

CHAPTER 1

INTERSECTIONALITY AND INCOMMENSURABILITY

Third World Feminism and Asian Decolonization

GRACE KYUNGWON HONG

THIS CHAPTER EXAMINES ACTIVIST ENGAGEMENTS WITH ASIAN American communities along with the importance of the figure of the Asian woman freedom fighter in the New York chapter of the Third World Women's Alliance (TWWA). TWWA, an organization formed in 1971, brought together Black, Puerto Rican, and Asian women in socialist anti-imperialist solidarity projects. Through readings of the TWWA periodical *Triple Jeopardy*, an interview with TWWA member Christine Choy, and analyses of archival materials from TWWA organizational records, I trace the role and representation of Asian women in this early Third World women's organization so as to reflect on the possibilities and limits of leftist Third World solidarity politics. *Triple Jeopardy* expressed a deeply internationalist Third World solidarity that highlighted US imperialism and connected it to state violence in the United States. While the group often mobilized a logic of commensuration in which the Third World was imagined as connected via imperialism, a logic advanced by their investment in the figure of the Asian woman freedom fighter in the pages of *Triple Jeopardy*, an analysis of the role of Asian American women in the organization reveals an ethos of multiplicity, heterogeneity, and juxtaposition that challenges us to recognize the alternative, relational analytic of comparison also produced by this organization. In so doing, they mobilized a

variety of analyses and critiques so as to challenge the various mechanisms of capitalism and imperialism. TWWA connected a Black radical internationalist tradition with a feminist analysis, a potent combination that enabled them to produce a complex and contradictory definition of solidarity based on both a narrative of unity and one that took seriously the differences, inequalities, and hierarchies between and within racialized groups and anti-imperialist histories. Examining TWWA in this way suggests that feminist organizations provided new and different analytics of comparison, and also provides an analytic to apprehend latent or unrecognized analytics of incommensurability as inherent to Third Worldist internationalist politics as a whole.

At the heart of these analytics and tactics is the idea of founding movements *on* rather than *in spite of* difference, an idea that many have observed is foundational to US Women of Color feminism. Women of Color feminists' theorizations of what Kimberlé Crenshaw has termed "intersectionality" are profoundly relational and comparative, connecting power relations on seemingly disparate scales and registers (Crenshaw 1989). That is, the complexities of race, gender, and sexuality meant the persistence of hierarchies of power within racial groups, even within antiracist, decolonizing movements. As such, intersectionality meant challenging the ideas that communities are brought together by commonality and that identification is the only or even the primary basis for collectivity. Intersectional feminist practice engaged the affective and interpersonal relations within movements, relations where power relations are both replicated and contested. Women of Color activists, writers, and artists have developed an analytic of difference that became the foundation for their relationships within movements. They have addressed the ways languages of struggle did not, and still do not, translate across geographical contexts and historical trajectories, but asserted that solidarity and coalition could still be based on, rather than built in spite of, these incommensurabilities.

TWWA began through discussions in the New York chapter of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), through the efforts of co-founder Frances Beal. A lifelong activist and icon of Black and Third World feminism, Beal is perhaps best known for her foundational essay "Double Jeopardy: To Be Black and Female," which was originally published as a pamphlet in 1969, and then included in Toni Cade's groundbreaking anthology *The Black Woman* as well as Robin Morgan's *Sisterhood Is Powerful*, both published in 1970 (Beal 1970a, 1970b). During the period in which she worked with SNCC and established TWWA, Beal worked at the National

Council for Negro Women. She later moved to the San Francisco Bay Area and worked as a journalist and associate editor of *The Black Scholar* (Beal 2005, preface). Beal recounts that the politicized space of SNCC allowed Black women to begin to theorize their concerns as structural rather than individual (Beal 2005, 35). At the same time, she recounts, some male members of SNCC started to gravitate toward the Nation of Islam and started “talking abortion was genocide” (Beal 2005, 36). Having almost died herself because of an illegal abortion that she underwent at the age of seventeen and profoundly affected by other Black women who had likewise suffered, Beal pushed back, along with others, and in 1968, SNCC voted to create a Black Women’s Liberation Committee to investigate “the conditions under which black women function” (Beal 2005, 27, 37).

By 1970, a number of women who had no affiliation to SNCC had joined them, and they became an independent organization, changing their name to the Black Women’s Alliance. Beal recounts that they focused on reproductive rights, connecting abortion rights to sterilization abuse, which seriously affected Puerto Rican women (Beal 2005, 37). As such, their efforts around reproductive justice were not simply confined to abortion, unlike mainstream white feminist reproductive rights discourses; instead, they were actually one of the earliest feminist organizations to address sterilization abuse against Women of Color. In 1971, perhaps inspired by this focus, a group of Puerto Rican women approached them, asking to join, and they became the Third World Women’s Alliance.

In 1971, one of the New York TWWA members, Cheryl Perry (then Cheryl Johnson), moved to the Bay Area and started a chapter there (Burnham 2005, 19). In the early 1980s, the Bay Area chapter transformed into the Alliance against Women’s Oppression (AAWO), allowed white women to join, and focused on women’s reproductive rights, women’s health, and welfare (Burnham 2005, 24).¹ AAWO dissolved in 1989, and member Linda Burnham, whom Johnson had recruited to TWWA, went on to found the Women of Color Resource Center in 1990 (Burnham 2005, 30). The archival record for the New York and Bay Area chapters is uneven, with documentary evidence from the New York chapter consisting mainly of issues of its periodical, *Triple Jeopardy*. More of the Bay Area chapter’s organizational records survived because they were archived at the Women of Color Resource Center until it closed in 2011; the records were then donated to the Sophia Smith Collection at Smith College.

As Judy Wu observes in her essay in this volume, the role of Asian and Asian American women in Women of Color feminist politics has been

underexamined in the scholarship. We see this tendency in the small but significant literature on TWWA, which has mainly been situated as a Black feminist organization. Historian Stephen Ward rightly points out the important ways in which TWWA originated as a Black Power organization (Ward 2006). Emerging out of SNCC, which by the late 1960s had dropped the *Non-violent* part of its name in favor of *National*, TWWA's stated concerns overlapped with those of SNCC, including a critique of state violence, both domestically and internationally, a commitment to self-determination, and a willingness to entertain militant imagery and principles, if not as actual tactics. For example, the first issue begins with a discussion of watershed events for Black radical movements: the violent suppression of the Attica prison riot in September of 1971 and the murder of Black Panther political prisoner George Jackson two weeks prior to the Attica prison riot ("Now Attica!!" 1971, 2; "Murder at San Quentin" 1971, 3). While this is certainly true, TWWA demonstrates the capaciousness of Black feminist organizations; they could be both Black feminist and Third World feminist organizations at the same time, because of their radical re-envisioning of Blackness. Advancing the internationalist aspect of Black Power movements, TWWA connected US state violence against domestic populations with imperialist violence all over the world. Further, the organization offered a distinctly Third World feminist analysis, highlighting both the gendered nature of imperialistic ventures and Third World women's importance to anticolonial struggles.

While the small numbers of Asian American women in the era before the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act meant that Asian representation in the organization was limited, Asian and Asian American women were integral to the organization. In the pages of *Triple Jeopardy*, the New York chapter of TWWA imagined itself as part of a worldwide struggle against imperialism in which Asian anticolonial struggles played a significant role. The Bay Area chapter engaged in a number of activist projects in Asian American communities, including working with United Farm Workers (UFW) and Katipunan ng mga Demokratikong Pilipino (KDP) to help build a facility for retired farmworkers, and participating in an antiwar demonstration organized by the Union of Vietnamese in the United States on Ho Chi Minh's birthday, among many other efforts.²

Triple Jeopardy's overall internationalist focus was impressively wide-ranging and comprehensive. During its four-year run, the journal featured stories about women's revolutionary struggles in Puerto Rico, Vietnam, China, North Korea, the Sudan, Ecuador, Mexico, Palestine, Chile, Oman,

and many others. According to Beal, connecting US imperialism and militarism abroad with racialized and gendered exploitation and violence domestically was a priority for TWWA; she credits that position to SNCC and the civil rights movement more broadly: “So the very fact that SNCC was breaking through on the international issue, was, I think, a very important contribution that SNCC made to the people’s movement as a whole. . . . So I think that was one of the big contributions that the civil rights movement of the ’60s eventually made to our understanding of the link between international affairs and domestic affairs” (Beal 2005, 40).

The idealization of Third World women engaged in anticolonial struggles is present everywhere in *Triple Jeopardy*. The anticolonial struggles of women in Asia—in particular, Vietnam, China, and to a lesser extent, North Korea—were prominently featured in issues of *Triple Jeopardy* and were an important part of TWWA’s transnational and cross-racial solidarity politics. Indeed, the cover to the inaugural issue of *Triple Jeopardy* featured an illustration of three women of color, featuring front and center a woman in a *qipao*-style dress holding a rifle, an image that could reference both Chinese and Vietnamese revolutionary soldiers. Throughout its run, *Triple Jeopardy* frequently depicted Chinese and Vietnamese women, in particular emphasizing their importance to socialist anticolonial revolutions.

The image of revolutionary Asian women often served as inspiration for US-based feminists, a part of a larger turn toward Asia as an alternative model for radicalism. As Robin Kelley and Betsy Esch observe in their essay “Black Like Mao,” for the radical Black movements of the 1960s and 1970s in the United States, the idea of a socialist republic established not by European proletariats, as Marx had declared, but by racialized, formerly colonized, agrarian peoples was immensely inspiring (Kelley and Esch 1999). They write that W. E. B. DuBois’s 1959 trip to China convinced him that “China will lead the underdeveloped nations toward socialism,” a view shared by many Black radical organizations and individuals (Kelley and Esch 1999, 8). In *Radicals on the Road*, Judy Wu documents a tendency toward what she calls “radical orientalism” among US-based leftist activists (Wu 2013). The perceptions of US leftists like Bob Browne, Eldridge Cleaver, Elaine Brown, Alex Hing, and Pat Sumi, among others, “were refracted through idealized projections of the decolonizing Third World,” in particular their romanticization of Vietnamese, Chinese, and North Korean societies that they met in their travels to Asia (Wu 2013, 4). Wu notes that this form of orientalism subverted the hierarchies manifested in classical orientalism as defined by Edward Said, in that US leftists “idealized the East and

denigrated the West.” Yet, in so doing, radical orientalism maintained the notion of a separation between the two (Wu 2013, 5).

US- and Canada-based feminists were not impervious to radical orientalism. Wu describes the historic Indochinese Women’s Conferences (IWC) organized by North American feminists, which brought a delegation of women from North and South Vietnam and Laos to Vancouver and Toronto in April of 1971. While the differing political orientations of the main North American feminist groups organizing the conference led to disagreements and the formation of factions, Wu finds that the North American women were unanimous in their admiration for the Southeast Asian women delegates: “The political leadership of Indochinese women inspired an array of American sisters to combat American militarism and imperialism. . . . The idealization of Southeast Asian women, which was expressed broadly among the North American attendees and not just among Asian Americans, reflects a radical orientalist sensibility” (Wu 2013, 258–59). As Wu notes in her piece in this volume, “The political heroism of women in socialist Asia played a central role in creating Third World feminism in the United States.”

The case of TWWA supports Wu’s contention. Indeed, TWWA was one of two Third World organizations that the mainly white organizers invited to help organize the IWC. The TWWA did not send representatives to the major planning meeting held in Budapest but did eventually participate in the IWC by organizing with other Third World women (Wu 2013, 224–25). While TWWA’s participation in the conference was limited, we can see many of the hallmarks of radical orientalism in *Triple Jeopardy*’s representation of Asian women. In contrast to liberal feminist perspectives on women in Vietnam and other Asian nations as victims requiring saving, *Triple Jeopardy* represented these women as heroes and models, and the United States as a prerevolutionary society in need of tutelage, particularly in terms of gender equality. In a cover-page article called “Puerto Rican Woman Visits China,” Geneveva Clemente depicts China as a revolutionary example for a still-colonized Puerto Rico: “While Puerto Rico, a small island in the Caribbean, is still a colony of US imperialism, China is a vast country in Asia with a population of about 800 million people. All over China, women can be seen working alongside men and doing all kinds of jobs” (Clemente 1972, 1). Clemente recounts the advances that Chinese women have made under a Communist regime, including equal pay, access to family planning and abortion, paid maternity leave, socialized child care, and access to traditionally male professions. While Clemente observes some inequities in professions like politics, education, and medicine,

she confidently asserts that these conditions are residual and that Chinese society under Communism will eventually eradicate them.

Another article, “Korean Women,” which carries no byline and reads much like a North Korean news release, proclaims that under the leadership of Kim Il Sung, “the Korean women have grown up rapidly on the road of revolution. . . . Bringing the revolutionary spirit of self-reliance into full play, the Korean women on the industrial front have made together with the man-comrades important contributions to the rapid development of industrial production” (“Korean Women” 1972, 4). The same issue also features a statement by the Committee for Solidarity with the Korean People that provides the history of Japanese and US imperialism in the Korean peninsula, outlines the official state of war still governing relations between North and South, and likens Korea to Vietnam (“Korea = Vietnam” 1972, 3). A two-page spread, “Filipino Women and the Revolution,” centers Filipinas in the movement against “the imposition of martial law by the US-Marcos dictatorship” (Roja 1973, 8).

Unsurprisingly, however, it was Vietnam that was most often referenced. Nearly every issue of *Triple Jeopardy* includes some reference to Vietnam, whether it be a critique of US Third World people’s role as cannon fodder in the Vietnam War or an excoriation of US imperialist policy abroad. Most significant were the tributes to Vietnamese women freedom fighters as figures of revolutionary struggle. Two articles exemplify this position. One is a statement by activist Pat Sumi, who, as Wu documents, was part of the Black Panther delegation to China, North Korea, and Vietnam in the summer of 1970 and a central organizer of the IWC (Wu 2013, 186). Sumi writes, “The example of Indochinese and Vietnamese women shows us the way. . . . We must draw on our courage and follow the women of the world in throwing this system onto the rubbish heaps of history” (Sumi 1972, 8). Less than two years after her travels to socialist Asia and just over a year after the influential meetings with Vietnamese and Laotian women at the IWC, Sumi’s words register the ways in which “American radicals who protested the war in Southeast Asia sought inspiration and political instruction from Third World socialist leaders” (Wu 2013, 188).

The second is the publication of a speech made by a TWWA representative at a Washington, DC, rally organized by the Peoples Coalition for Peace and Justice. That the speech situates Vietnamese women as role models is manifest in the article’s title, “Live Like Her,” next to a photograph of a young Vietnamese woman smiling into the camera with a rifle in her hands. The text of the speech proclaims that while “the role of women in liberation

struggles has only been questioned here in America . . . [i]n China, Cuba, Vietnam and Guinea-Bissau it is assumed that women are a vital part of the revolution, and that no revolution can be or has been successful without them” (“Live Like Her,” n.d., 14). Vietnamese women in particular are “the best example of what the role of women can be in liberation struggles” (“Live Like Her,” n.d., 14).

While admiration for revolutionary women was consistent in the pages of *Triple Jeopardy*, we also see complex and sometimes contradictory analyses about the relationship among Third World women in various contexts. On the one hand, it certainly articulated a theory of Third World leftist internationalism predicated on common cause against US and Western imperialism and capitalism. In articles discussing women fighters in the Sudan or North Vietnam, for example, there is no explicit analysis of how people of color in the United States might be complicit with empire, or how some Third World nations might be structurally situated to benefit from the colonial expropriation and extraction of others. Much of *Triple Jeopardy*’s analysis of Third World feminism highlights commonality within the category “Third World,” focusing on how women are colonized and exploited in similar ways. A two-page spread in the centerfold of the first issue, a reprint of material from a booklet that TWWA created to give context to its emergence and to describe its politics, describes Third World women as experiencing the “same general oppressions” (“Women in the Struggle” 1971, 8–9). As examples, they list industries that target Third World women for exploitation as domestic workers, hospital workers, factory workers, farm laborers, and garment workers; stereotypes; and endemic drug abuse within their communities. The frequent images of revolutionary women in the Third World are, of course, not inherently feminist, as Maylei Blackwell observes (Blackwell 2005).

On the other hand, even in the early 1970s, they developed an analysis of the differences and hierarchies that may occur between racialized groups. As Blackwell argues, the organization’s attention to the relationship between the international and the local implied a diversity of struggle. She writes, “The TWWA was aware of how it was situated within geopolitical struggles and it localized a transnational imaginary of third-world solidarity among women to forge coalitional politics among women of color locally” (Blackwell 2015, 285). Blackwell argues that in contrast to the abstract, generalizing notion of “global sisterhood,” TWWA “refused claims to universality by working from their own situated struggles, their political locations” (Blackwell 2015, 285). Likewise, rather than making “Third World” a universal

category of oppression, *Triple Jeopardy* produced an alternative relational logic that highlighted the differences among contexts and imagined new and complex terms for building solidarity.

Thus, even as they steadfastly developed anti-imperialist socialist connections with women all over the world, their focus on gender and their resolutely feminist analysis required an immensely complex notion of racial solidarity. Nothing illustrates this more clearly than Beal's description of how the Black Women's Alliance became the Third World Women's Alliance. When Puerto Rican women asked to join, the request precipitated serious discussions weighing the importance of pursuing issues and concerns specific to Black communities against the imperative of a broader Third World solidarity. Beal recounts:

So we had a big debate in the organization. And what we were essentially dealing with here was, what were the things that were particularly African American as opposed to what were the things that were specifically Puerto Rican. . . .

And when we looked at the Puerto Rican sisters, we saw that they were trying to deal with both their national oppression of living within the United States and a kind of racial and class thing that was separate from just being a part of America as a whole, and how does your gender fit in when you have this other overriding oppression. And then black women were essentially trying to deal with the same thing: how do you deal with the question of race and class and gender. . . .

So we finally decided that the two forms of oppression, while not precisely exactly the same—race versus, say, nationality—but the idea of the complexity of women's liberation in that context was fundamentally the same. (Beal 2005, 39–40)

As we know, the coalitional impulse won out, and the group changed its name to the Third World Women's Alliance. Beal's comments underscore how a complex and nuanced theorization of relational racialization and colonization was integral to the group's very founding. That is, bringing Black and Puerto Rican women together in a category of Third World women was predicated not on an emphasis on their similarities but rather on a nuanced understanding of their different relationships to racialized state violence and US imperialism, which Beal marks with the term *nationality*. Beal writes that what brought them together was not a uniformity or commensurability, but rather the exact opposite, that what they had in common was the

“idea of the *complexity* of women’s liberation in [each] context.” We can recognize her analysis—“How do you deal with the question of race and class and gender?”—as that which Kimberlé Crenshaw decades later named “intersectionality.” Intersectionality connects them, but what *intersectionality* inherently means is the recognition of difference rather than a demand for uniformity.

The circumstances through which an Asian American feminist ended up as part of TWWA exemplifies the idea that identification with racial categories is not natural or presumed. The New York chapter included Christine Choy, who is credited as the art director of *Triple Jeopardy*.³ In my telephone interview with Choy, I found her disarmingly frank and funny, speaking a mile a minute in her signature gravelly smoker’s voice and pulling no punches. Being the art director, she explained, meant that she drew many of the graphics that were such an important part of the publication’s aesthetic.⁴ She also participated in many of the TWWA’s actions and campaigns and, as I will outline in more detail later, found in them a like-minded community of leftist and revolutionary activists with whom she felt more camaraderie than with other Asian immigrants. She later became an acclaimed Oscar-nominated documentary filmmaker, the director of such now canonical Asian American films as *Who Killed Vincent Chin?* and *Sa-I-Gu*, and a pioneer in independent film distribution as one of the founders of Third World Newsreel.

Choy’s unusual life history made her an uneasy fit with Asian American communities and organizations of that era, and she found that she was more comfortable with the Black and Puerto Rican women in TWWA than she was with other Asian Americans. Born just a few years after the Chinese Revolution, Choy was raised in Shanghai by her mother, a brilliant and educated woman who spoke several languages fluently. Her father was Korean, born to a family that had fled Japanese colonial rule to Shanghai, where the Provisional Government of the Republic of Korea had been established. Choy’s father left Shanghai for South Korea after the Korean War, and Choy and her mother eventually joined him. Succeeding academically in South Korea, Choy received a scholarship offer from a Catholic high school in Manhattan. Captivated by American films, she romanticized the United States, and she moved to New York, alone, at the age of fifteen. She spent a year at Princeton and then transferred to Columbia, earning a combined BA/MA degree. During her time at Columbia, she became involved with TWWA. At the time, Choy had started working with Newsreel, a network of radical filmmakers. Choy would later be instrumental in turning

the New York chapter of Newsreel into the long-running film production and distribution organization Third World Newsreel. Having met Frances Beal and other members of SNCC through her activist work in New York, Choy offered Newsreel's office as a meeting space for TWWA once they split from SNCC. Because of Choy's background in art and architecture, they recruited her to draw graphics for *Triple Jeopardy*. Word of her facility for graphics spread, and Choy recounts drawing for publications produced by the Young Lords and the Black Panthers as well as TWWA.

Although for a time Choy was the only Asian American woman in TWWA (she recalls a Filipina joining later), she felt more camaraderie and ease among their ranks than she did with Asian American organizations. Partly this was because of her unusual upbringing. Choy's peripatetic life had exposed her to a variety of ideologies and forms of governance, with which she was able to cultivate a critical engagement:

I was born under communism. Then we moved to Hong Kong which at that time was a colonial state. Then we moved to South Korea. I was bewildered by the amount of American GIs stationed in the middle of the 5th Avenue of Seoul. And then of course you see the division of white GIs and Black GIs very clearly. Clearly, clearly separate. Separate and not equal. My early upbringing was Marxism-Leninism, and I ended up in South Korea, which was against communism. It was rather confusing and then I went to Japan, which was a monarchy, right? Then I came to United States; there's capitalism. At a young age, I tasted all different "isms."

At the time, Choy explains, international students from the PRC were rare; the other recent Chinese immigrants in New York were largely from Taiwan and Hong Kong and were suspicious of her politics and background. She also recounts interpersonal antipathies. Her memories of Communist China were favorable, in particular because of its possibilities for a proto-feminist politics. She recounts, "Mao Zedong says women hold up half the sky. That really made a big impression on me when I was a kid. Women are no longer allowed to [have] bound feet, and feudal ideologies such as men can have several wives got wiped out when I was growing up in China. I also witnessed that my mother was very happy at the time. She felt she was really contributing to the country, and she spoke a lot of languages, so she already did shorthand and translation for the party, for the agencies."

Her pro-China politics clashed with the more conservative, anti-Communist Taiwanese international students in New York at the time. She

notes that “Taiwan was Chiang Kai-shek. I grew up against the Kuomintang.” She found the students from Hong Kong alienating for other reasons: “Then people from Hong Kong, they were colonials.” In contrast, the anticolonial, leftist, revolutionary politics of TWWA resonated with her, and she found in them a welcoming community: “I ended up with a group of people who really believes [in] independence. Vietnam independence, Cuban independence, independence of Angola, Botswana, Mozambique.” Choy found a community of like-minded people: “And the Newsreel people and the Panthers, Lords and Third World Women’s Alliance, they took me very, very seriously. I appreciated that because my thinking was so different than most young people at that time, you know. . . . I’ve seen so much poverty. I’ve seen literally exploitation, the women being exploited in Korea as prostitutes and the GIs were using like PX and selling black market.”

Choy’s experience undermines any assumption of solidarity or shared experience based on racial categorization, as she found she had less in common with other Chinese immigrants than she did with radical Black and Puerto Rican women. At the same time, we must understand her experiences as not simply idiosyncratic or individual, for they were formed by the historical and material conditions of US and Japanese imperialism and wars both hot and cold that shaped Asian geopolitics in the twentieth century. While Choy’s life story is certainly unique, it helps us understand the heterogeneity of Third World feminist organizing at the time. While TWWA understood the necessity of a rhetoric and discourse of commonality as the basis for solidarity, the women in the organization forged relationships based on a theory and practice of difference. We see that while the *figure* of Vietnamese and Chinese revolutionary women was ubiquitous, the presence of Asian American women in TWWA was more anomalous. Both examples, however, are instructive insofar as they help us understand the different and simultaneous understandings of collectivity and coalitions that TWWA forged at the time.

While TWWA’s vision was global and international, *Triple Jeopardy*’s cogent and pointed analyses of the differing interests among individuals or factions *within* movements highlight the interpersonal as well as geopolitical stakes of theorizing collectivity based on heterogeneity. While in the main *Triple Jeopardy* did not comment on internal organizational politics, instead focusing on informational essays and articles, one early editorial stands out as a departure. In this editorial, published within the first year of *Triple Jeopardy*’s run, TWWA members expose a “serious and potentially dangerous situation” (“Editorial” 1972, 4). A member of SNCC, Mohammad

Hunt, had created a list of supposed government agents or these agents' pawns within TWWA and other SNCC-related organizations and had surreptitiously circulated this list among their friends and co-workers. Many of the accused women had turned down Hunt's sexual advances, and many of the men on his list were partnered with these women. They also reported that Hunt had been physically violent to two women who had criticized him.

The editorial goes on to detail the manner in which they attended to Hunt's activities once they discovered what he was doing: they convened a meeting at which they decided to inform their community of Hunt's actions and also to develop an analysis of "how a person like Mohammad Hunt was able to create this much turmoil and divisiveness so that other organizations can learn from our mistakes" ("Editorial" 1972, 4). The majority of the editorial, rather than detailing Hunt's activities, is devoted to their own analysis, in which they taxonomize three types of actors who jeopardize movement politics, whom they call "Agents, Opportunists, and Fools" ("Editorial" 1972, 4). And indeed, it is not inconceivable that Hunt was an agent of the state since SNCC had been infiltrated by government agents. Neither was TWWA immune: Kimberly Springer writes that COINTELPRO put the TWWA under investigation from 1970 to 1974, and that in addition to surveilling TWWA and *Triple Jeopardy*, COINTELPRO had infiltrated their meetings (Springer 2005, 50). The TWWA archives at the Sophia Smith Collection at Smith College contains the file the FBI maintained on the TWWA, uncovered through Freedom of Information Act requests.⁵ The first issue of *Triple Jeopardy* featured an article appealing for funds for TWWA member Kisha Shakur, who was imprisoned because she had gotten caught up in a case against her husband, a case that turned out to be orchestrated by COINTELPRO (Springer 2005, 91).

Regardless of whether Hunt was an agent provocateur or simply a predator in the movement, TWWA make perfectly clear the stakes of a feminist analysis of antiracist and anti-imperialist struggle. They use this example as a case study that supports their analysis in the statement above, that antiracist and anti-imperialist struggles without a feminist analysis hinder their own growth and effectiveness and are thus "counterrevolutionary." The editors write, "The actions of Mohammad's began to have a disastrous effect on our organization. Essential tasks were not completed or done in a slipshod manner. Working and personal relationships between sisters became strained and a mass paranoia began to creep into our midst and poison our ability to function in an effective manner. Insinuations were made against the leadership of the Alliance and people were afraid to

talk to each other. Criticisms raised were handled in a superficial manner. Two essential ingredients of any revolutionary organization were damaged in the Alliance: Honesty and Trust” (“Editorial” 1972, 4).

The publication of this editorial outlines a very different understanding of what solidarity, community, and organizing might look like. It presents no narrative of resolution or of failure, nor the story of an organization broken by these betrayals and violences, nor one that triumphantly overcame them. Instead, the editorial performs a contingent gesture to a future possibility, but one that is certainly not premised on an idealized utopian narrative of coming together. Instead, it presents a brutal analysis of how even within movements, some actors stand to gain more than others. We might find that this affectively difficult but politically useful insight offers a different definition of coalitional politics, one that proposes a new approach to understanding conflict within and across social movements. Rather than approach conflict and fracture as detrimental to collective organizing and solidarity movements, this editorial prompts us to ask what might happen if we took seriously what US Women of Color feminists advanced: that conflict even to the point of the demise of an organization can itself be understood as an organizing practice, something to be not overcome but utilized.

TWWA’s theorization of the hierarchies of gender and patriarchy *within* racial and radical groups lends itself to theorizing solidarity *across* racial groups and histories. TWWA examined the important differences between groups of women, even as they highlighted a shared history of racialized and colonial violence. At the same time, because of their historical moment, their political and activist practice was predicated on an understanding of Third World women as sharing common concerns because of the global nature of capitalist imperialism. That is, the *historical* development of a post-civil rights era Black middle class or an Asian technical and managerial class or the neocolonial capture of newly independent nation-states by transnational capital had not taken hold enough to be reflected in their class analyses. However, by reading their feminist critiques of masculinist and patriarchal power *within* their racial groups, and analyzing the heterogeneous aesthetic of their periodical as an expression of political common sense, we can read for an incipient alternative political practice of solidarity that acknowledges differences of power and hierarchy within and across racialized and (neo)colonized groups. The role of Asian American and Asian women within these movements can help illuminate the politics of difference that might otherwise be implicit or overlooked.

NOTES

Acknowledgments: My gratitude goes to the many interlocutors who read versions of this chapter in earlier iterations, first and foremost LOUD Collective, who provided not only generous and rigorous intellectual engagement but support, care, and kindness over many years. I thank in particular LOUD members Maylei Blackwell, Dayo Gore, Sarah Haley, Jodi Kim, Shana Redmond, and Tiffany Willoughby-Herard for their attention to this essay, Special thanks go to Maylei Blackwell for introducing me to the Third World Women's Alliance and providing me my first set of copies of *Triple Jeopardy*. I also thank the UCHRI Residential Research Group on Transnational Feminisms for their careful reading of and enthusiastic support for this project. I am indebted to, once again, Maylei Blackwell, Judy Wu, Karen Leong, Monisha Das Gupta, Zeynep Korkman, Rana Jaleel, Rachel Fabian, and Jessica Millward. I thank the UCLA Council on Research's Faculty Research Grant, the UCLA Center for the Study of Women, and the UC Humanities Research Institute, which funded this research. I also thank Stephanie Santos, research assistant extraordinaire, as well as Christine Choy for graciously agreeing to be interviewed. All errors are my own.

- 1 A smaller chapter was also established in Seattle, but existing records of this chapter are sparse and consist mainly of reports filed to the TWWA national organization, copies of which were sent to the Bay Area chapter and are preserved in their records.
- 2 "Agbayani Work Brigade," Box 5, Folder 4; "Katipunan ng mga Demokratikong Pilipino (KDP)," Box 5, Folders 16–18; "Union of Vietnamese in the US," Box 5, Folder 23, Third World Women's Alliance Records, MS 697, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, MA.
- 3 *Triple Jeopardy* 3 (4) (March–April 1974): 2. She was credited as Chris Choy.
- 4 Christine Choy, telephone interview with the author, February 20, 2017.
- 5 "FBI File of TWWA," Box 4, Folders 11–12, Third World Women's Alliance Records, MS 697, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, MA.

REFERENCES

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

- "Editorial." 1972. *Triple Jeopardy* 1 (7) (September–October): 4.
- "Korea = Vietnam." 1972. *Triple Jeopardy* 1 (5) (April–May): 3.
- "Korean Women." 1972. *Triple Jeopardy* 1 (5) (April–May): 4.
- "Murder at San Quentin." 1971. *Triple Jeopardy* 1 (1) (September–October): 3.
- "Now Attica!!" 1971. *Triple Jeopardy* 1 (1) (September–October): 2.
- "Women in the Struggle." 1971. *Triple Jeopardy* 1 (1) (September–October): 8–9.

OTHER SOURCES

- Beal, Frances. 1970a. "Double Jeopardy: To Be Black and Female." In *The Black Woman*, edited by Toni Cade. New York: New American Library.

- . 1970b. "Double Jeopardy: To Be Black and Female." In *Sisterhood Is Powerful: An Anthology of Writings from the Women's Movement*, edited by Robin Morgan. New York: Vintage.
- . 2005. Oral history by Loretta Ross. Voices of Feminism Oral History Project, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College.
- Blackwell, Maylei. 2005. "Bearing Bandoleros." In *Beyond the Frame: Women of Color and Visual Representation*, edited by Angela Y. Davis and Neferti Tadiar. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- . 2015. "Triple Jeopardy: The Third World Women's Alliance and the Transnational Roots of Women-of-Color Feminism." In *Provocations: A Transnational Reader in the History of Feminist Thought*, edited by Susan Bordo, M. Cristina Alcalde, and Ellen Rosenman. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burnham, Linda. 2005. Oral history by Loretta Ross. Voices of Feminism Oral History Project, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College.
- Clemente, Genoveva. 1972. "Puerto Rican Woman Visits China." *Triple Jeopardy* 2 (3) (March–April): 1.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1989. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum* 140 (1): 139–67.
- Kelley, Robin, and Betsy Esch. 1991. "Black like Mao: Red China and Black Revolution." *Souls* 1 (4): 6–41.
- Roja, Clarita. 1973. "Filipino Women and the Revolution." *Triple Jeopardy* 3 (1) (September–October): 8–9.
- Springer, Kimberly. 2005. *Living for the Revolution: Black Feminist Organizations, 1968–1980*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Sumi, Pat. 1972. "Vietnam." *Triple Jeopardy* 1 (6) (July–August): 8.
- Ward, Stephen. 2006. "The Third World Women's Alliance: Black Feminist Radicalism and Black Power Politics." In *The Black Power Movement: Re-thinking the Black Power–Civil Rights Era*, edited by Peniel E. Joseph. New York: Routledge.
- Wu, Judy. 2013. *Radicals on the Road: Internationalism, Orientalism, and Feminism during the Vietnam Era*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.