Zeitschrift für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung (2024) 13:417–426
https://doi.org/10.1007/s42597-024-00138-x

FORUM

Claims to universal norms and the forging of transnational networks: Struggles over the meaning of gender-based and sexual violence in conflicts

Michaela Zöhrer · Christian Methfessel · Daniel Stahl

Received: 3 April 2024 / Revised: 13 December 2024 / Accepted: 15 December 2024 / Published online: 10 February 2025

Abstract The article analyzes the ways in which claims to universal norms promote, or complicate, collaboration in the context of transnational activism. It emphasizes the potential of a constructivist understanding of universality, i.e. not as something intrinsic to certain norms, but rather as an empirically powerful assumption and a strategic tool. The argumentation is based on two case studies. The first looks at how networks of transnational solidarity were formed and conflicts between activist groups emerged in response to conflict-related sexual violence committed during the Bosnian War. The second example looks at responses to the crimes committed by ISIS in Iraq in 2014 and beyond, demonstrating how shifts within the field of transitional justice, and in particular the emergence of norms centered on the concerns and participation of survivors, have shaped the building of networks around the right to reparation.

Keywords Universal norms · Transnational activism · Conflict-related sexual violence · Bosnian war · Yazidi survivors law

✉ Michaela Zöhrer
University of Augsburg, Augsburg, Germany
E-Mail: michaela.zoehrer@uni-a.de

Christian Methfessel
Leibniz Institute for Contemporary History, Berlin, Germany

Daniel Stahl
Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Erlangen, Germany

Appelle an universelle Normen und transnationale Netzwerkbildung: Deutungskämpfe um geschlechtsbezogene und sexualisierte Gewalt in Konflikten

Zusammenfassung Der Artikel analysiert, auf welche Weise die Berufung auf universelle Normen die Zusammenarbeit im Rahmen von transnationalem Aktivismus fördert oder auch behindert. Er argumentiert, dass sich das Potenzial universaler Normen nur mithilfe eines konstruktivistischen Verständnisses von Universalität analysieren lässt, das heißt nicht als etwas, das bestimmten Normen immanent ist, sondern als empirisch wirkmächtige Behauptung und strategisches Instrument. Die Argumentation stützt sich auf zwei Fallbeispiele. Das erste befasst sich damit, wie in Reaktion auf die konfliktbezogene sexualisierte Gewalt während des Bosnienkriegs sowohl Netzwerke transnationaler Solidarität gebildet werden konnten, als auch Konflikte zwischen aktivistischen Gruppen aufkamen. Das zweite Beispiel befasst sich mit Reaktionen auf die vom sogenannten Islamischen Staat im Irak im Jahr 2014 und danach begangenen Verbrechen und verdeutlicht, wie Neuerungen im Bereich der Transitional Justice und dabei insbesondere das Aufkommen von Normen, die die Belange und die Partizipation von Überlebenden in den Mittelpunkt stellen, den Aufbau von Netzwerken rund um das Recht auf Wiedergutmachung (*reparation*) geprägt haben.

Schlüsselwörter Universelle Normen · Transnationaler Aktivismus · Konfliktbezogene sexuelle Gewalt · Bosnienkrieg · Yazidi survivors law

At the beginning of the 1990s, women's demands and rights received unprecedented attention at the international level, namely as human rights. This is reflected in the well-known framework of the campaign at the time: "Women's rights are human rights." By this time, women's rights had become an integral part of the international human rights regime and violence against women (VAW) in the public and private spheres was recognized as a human rights violation.

In preparation for the Second World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna (1993) and the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing (1995), various feminist activists from around the world strategically built alliances under the umbrella of human rights and VAW. Networking opportunities had already increased during the UN Decade for Women (1976–1985), but conflict and mistrust prevailed for a long time, not least between feminists from the Global North and the Global South. Eventually, however, the focus on VAW "helped women's groups attract new allies by situating them within the larger 'master frames' or 'metanarratives' of violence and rights" (Keck and Sikkink 1998, p. 196). According to observers at the time, this focus brought a broad consensus among feminists, women's groups and human rights NGOs alike, which significantly strengthened the transnational campaign for women's rights, as it promoted the formation of a broad and effective coalition (Reilly 2011). Inspired by the new opportunities on the post-Cold War international stage, different actors with disparate demands and interests put aside

internal conflicts and worked together under the jointly established framework of (fighting) VAW.[1]

Transnational activism against VAW demonstrates the great (strategic) potential that claims to universality and universal norms have, not despite, but because universal norms are plural, contested, and contradictory (Glasman 2022, p. 192; Stammers 2015). Even many postcolonial and feminist authors, who are rather critical of hegemonic claims of an ultimately Western universalism, highlight the capacity of appeals to universal human rights for bottom-up, counter-hegemonic struggles around the globe and "the continual, multidirectional flows of processes of naming, claiming and contesting human rights" (Reilly 2011, p. 71).[2] Our article contributes to peace and conflict studies by building on human rights and transitional justice (TJ) research from various disciplines that emphasizes the relevance of analyzing concrete 'translations' of universal norms and their potential to promote—or complicate—collaboration in the context of transnational (rights) activism. We aim to demonstrate that it is promising to examine how appeals to particular universal norms and their (critical) appropriation shape the network-building processes that accompany them.

In our view, universality is best understood from a constructivist view, i.e. not as something intrinsic to certain norms, but rather as an empirically powerful assumption and a strategic tool. In this way, the focus is not on whether certain norms are 'in fact' universal, but on how activists worldwide frame their demands in the language of universality and how they translate the respective norms in actor- and context-specific ways to connect local to global realities and vice versa (Zwingel 2012). Claims to universality can reinforce the cross-contextual recognition and glocal embeddedness of particular experiences, thereby facilitating the addressing of an international political audience and the formation of transnational networks and alliances. This approach avoids "diffusionist interpretations of the rise of a 'universal' human rights paradigm" by focusing on concrete translocal practices and actors "and the way they construct, export, and re-appropriate ideas" (Grosescu et al. 2019, p. 311).

However, while the formation of transnational alliances and networks under the umbrella of universal norms can facilitate the pooling of forces and the division of labor, it can also create conflicts or further promote certain asymmetries and thus the silencing and suppression of internal criticisms and opposing positions (Engle 2020). Moreover, if the "convergent translation" of different ways of knowing and experiencing human rights (violations) is not possible, even the breaking of alliances seems likely (Santos 2018). In particular, recent TJ research has emphasized the need to explore (the creation of) hierarchies between different groups of actors in order to address issues of power and in/visibility and the conflicts between and within groups participating in TJ processes. We assume that struggles over the meaning of

[1] On civil society activism in the post-Cold War era, see also the contribution of Bretton J. McEvoy and Jana Hönke (2025) on the arms trade with South Africa in this Forum.

[2] On counter-hegemonic struggles, see also the contribution of Christina Pauls (2024) on decolonial memory activism in this Forum.

universal norms can help to overcome such asymmetries, invisibilities, and conflicts, or find ways to address them, but they can also create or reinforce them.[3]

We develop our arguments based on two case studies. The first looks at the conflict-related sexual violence (CRSV) committed during the Bosnian War and analyzes how feminist and human rights activists responded to this violence by establishing transnational networks based on the 'strategic consensus' that VAW is a human rights violation. However, the gender-based interpretation advocated by most feminists was not undisputed, and struggles over the interpretation of acts of mass rape also led to conflicts and divisions between advocacy groups. Our second example looks at responses to the mass atrocities and CRSV committed by the self-proclaimed Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) in Iraq in 2014 and beyond, and shows how shifts in TJ, and in particular the emergence of norms of 'survivor-centeredness' have shaped the building of networks around the right to reparations in this particular case. In the brevity of this forum article, it is not possible to provide an in-depth analysis of either case. Rather, we want to show that a closer look at the struggles over the meaning of universal norms can advance the analysis of network-building processes in response to violent conflicts.

1 The Yugoslav Wars and transnational mobilization against CRSV: Alliance building and conflicts in feminist networks

During the Bosnian War (1992–95), reports of mass rape sparked outrage in Europe and beyond, not least among numerous civil society groups fighting against gender-based sexual violence. Moreover, activists from the conflict region appealed to the international public to draw attention to the atrocities committed during the war. A case in point is Fadila Memišević, a member of the Zenica Documentation Centre of War Crimes in Bosnia and Herzegovina, who took part in numerous activities to protest against the war crimes committed in her country. At the Global Tribunal on Violations of Women's Human Rights, organized by feminist activists at the UN World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna in June 1993, she gave a speech on the fate of Bosnian women (Memišević 1994). As already mentioned, Vienna was an important milestone for transnational advocacy work to put the issue of VAW on the international agenda. The tribunal enabled Memišević to situate her demands in the broader fight against gender-based sexual violence and mobilized support among international feminist networks. In Germany, Memišević worked closely together with *Gesellschaft für bedrohte Völker*, an NGO that framed the violence during the Bosnian War as genocide from the outset, launched numerous information campaigns about the war crimes committed and supported attempts to prosecute the perpetrators. The NGO organized a demonstration at the Buchenwald memorial site, at which Memišević warned that Buchenwald would be repeated, as Bosnia had been turned into a concentration camp (Schmid 1994). She was thus able to voice her concerns not only in networks that sought to establish women's rights as human rights, but also in forums that advocated anti-genocide norms.

[3] On the concept of "struggles over meaning", see the introduction to this Forum (Sändig and Kühn 2025).

In other cases, however, different interpretations of sexual violence led to serious conflicts among activists. Feminist NGOs in Zagreb, in particular, were divided over the start of the Yugoslav Wars and disputes over the meaning of the mass rapes caused a deep split in the Croatian feminist movement (Kajevska 2017). Roughly speaking, one group described itself as anti-nationalist and tended to focus on a gender-based interpretation of the rapes, arguing that all sides engaged in sexual violence during the war and that women were targeted because of their gender. The other group, often defamed by their opponents as 'nationalists', focused on an ethnicity-based interpretation of sexual violence and blamed the mass rapes solely on the Serb forces as part of a genocidal strategy. The 'nationalists' also rejected any cooperation with Serbian feminists who, like the Croatian antinationalists, advocated a gender-based explanation of the war rapes and, at least at the beginning of the Yugoslav Wars, held politicians on all sides responsible for the escalation of the conflicts.

The split within the Croatian feminist movement repeatedly led to controversy during transnational activities that involved Croatian participants and resulted in the forging of competing coalitions that invoked divergent universal norms when demanding action against sexual violence. For example, when the US women's human rights NGO *MADRE* invited Croatian and Serbian anti-nationalist feminists to a speaking tour, the "nationalist" Croatian group *Kareta* wrote a letter to the feminist journal *Off Our Backs*, criticizing the invited speakers, accusing them of "refusing to acknowledge the reality and particularity of genocidal rapes through the same whitewashing line of 'all men rape,'" thus "contributing to an international climate reluctant to take a stronger stand against the Serbian aggressor because it hides that aggressor by blaming it equally with the victim" (Kareta Feminist Group et al. 1993, p. 10). In their response, the antinationalist feminists Vesna Kesić and Đurđa Knežević conceded "that Serbian militias rape in massive numbers and for the purpose of genocide", but still emphasized that "women are the special victims of all wars, and rape is a universal weapon, which is always used 'strategically'" (Kesić and Knežević 1993, p. 30).

The Croatian "nationalist" feminist found an ally in the U.S. feminist Catharine MacKinnon, who also argued that only the Serbs pursued a systematic strategy of genocidal rape and publicly attacked Croatian anti-nationalist and Serbian feminist groups, for example by calling the latter "collaborators" of the Serbian regime in an interview with a German newspaper (Böhm 1993). Overall, however, it was much easier for the Croat anti-nationalist groups to forge international networks, as their gender-based interpretation of the violence was widely shared in transnational feminist circles (Kajevska 2017). For many women's rights activists, "a feminist perspective" had to be "explicitly anti-national" (Fregiehn 1993, p. 88).

The predominance of the gender-based interpretation in transnational feminist groups made it easier for activists who appealed to universal women's rights norms and harder for advocates who appealed to universal norms against genocide and aggression and argued for the need to take sides and demand forceful action against the Serbian aggressors. For example, in her aforementioned speech to the 1993 tribunal, Memišević also called for an end of the arms embargo to give Bosnia and Herzegovina the opportunity to defend itself against the Serbian aggressor. The verdict of the tribunal and the position paper of the Working Group on Women's

Rights of the NGO Forum did not raise this point and only emphasized that rape was a crime against humanity and had to be stopped and prosecuted (Bunch and Reilly 1994, pp. 45–8, 145). These demands were undisputed among all feminist activists and were repeatedly raised during protests against sexual violence. They formed the strategic consensus of the various initiatives that mushroomed in the wake of the news of mass rapes during the wars.[4]

Despite these controversies, these activities did have an impact on international reactions to the Bosnian War and shaped the evolution of global norms in the field of international criminal and transitional justice. They contributed to the inclusion of rape as a crime against humanity in the Statute of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia and reinforced the framing of rape as a war crime in general.

During the Bosnian War, feminist and human rights activists could only refer to the Fourth Geneva Convention, which states that women should be protected from rape and enforced prostitution (Bunch and Reilly 1994, p. 87). In the following decades, CRSV found its way into international law and international jurisdiction as a war crime, a crime against humanity or as an constitutive act with respect to genocide. In addition, various resolutions address CRSV in the context of the UN Women, Peace and Security Agenda, which started in 2000 with Security Council Resolution 1325.

2 Changing norms in transitional justice: Mobilization and survivor participation in the context of Iraq's reparation program

In recent decades, not only the meaning of gender and gender-based sexual violence as a suitable (still not uncontroversial) normative reference point has changed, but also the role that victims and survivors can, or at least should, play in the context of peacebuilding and TJ. For a long time, they were only indirectly addressed as recipients of justice, and their role was limited to testifying as witnesses. However, this has changed, not least in response to civil society initiatives that campaigned for the recognition of the demands and rights of (women) survivors of CRSV (e.g. the 2007 Nairobi Declaration on Women's and Girls' Right to a Remedy and Reparation). As the UN Special Rapporteur on Torture, Juan E. Méndez, noted in 2016, the "requirement of victim participation has become a well-established norm" (Méndez 2016, p. 2) in the field of TJ.

These observations help to better grasp how and which (new) norms can be claimed as universal in civil society activism that accompanies TJ processes in response to ISIS's genocidal and gender-based sexual violence in Iraq in 2014 and beyond. In fact, the relevant struggles and the associated mobilization of local and transnational networks have been strongly oriented not only towards norms of gender-sensitive and transformative TJ, but also towards norms of survivor participation. This becomes clear when examining the processes around the development of ad-

[4] See for example: Archiv des Instituts für Zeitgeschichte (IfZArch), Verbandsschriftgut/Frauenakademie München (FAM), ED 892/184.

ministrative reparation mechanisms that led to the Yazidi Survivors Law (YSL), which was adopted by the Iraqi Parliament in March 2021.

The first draft of a reparations bill, introduced in April 2019 by then Iraqi President Barham Salih, was initiated in a top-down manner without consultation with local civil society organizations or survivors. The initiative was initially welcomed because the underlying concept of reparations was complex and multi-layered. Nevertheless, it faced comprehensive criticism, and concerns were raised due to its narrow scope, as it limited eligibility to a specific group—female (Yazidi) survivors of ISIS abductions—and addressed only certain types of violations. It failed to acknowledge the broader spectrum of crimes perpetrated by ISIS, including CRSV and torture. All of these points are considered "shortcomings" because of "a lack of a consultative process with victims and community representatives, as well as a lack of reference to international good practice, during its drafting stage" (CIGE 2020, p. 4). Furthermore, the lack of consultation with survivors themselves was found to be "contrary to relevant international standards where meaningful participation of survivors should be ensured in mapping, design, implementation and monitoring of reparations" (C4JR 2023, p. 49, Fn 26).

Shortly after the introduction of the draft, survivor activists—some of them from the Yazidi diaspora—and civil society organizations (CSOs) from Iraq and the Kurdistan Region joined forces to participate in the legislative process. They did so in a broader transnational network that also included various international actors, such as IOM (International Organization for Migration) Iraq, which played an important mediating role vis-à-vis the Iraqi authorities.

An example of this 'joining of forces' is the founding of the Coalition for Just Reparations (C4JR) in November 2019: "As a coalition, we hope to focus attention on the civilian victims of armed conflict and their right to reparations. In order for their voices to be heard, a coordinated response is required: a coalition of CSOs working with and championing the cause of Iraq's diverse communities" (C4JR 2024). One of the core beliefs of the coalition is that "CSOs in post-conflict states are able to rise above sectarian, religious, ethnic, class, ideological and other divisions" (C4JR 2024) for the benefit of all survivors. In their work, the C4JR and its member organizations, some of them led by survivors, have consistently practiced survivor consultation and empowerment. At the same time, they fought for official recognition of a survivor-centered approach not only in the legislation of the YSL, but also in its ongoing (and challenging) implementation (Bor 2021; FGO 2023).

As a result of the processes initiated after the release of the initial bill, in which a broad and heterogeneous transnational network of actors, with survivors in pivotal roles, provided feedback to government actors, the final law contains important changes compared to the first draft. In 2020, for example, Farida Khalaf, president of the survivor-led NGO Farida Global Organisation (FGO), campaigned for the acknowledgment of the crimes committed against the Yazidis as genocide within the context of community and survivor consultations (FGO 2023, p. 7). The changes achieved relate in particular to broader (still not fully inclusive) criteria for eligibil-

ity[5], the definition of the crimes, which was "fairly aligned with the UN definition of CRSV" (C4JR 2023, p. 14), and the recognition of genocide. The YSL is considered one of the few reparation laws worldwide that covers CRSV. It includes "gender-sensitive provisions reflecting survivor demands and best practices in the field" (Bor 2022, p. 2), with some of the benefits granted through the YSL also reflecting a transformative approach to TJ.

3 Conclusion

A comparative analysis is beyond the scope of this article. Nevertheless, we would like to note that the networks that were mobilized in response to the first draft of the YSL differed *and could differ* in their composition and normative repertoire from those formed among activists in the context of the Yugoslav Wars. They had to look different, not only because the contexts in which the respective activists acted were different, but also because the political and legal vocabulary for framing gender-based and sexual violence as violations of universal (human rights) norms was rapidly changing.

While we owe a thorough analysis of the (civil society-driven) transformation of international norms on gender-based and sexual violence, we hope to have shown that developments in the field of (women's) human rights, e.g. concerning CRSV, are echoed in concrete struggles over the meaning of universal norms and in their contextual translation, thereby shaping the formation of local and transnational networks and alliances. Universal norms need not necessarily be legal norms or otherwise formalized, just like "[m]eanings and understandings of human rights are much wider than the framework of the international regime and legalistic definitions of what human rights are" (Stammers 2015, p. 76). Nevertheless, activists around the world often base their claims to universal norms on such a "'concrete universal' which can be adapted, contested and transformed" (Stammers 2015, p. 73).

Funding Research for this Forum article was supported by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) in the project "Bayerisches Zentrum für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung: Deutungskämpfe im Übergang" [grant number 01UG2204A-D], see also https://conflicts-meanings-transitions.de/.

Funding Open Access funding enabled and organized by Projekt DEAL.

[5] The YSL addresses female survivors of CRSV from Yazidi, Turkmen, Christian and Shabak minorities, Yazidi children who were kidnapped and survivors of all genders and age of the mentioned minorities who survived ISIS mass killings.

References

Böhm, Andrea. 1993. *Die US-amerikanische Juristin Catharine MacKinnon über Vergewaltigung als Menschenrechtsverletzung. „Einen Präzedenzfall schaffen"*. taz. 5 February 1993. https://taz.de/!1631721/.

Bor, Güley. 2022. *Mobilizing for Gender-Sensitive Reparations: Iraq's Yazidi Survivors Law and Civil Society*. Critical Peace Studies in Turkey (Blog). 7 November 2022. https://off.pubpub.org/pub/att0u76g/release/2.

Bunch, Charlotte, and Niamh Reilly. 1994. *Demanding Accountability: The Global Campaign and Vienna Tribunal for Women's Human Rights*. New Brunswick, NY; New York: Center for Women's Global Leadership, Rutgers University; United Nations Development Fund for Women.

C4JR. 2023. *More than "Ink on Paper": Taking Stock Two Years After the Adoption of the Yazidi [Female] Survivors Law*. https://c4jr.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/C4JR-Report-2024-Three-Years-After-YSL-1.pdf.

C4JR. 2024. *Coalition for Just Reparations (C4JR)*. https://c4jr.org/.

CIGE. 2020. *Consultations for Reparations: Enhancing Victims Participation towards the development of a Comprehensive Reparation Policy. Final report*. Commission for Investigation & Gathering Evidence (CIGE). August 2020. https://cige.gov.krd/files/517675d046381ba8a52420341bc72652.pdf.

Engle, Karen. 2020. *The Grip of Sexual Violence: Feminist Interventions in International Law*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

FGO. 2023. *Guidance on supporting survivor applications under the Yazidi Survivors Law*. Farida Global Organization. 17 March 2023. https://faridaglobal.org/blog/2023/03/17/guidance-on-supporting-survivor-applications-under-the-yazidi-survivors-law/.

Fregiehn, Claudia. 1993. Feministinnen zwischen nationaler Identität und Frauensolidarität. *Sicherheit und Frieden* 11(2):85–89.

Glasman, Joël. 2022. Universale Normen fallen nicht vom Himmel. Wie aus lokalen Interessen globale Konventionen gemacht werden. *Zeitschrift für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung* 11(2):183–193.

Grosescu, Raluca, Sophie Baby, and Laure Neumayer. 2019. Justice, Memory and Transnational Networks: European and South American Entanglements. *Global Society* 33(3):307–315.

Bor, Güley. 2021. *Yazidi Survivors in Germany and Iraq's Reparation Programme: "I want to have a share in Iraq"*. Bagdad: International Organization for Migration (IOM) Iraq. https://germany.iom.int/sites/g/files/tmzbdl806/files/documents/iom_yazidi-survivors-in-germany-and-iraq-reparations-programme.pdf.

Kajevska, Ana Miškovska. 2017. *Feminist Activism at War: Belgrade and Zagreb Feminists in the 1990s*. New York: Routledge.

Kareta Feminist Group, International Initiative of Women of Bosnia-Hercegovina Biser, Bosnia-Hercegovina Women's Group "Zene BiH", and Bedem Ljubavi Women's Group. 1993. Women express concern over tour. *Off Our Backs* 23(5):10–11.

Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Kesić, Vesna, and Đurđa Knežević. 1993. Croatian feminist reply. *Off Our Backs* 23(8):30–31.

McEvoy, Bretton J., and Jana Hönke. 2024. From 'merchants of death' to heroic patriots and back: rethinking responsibilities of arms producers. *Zeitschrift für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung* 13(2).

Memišević, Fadila. 1994. Bosnia/Herzegovina. In *Testimonies of the Global Tribunal on Violations of Women's Human Rights at the United Nations World Conference on Human Rights, Vienna, June 1993*, ed. Niamh Reilly, 40–41. Rutgers: Center for Women's Global Leadership.

Méndez, Juan E. 2016. Victims as Protagonists in Transitional Justice. *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 10(1):1–5.

Pauls, Christina. 2024. Struggles over memory? Decolonial memory activism as epistemic struggle against Eurocentrism. *Zeitschrift für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung* 13(2).

Reilly, Niamh. 2011. Doing Transnational Feminism, Transforming Human Rights: The Emancipatory Possibilities Revisited. *Irish Journal of Sociology* 19(2):60–76.

Sändig, Jan, and Florian P. Kühn. 2025. Guest Editorial: Contested transitions and perspectives on peace – Deutungskämpfe im Übergang. *Zeitschrift für Friedens- und Konfliktforschung*.

Santos, Cecília Mac Dowell. 2018. Mobilizing Women's Human Rights: What/Whose Knowledge Counts for Transnational Legal Mobilization? *Journal of Human Rights Practice* 10(2):191–211.
Schmid, Thomas. 1994. *2.500 protestieren gegen Völkermord. „Bosnien: Ein später Sieg Hitlers"*. taz. 15 November 1994, 3. https://taz.de/!1590926/.
Stammers, Neil. 2015. Human Rights and Social Movements: Theoretical Perspectives. *Revue interdisciplinaire d'études juridiques* 75(2):67–89.
Zwingel, Susanne. 2012. How Do Norms Travel? Theorizing International Women's Rights in Transnational Perspective. *International Studies Quarterly* 56(1):115–129.