book event in one of our sites, a leader of a national organization headquartered in North Carolina expressed frustration with the local food movement's lack of concern with structural change, disparagingly referring to it as the "Happy Food Movement".

Admittedly, it is tempting to judge the movement by the Gibson-Graham criteria and find it wanting. Yet, *A Postcapitalist Politics* cautions against discursive entrapment. We must, especially in the case of contemporary movements, use the criteria as a tool for dialogue and reflexivity, not judgment. We must leave open the possibility that the emerging local food systems and knowledges about contemporary food and farming will eventually prove significant in relation to the global agro-industry. How might this be so? As a means to probe our assumptions, I ask: How are the general conditions for activism and avenues for change during the present era different from those in the times and locales of Gibson-Graham's work and from that of the feminist movement in Bogotá in the 1970s and 1980s? In what follows, I describe styles of food activism that seem to be emerging in response to the "perverse confluence" (Dagnino 2003) that characterizes neoliberalism.

First, efforts to "make history" may now be of a more individualized character. In *Disclosing New Worlds*, Spinoza et al. (1997) theorize that in societies such as the US with capitalist markets and democratic governments the drive for change leads some entrepreneurs—by way of commercial ventures, and some activists—by means of civic action, to transformative social practice or what the authors refer to as "making history". The impetus to make history comes from individuals actively engaging in the world, experiencing "disharmonies", and working to "disclose" or clarify and create new

²⁵ Over the last decades, the use of food banks and pantries has steadily increased in North Carolina. Meanwhile, the food stream into pantries is decreasing (Berner, 2013). What happens, for example, when even more pronounced levels of hunger result as Berner and others predict they will?

products and services or new policies and programs that resolve the disharmonies. Categorized analytically as a social movement, local food activism is supposedly a collective effort; however, based on accounts of personal involvement provided in interviews from our research, the movement could be made to appear more as the myriad efforts of many loosely connected activists to make history. Given the numerous distinctive aspects of the food system that attracted AFOs and the looseness of ties between and among them, the movement could in fact be made to read more like a novel with many different, occasionally intersecting characters, plots, and sub-plots.

Many of the activists and social entrepreneurs in our research were first-time activists. They entered into creating a community restaurant, an organic farm, a farm labor-exchange, a community garden, a women's group supporting local agriculture, or a variety of other endeavors as a result of various personally experienced concerns about the safety of the food they were eating, about the people in their community who lacked sufficient food, about anticipated upcoming challenges to community food security resulting from peak oil, about the disappearance of small farms and so on. Most were middle-class, white, and often searching for something worthwhile to do or some way to "give back" to their community.

Notice that these emerging activists tended not to create or join groups with long standing, well-formed politics and analyses. Instead, if they brought elaborated moral commitments and passions to the local food movement, they brought them from elsewhere—from religious teachings about helping those in need, from civil rights and social justice backgrounds, or from free market moralities encountered in the business world. They talked excitedly about ideas from experiments they had heard about or witnessed. A chef in Western North Carolina, for example, was busy during our study developing and opening a restaurant that used local produce and meat where possible, and patrons paid whatever they could. Her account of her efforts included elements common to activists' stories. She heard a segment on National Public Radio about a community kitchen in Charlotte that trained people "pretty much on the fringe of society, a lot of them had been in prison. And they were training them in their culinary school, to be employable, and to have...self-respect, to have self worth, and to be a part of something. And I thought, 'What a great idea!'" She and two others travelled to Charlotte to tour the school. Afterwards, they invited others to a meeting and meanwhile, a member of their church brought in an article about "One World Everybody Eats" [a sliding-scale restaurant pioneered in the one of the Western states a few years earlier]. "For me, the motivation was to do something to give back to the community, but also [to have] something unique that I could participate in. It's not, ... I believe in altruism, but only in the sense that we're all trying to get something that we want to do, too, because we want to be part of something."

As with the activist chef, most of the other activists interviewed were focused on local issues and on building projects in places where they lived. They were motivated by the "disharmonies" they sensed personally—in the chef's case feelings that low-income people should have access to good food regardless of their means; that the community should be connected through cross-class ties of friendship; that she should be able to use her skills and background for morally worthwhile purposes. In order to address these disharmonies, the activists, except in a few cases (e.g., Slow Food chapters), did not affiliate with national organizations nor seek "tutoring" in discourses from regional organizations as did NC environmental and other voluntary associations in the late 1990s

(Holland et al. 2007:199-231). Instead, the local food projects were more home grown with idiosyncratic connections to projects elsewhere and varying familiarity with the websites of other food organizations. As already noted, activists were familiar with circulating speakers, books and films critiquing the global agro-industry. In addition, there were some critical discussions of the federal Farm Bill and GMOs on a state-wide listserv and Facebook postings. But, during the time of our research, those critiques did not become the focus of meetings or result in a collective local expression that entailed extra-local efforts or ties.

Second, emerging trends in activism appear to be connected to the cultural terrain of neoliberalism that is host to these new forms. Holland et al. (2007) describes research from the late 1990s on the local effects of government reformulation and economic restructuring in North Carolina. The research noted, in accord with burgeoning neoliberal developments across the country, an increasing reliance on public/private partnerships and concomitant changes in forms of activism. Non-profits were able to step into lacunae created by governmental retreat from social services and public protection. On the one hand of what Evelina Dagnino (2003) labels the “perverse confluence” of neoliberalism, the rhetoric and policies of market rule have led to ever increasing inequality, devolution to the individual of risk and responsibility for well being regardless of means or structural position, and a blurring of responsibility between government, civil society and businesses. On the other hand, possibilities have opened for non-profits to provide services based on dissenting ideologies and practices.

Ten years later, our research on the local food activism found the movement flowering profusely on an even more entrenched neoliberal cultural terrain. Some activists and especially funders were increasingly attracted to what the literature refers to as “social entrepreneurship” (Dees 2001, 2007). Such organizations were less concerned with cultivating solidarity and empowerment and/or representing the interests and wishes of a group of like-minded members as they might have been in the past. They were more focused on realizing a defined social outcome using “business plans” and other concepts from the business world. A successful activist, along these lines, was one who accomplished a social mission through the entrepreneurial skills of recognizing opportunities and searching out resources in both expected and unexpected places. For many commentators, social entrepreneurship, and for some in our research, today’s activism ideally entails moneymaking ventures that support organizations’ social mission efforts in lieu of dependency on foundations and government grants. Given this marked shift in forms of activism, it may be less surprising that some of the energy of the movement, especially the segment devoted to expanding local food availability, was oriented to local enterprises, mindful of potential revenue streams from sales of food, and not particularly interested in trans-local organizations.

Nor were organizations necessarily intent on forming common goals or ideologies across their locality. As with the US Occupy Movement that emerged in the fall of 2011, the food movement honored the diversity within. Alliances and interlinked activities were certainly common. Intermediary organizations such as farmers’ co-operatives, multi-farmer CSAs, and, in a few instances, food policy councils were forming. Their aims, however, were not to create or even debate a set of shared analyses, values and strategies, but to co-operate in the organization of positive activities.

Ottinger's (2013) recent book on changing patterns of activism alerts us to the many challenges of neoliberalism for twenty-first century movements. The author describes an abrupt shift in environmental justice activism in Louisiana Gulf Coast towns brought about by the repositioning of corporate experts of the petrochemical industry to take advantage of neoliberal cultural terrain. As already foreshadowed, local food activism in North Carolina bears traces of connection to the terrain of neoliberalism as well, but the connection is of a different sort than Ottinger's ethnography reveals. In the Gulf Coast towns, agents of the petrochemical companies were on site. The state government, downplaying its responsibility for protecting residents from the harmful effects of chemical factories, encouraged the fence-line communities to deliberate about their concerns face to face with corporate experts. Seemingly at the end of their options for redress and in exchange for more civil treatment by corporate experts and some monetary concessions, the environmental justice activists abandoned their independent collection of air quality data and otherwise halted their protest activities. In the ensuing meetings, while everyone performed as though they were equals, the conversations were subtly directed in ways that disallowed community criticisms. At the same time, the company differentially rewarded the more pro-corporation groups.

In the case of local food, activists were not dealing with on-site food "experts" from Monsanto or some other giant agro-food corporation, but rather with vague notions of untrustworthy, profit-hungry global corporations out there somewhere, a sense of hollow communities, broken connections to their food sources, and questionable moralities that glibly exclude segments of the community from healthful food. The activists undertook great personal effort to produce local food systems in better harmony with the values they missed from the world created by the global agro-industry. Yet, they, as with the Gulf Coast activists, were facing a relatively new context for activism. They were having to (re)build these local food systems on a neoliberal terrain constituted by uneven, but widespread government and corporate espousal of market rule and the devolution of risk and protection to the individual. Yet, the terrain offered windows of opportunity by providing resources for public/private partnerships and social entrepreneurial ventures. While one wonders what, as in the case of the Gulf Coast activists responding to the changes introduced by neoliberalism, the long-term outcomes will be, the responses of food activists make sense.

On such cultural terrain, the perpetrators of the dissatisfying food system seem distant and avoidable through local efforts. Except among a relative few activists, most of whom were focused on food injustice, the benefits of local food seemed possible purely through creating relevant local activities, convincing fellow community members of the superiority of local food, and supporting local farmers who produced the food. Instead of pursuing remote corporations or petitioning dysfunctional politicians, why not put energy instead into building local projects that produced good food in better ways?

Summarizing: Used as a tool for judging local food activism in our sites, the inferred Gibson-Graham criteria see a movement hampered by the virtual absence of collective, critical analyses of the global food regime. Used as a tool for reflection and dialogue, in contrast, the criteria promoted a step back from the movement to consider the context in which the activism has formed. The situation was one in which a surprising number of people were acting to resolve the disharmonies they sensed in the food and agriculture of the dominant food regime. The Gibson-Graham criteria imply an initial and on-going need for purposeful opposition and difficult disentanglement from the subjectivities formed in

the dominant food regime. Yet, growing amidst the “perverse confluence” that characterizes neoliberalism, the local food movement reveals a possibly different order of events and calls perhaps for a division of labor among the as yet relatively disconnected national and local components.

In our study locales, local food activism has been spurred by a sense of opportunity and possibility that has so far overshadowed apprehension of a need for opposition. Also striking, the movement is extremely decentralized. Activists draw information and stimulation from the Internet, social media, circulating speakers, films and other media not from on-going relationships with regional and national movement organizations. Although local activism has downplayed critical structural analyses of the dominant regime and its long-term hold on local possibilities, movement efforts have meanwhile managed to shift tastes and sensibilities and develop practical knowledges of local agricultural possibilities. Activists have put a great deal of energy and labor into (re)building the cultural, social and economic infrastructures needed for local food systems. Many activists and non-activists alike now have an appetite for local food and are familiar with the alternative discourses and visions of food and farming circulated by the movement. These infrastructures have tremendous potential not only for local agricultural endeavors, but also arguably for regional, national or even international groups with critical analyses and initiatives to change government policy. This base, if mobilized, could be a key pressure for redrawing government policies and even the systemic design of the food system. The challenge for trans-local groups, of course, is sufficient understanding of how to intersect with these new forms of activism and sensibilities.²⁶

Conclusions

Gibson-Graham’s *A Postcapitalist Politics* is remarkable in that the authors bring the results of their participatory action research back into conversation with scholarly theory. Perhaps with their book and Arturo Escobar’s (2008) recent *Territories of Difference*, which similarly returns the results of participatory action research to academic circles, we are witnessing an important development within geography and anthropology. In the spirit of such a transformation, we have derived from Gibson-Graham’s book a list of key elements for assessing the transformative achievements of social movements. We intend the list to be useful to researchers and movement participants for dialogue and reflection as well as an object of intense debate. We believe in the value of making theories of change explicit and in using those theories, in an explicit fashion such as inferred criteria, for reflection on social change efforts.

Here, we employed the derived list of elements to discuss the feminist movement in Bogotá and the local food movement in North Carolina. From the analyses the feminist movement appears to have had greater transformative significance than that of the alternative food movement to date. Interestingly, the feminist movement of the 1970s and 1980s was not recognized as a particularly important political actor at the time; nonetheless, the movement was successful in changing some policies and even more important brought about a striking transformation of subjectivity that women passed on to their daughters and sons, and to the next generations. The contemporary local food

²⁶ Bill McKibben, with his innovative 350.org, seems to have found a means to mobilize similarly defuse and dispersed activists and sentiments around climate change.

movement has expanded the amount of organic and locally grown food available in areas of North Carolina. It has substantially increased the frequency and range of food activities and events carried out in communities where it is present. It has underscored concerns about the agro-food industry and its shortcomings. Still the creative, activity-generating effort of the movement has not yet been accompanied, especially for those oriented to expanding the availability of local food, by a deeper collective, structural analysis. It, in effect, appears satisfied with creating pockets of “good food” at least for those who can afford it. Recalling the spirit of Gibson-Graham’s politics of possibility and using the criteria as a tool for reflection and dialogue not judgement, however, we suggest that the local food movement is a new form of activism emerging under neoliberalism that potentially constitutes a base constituency for more oppositional trans-local activists seeking significant change in the current food regime.

While Gibson-Graham’s theory of change as translated into the eight criteria has proved productive, we do see the need for two additional criteria. Despite the stark differences in content and context between the two movements, we found both to be compromised in a similar respect. Both exhibited an inattention or inability to address contradictions that shaped the reach and significance of the activism. Major challenges to forging collective action resulted from the structural divisions of the broader society especially as exacerbated by the historical contexts in which the movements were embedded. The movements internalized these structural features and the dynamics that developed around them inside the movement created weaknesses and difficulties not recognized as such.

Critics of *A Postcapitalist Politics* claim that Gibson-Graham pays too much attention to agency; too little to analysing how structures constrain agency (e.g., Grossberg 2010), and, as Gómez emphasized in her analysis of the feminist movement, too little to recognizing how structures create possibilities for new productive power. Concerning constraints, our analyses of the movements point to a key avenue by which structures intrude into activism and limit agency. In both of our cases, pervasive structures of class, ethnicity and race were situated in the change organizations themselves. Class- and race/ethnicity-hierarchies of power and status, in other words, were recreated in both with only minimal reflection. We suggest amending the Gibson-Graham list to incorporate this important point and other reflections we have presented throughout the text. Change efforts need to reflect upon the ways in which societal structures of power and privilege—especially if left unexamined—can become operant in the dynamics of activist organizations creating contradictions that restrict the organization’s capacity for effective change. A ninth criterion—analysis of the dynamics by which broader structures of privilege are being re-coded/re-established within change efforts of the movement and constraining success—has been added (see Table 2).

We also propose to include a tenth criterion: **reflexive dialogues within the movements that permanently look at and rethink their objectives, analyse reality and reinvent their action.** We consider this reflexive process to enable movements to be more successful in the achievement of their goals. This attitude should include the subjective dimension. Thus, we consider the key elements of social and economic transformation we have identified and discussed should be permanently brought into conversation with each other in order to contribute to emancipatory change.

Table 2: Amended, Modified List of Key Elements of Social & Economic Transformation As Derived from Gibson-Graham's *A Postcapitalist Politics*

Must occur for a critical mass undergoing politicization:
1. Recognition of a structure of domination, some of its elements or at least critical reflection on a crisis of the status quo and its interrelation with other structures of domination
2. Identification and enactment of a politics of possibility
3. Creation of alternative discourses/vision
4. Orientation to a collective and a building of community – an “us” that includes reflection about power
5. Changes made in daily life and everyday practices
6. Cultivation of subjects with the desires and capacities for sociability, happiness & action offered by alternative social and economic arrangements
7. Ethical commitment and self-cultivation
8. Purposive shifts in subjectivities and identities
9. Analysis of the dynamics by which broader structures of privilege are being re-coded/re-established within the movement and constraining success
10. On-going reflexive dialogues within the movements to revise and rethink their objectives, analyse reality and reinvent their action

Coming to the conclusion of this exercise and notwithstanding the need to augment the list of elements, we continue to find Gibson-Graham’s theory of social transformation valuable for its recognition of the potentialities of subjects, despite the hold of controlling discourses and material arrangements, to create and act in local spaces and activities. Gibson-Graham’s work offers a welcome opportunity to reflect on some of the central elements that social change entails—some of which tend to be under-theorized or ignored by the academy, the Left and some social movements—and enables a discussion of how to gauge the significance of social change efforts.

References

- Alperovitz, Gar. (2013). *What then must we do? Straight talk about the next American revolution*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Archila, M. (2003). *Idas y venidas. Vueltas y revueltas. Protestas sociales en Colombia. 1958-1990*. Bogotá: ICANH, Cinep.
- Casas-Cortés, M. I., Osterweil, M. & Powell, D. E. (2008). Blurring boundaries: Recognizing knowledge-practices in the study of social movements. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 81(1), 17-58
- Escobar, A. (2008). *Territories of difference: Place, movements, life, redes*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Escobar, A. (2007). "Worlds and knowledges otherwise: The Latin American modernity/coloniality research program." *Cultural Studies*, 21(203), 179-210.
- Fanon, F. (1961). *The Wretched of the earth*. New York: Grove Press.
- Gibson-Graham, J.K. (2006). *A postcapitalist politics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Gill, H. (2010). *The Latino Migration Experience in North Carolina*. Chapel Hill, NC: UNC Press.
- Giraldo, J. (1996). *Colombia: The Genocidal democracy*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.
- Gómez, D. (2011). *Dinámicas del movimiento feminista bogotano: vivencias de cuarto, salón y calle, historias de vida. 1970-1991*. Bogotá: Impresol Limitada.
- Grossberg, L. (2010) *Cultural studies in the future tense*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Guthman, J. (2008). Bringing good food to others: investigating the subjects of alternative food practice. *Cultural Geographies*, 5, 431-447.
- Gutiérrez, R. (2012). The Rhythms of the Pachakuti: Brief reflections regarding how we have come to know emancipatory struggles and the significance of the term social emancipation. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 111(1), 51-64.
- Hauter, W. (2012). *Foodopoly: The battle over the future of food and farming in America*. New York: The New Press.
- Holland, D.C., Lachicotte, W.S., Skinner, D. G. & Cain, W.C. (1998). *Identity and agency in cultural worlds*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Holland, D., Nonini, D. Lutz C., Bartlett L., Frederick, M. Guldbrandsen, T. & Murillo, E. (2007). *Local democracy under siege: Activism, public interests and private politics*. New York: New York University Press.
- Langemeyer, I. (2011). Science and social practice: Activity research and activity theory as socio-critical approaches. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 18(2), 148-160.

- Langemeyer and Schmachtel (this issue)
- Lyson, T. (2005). Civic agriculture and community problem solving. *Culture and Agriculture*, 27(2), 92–98.
- Mignolo, W. (2009). Dispensable and bare lives: Coloniality and the hidden political/economic agenda of modernity. *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge*, VII, 69-88.
- Múnera, L. (1998). *Rupturas y continuidades: Poder y movimiento popular en Colombia (1968-1988)*. Bogotá: Universidad Nacional, Iepri, Cerec.
- Quijano, A. (2007). “Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality.” *Cultural Studies*, 21(2-3), 168-178.
- Ottinger, G. (2013). *Refining expertise: How responsible engineers subvert environmental justice challenges*. New York: New York University Press.
- Santos, B. d. S. (2006). *The Rise of the Global Left: The World Social Forum and Beyond*. London and New York: Zed Books.
- Spinosa, C., Flores, F. & Dreyfus, H. (1997). *Disclosing New Worlds: Entrepreneurship, democratic action, and the cultivation of solidarity*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Stetsenko, A. (2008). From relational ontology to transformative activist stance on development and learning: expanding Vygotsky’s (CHAT) project. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 3, 471–491.
- Valcárcel, A. (1997). *La Política de Las Mujeres*. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, Universitat de Valencia, Instituto de la Mujer.
- Wilson, A.B. (2009) “Doing Justice to Local Food.” Carrboro Urban Farm Tour 'Zine, pp.10-11. Carrboro Greenspace: Carrboro, NC.
- Wilson A.B. & Holland, D. (2009). Movements & moralities: evolving moral logics of food in the United States. Paper presented for the invited session *Evolving moralities: When the good and the right need to be reconfigured*. 108th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, Philadelphia, Dec 5th.
- Zakaria, F. (1997). The Rise of Illiberal Democracy. *Foreign Affairs*, 76(6), 22-43.

About the authors

Dorothy Holland is Cary C. Boshamer Professor of Anthropology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Former chair of department, former president of the national Society for Psychological Anthropology, and co-founder of the Center for Integrating Research and Action at UNC-CH, Holland has conducted anthropological research in several parts of the world including the Caribbean, South Asia and the South Pacific with a primary focus on the United States. She is co-author of *Identity and Agency in Cultural Worlds* (Harvard University Press) and *History in Person* (School of American Research Press). Her most recent article on CHAT, “Social practice theory and the historical production of persons” (co-authored with Jean Lave) appeared in *Actio*. Her most recent publications on social movements and activism include the co-authored *Local*

Democracy Under Siege (NYU Press) and “Social movements and collective identity” *Anthropological Quarterly*.

Contact: Department of Anthropology, CB #3115, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina, USA Email: dholland@unc.edu

Diana Gómez Correal is currently based at University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill as a Graduate Student in the Department of Anthropology. Diana Gómez has a BA in Anthropology and a Master in History from the Universidad Nacional of Colombia. Gómez has been part of different social movements in Colombia since 2002, and she is part of The Transnational Network of Other Knowledges. Gómez is the author of *Dinámicas del movimiento feminista bogotano: vivencias de cuarto, salón y calle, historias de vida. 1970-1991*. [Dynamics of the Feminist Movement of Bogotá: Experiences of the Bedroom, Living Room, and the Street] (2011); and other articles related to her research interests. Her research focuses on Latin America, social movements, feminism, emotions, human rights, identity construction, modernity/coloniality, memory, arts and violence.

Contact: Department of Anthropology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Email: gomezcor@email.unc.edu