

1
3
5
7
9
11
13
15
17
19
21
23
25
27
29
31
33
35

SUSTAINABLE NETWORKING: COLLABORATION FOR WOMEN'S HUMAN RIGHTS ACTIVISTS, SCHOLARS, AND DONORS

13 Brooke Ackerly

INTRODUCTION

19 What sustains feminism across the range of shared and invisible interests,
experiences, and geopolitical struggles that make us usefully discuss “sus-
21 tainable feminisms”? The same things that sustain feminists. One of these is
networking with other feminists. As evidenced by the participation in the
23 conference that led to this volume, feminists are sustained not by similarities
or differences but by networking and collaboration with one another. How
25 can we make our networks more sustaining of feminisms?

This chapter emerges out of five years of action research with women's
27 human rights organizations and participant observation of transnational
feminist networks at venues of transnational dialogue. Why women's or-
29 ganizations and not just women in human rights organizations? Because as
Clark and collaborators argue, women's organizations are the heart of the
31 transnational women's movement (Clark, Sprenger, VaneKlasen, & Durán,
2006; cf. Ferree & Tripp, 2006; cf. Hawkesworth, 2006).

35 _____
Sustainable Feminisms

37 Advances in Gender Research, Volume 11, 143–158

Copyright © 2007 by Elsevier Ltd.

All rights of reproduction in any form reserved

39 ISSN: 1529-2126/doi:10.1016/S1529-2126(07)11008-0

1 This chapter shares part of my findings: lessons about *how* to network and
3 collaborate so that the needs and concerns of all parties are shared between
5 the parties. I argue that in order to sustain our feminisms, activists, aca-
7 demics, and donors need to work together to develop linkages, cooperation,
9 ethical partnerships, and new institutions.¹ After a brief (and admittedly
11 oversimplifying) exposition of their differences, I describe these four op-
13 portunities for networking and collaboration. These insights are shared as
15 work in progress in two senses. This research is still underway *and* women's
17 human rights activism is in transition (Alvarez, 1999; Clark et al., 2006;
19 Hawkesworth, 2006; Moghadam, 2005). The changing global and local po-
21 litical and funding environments will likely continue to change the *relation-*
23 *ships* among scholars, activists, and donors.

13 For example, "gender mainstreaming," originally a strategy for integrat-
15 ing women's rights issues into local, national, and global policy consider-
17 ations, has influenced the funding for women's human rights work in
19 disturbing ways. Rather than centering the concern about gendered power
21 as feminists had hoped, mainstreaming has functioned to de-center concerns
23 about gender inequality (Clark et al., 2006; Goetz, forthcoming; Lewis,
25 2006). In this changing environment, feminist donors and feminists within
27 mainstream donor organizations are increasingly marginalized and in need
29 of sustaining partnerships with activists and academics. This chapter lays
31 out a landscape of concerns to which activists, academics, and donors of
33 women's human rights might be attentive as we reform and sustain our
35 networks.

25 Women's human rights feminists can be sustained by appreciating
27 women's human rights activism, scholarship, and donor initiatives as con-
29 fluent. Each provides the context of the other's impact by influencing their
31 opportunities and choices, in part by being each other's (potential) dialogue
33 partners. Feminism has always been a theory and a practice of social change
35 and education. Activism and scholarship have always been part of much
37 feminist practice and theory. They do not constitute a division of labor, but
39 rather interrelated projects (Collins, [1990] 1991; Harding & Norberg, 2005;
Mackinnon, 2006; Moraga & Anzaldúa, 2002; Peck & Mink, 1998; Sand-
oval, 2000; Smith, 1999).² In the area of women's human rights, the As-
sociation for Women's Rights and Development (AWID) and Development
Alternatives for Women in a New Era (DAWN) are just two of many
networks that bring activism and scholarship together with an eye toward
influencing public policy (e.g. Sen & Grown, 1987). Many donors have
supported such partnerships, for example United Nations Research Insti-
tuted for Social Development. However, professionalization and

1 competition for funding are forces that separate activists and academics.
2 Consequently, the scholar-activist-donor collaboration is a multi-faceted
3 and multi-sited relationship among actors who themselves move among
4 locations including academe, research institutes, non-government organiza-
5 tions (NGOs), international NGOs, international organizations, national
6 governments, local governments, and associations.

7 At the end of the 20th century, UN-centered organizing was important
8 for transnationalizing feminists. For example, leading up to the Vienna
9 Conference on human rights, the Center for Women's Global Leadership
10 organized a women's human rights tribunal. Through careful organization
11 that facilitated their public testimony at the parallel NGO forum, women
12 became the *voice* and not just the *face* of women's human rights violations
13 (1993). Likewise, in the book that Amrita Basu prepared anticipating the
14 Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing, *The Challenge of Local*
15 *Feminisms*, women from around the world offer the *analysis*, and not just
16 the *voice*, of local feminism (Basu & Mcgrory, 1995). As feminists assess
17 where we are against the Platform for Action generated by the Beijing
18 process and assess whether the Millennium Development Goals process will
19 improve women's human rights in this millennium, the need for *localized*
20 gender analysis and sustainable feminist collaboration are evident.

21 The insights in this paper come primarily from 21st century meetings of
22 grassroots and transnationalizing feminist activists, scholars, and donors:
23 "Human Rights Activism and Networking," Center for International Stud-
24 ies, University of Southern California (USC) (Los Angeles, 2001); "Work-
25 ing Together: Scholars, Activists and Funders," AWID (Guadalajara,
26 2002); "Sustainable Feminisms," Macalester College (St. Paul, 2003);
27 "Clash or Consensus: Gender and Human Security in Globalized World,"
28 Women's Learning Partnership and Global Fund for Women (Washington,
29 DC, 2003), World Social Forum (WSF) (Mumbai, 2004), Feminist Dia-
30 logues (Porto Alegre, 2005), WSF (Porto Alegre, 2005).

31 In order to have sustainable feminisms, the policies of this millennium
32 need to be based on transformative analysis that is integrated into the
33 analyses of all forms of oppression. Such analysis requires the sustained
34 collaboration of activists and scholars. Such collaboration needs to be sup-
35 ported by donors and its findings must achieve an audience with policy-
36 makers. However, the separations and differences between activists, schol-
37 ars, and donors create obstacles to networking and collaboration. The
38 transformative potential of feminism depends not only on the relationships
39 among these but also on transforming the contexts in which they work. In a
recent piece of action research around women's human rights funding, the

1 collaboration must pay off, and have the prospects of that payoff clearly
2 visible on the horizon. Activists often work in organizations that are not
3 highly developed, meaning both that their organizational design is flexible
4 and that lines of communication are not always clear. Of course, there is a
5 range of organizational structures implemented by activist organizations,
6 but compared to other participants, their organizations are more flexible, (it
7 doesn't take an act of Parliament to change them). However, activists may
8 be less professionalized. They may be unrehearsed in the discourse of
9 scholars and donors; their speech may reflect the passion that drives them in
10 their social mission. They may not be able to anticipate the interests of
11 donor and policy audiences. Despite their possible professional limitations,
12 in the hands of activists, a little money goes a long way. Many activist
13 organizations are experienced at leveraging small amounts of money for big
14 purposes. They need to be because when there is a macroeconomic down-
15 turn, demands on them increase and their resources decrease.

16 Similarly, "scholars" vary significantly by location, discipline, and other
17 professional factors. In general, scholars interested in women's human rights
18 work share in the activists' social mission. However, given institutional
19 pressures, researchers seek to make an impact on scholarship (Clark, 1995;
20 Stanley, 1997). Whether this means being cited in the near term or having
21 one's contribution recognized and built upon in the long term depends on
22 the scholar and the field. However, compared to the other participants, they
23 work with the least sense of urgency. Also, compared to the others, they
24 work under the most minimal organizational constraints. In addition to the
25 obvious job security of tenured professors, scholars generally are not con-
26 fined in their work by their organizational structures.³ Without beneficiaries
27 making demands, social problems requiring immediate investment, political
28 initiatives needing action, scholars can direct their own research agendas.
29 This makes them good partners for activists whose work is confined by
30 pressing needs of a social or political nature. Moreover, scholars also work
31 with minimal financial pressures. Certainly, funding would enable a scholar
32 to pursue a research agenda; a research project needs to be adequately
33 funded in order to be carried out, and certain projects are worth pursuing
34 only if the prospect of future funding is significantly secured such that work
35 that is necessary to inform future work takes place. None of these financial
36 constraints change whether scholars work. They merely affect on what and
37 how they work.

38 As with the others, "donors" differ institutionally from one another from
39 bilateral agencies to international foundations to women's groups and fam-
ily foundations. Some seek to mainstream gender in their initiatives, others

1 have a more oblique interest in women's human rights (Clark et al., 2004). QA :1
 3 However, all are investing in social and economic change. Investment involves supporting the individual missions of activist organizations, but it
 5 also involves seeing activist work as contributing to sustainable change more broadly. Donors see connections that activists could be making with one
 7 another. They can spot trends within and across societies. They have a perspective that enables them to see their own work and the work of activists as affecting future generations. Because of organizational structures,
 9 they may or may not be able to make connections between activists and scholars. They work under determined organizational and governance
 11 structures, including often constraints established by law or contracts. However, donors have been known to be flexible in interpreting their mission and the organizational design required to implement their goals. Finally, though they work with money, their work is not constrained by its
 13 lack in the way that the work of activists and scholars is. Changing personnel, priorities, oversight, or organizational structures have had a greater
 15 impact on donors than changes in available funds to disburse (Table 1).
 17

19

21

Table 1. Characteristics of Some of the Relevant Features of Participants.

23

25

27

29

31

33

35

37

39

| | Activists | Scholars | Donors |
|-----------------------------|--|---|--|
| Purpose | Social mission | Scholarly contribution | Investing in social change |
| Conceptual time frame | Immediate | Longest term – in this century and beyond | Medium to long term – in this generation and the next |
| Organization and governance | Varied and flexible | Almost no relevant organizational governance | Strong but potentially flexible organizational governance |
| The value of money | High – a little money goes a long way. A macroeconomic crisis increases demands on an organization | Medium – a little money wouldn't change how they work, a lot of money could | Low – more or less money would not affect how a given organization works, but organizations with different amounts of money work differently |

FOUR CHALLENGES

1
 3 In order for activists and scholars to develop transformative gender analysis
 5 and transformative policy prescriptions, sustainable women's human rights
 7 feminism needs to address fundamental challenges to such partnerships. By
 9 discussing the challenges women's human rights advocates face individually
 11 and collectively, we can create greater understanding of how we might make
 13 gains in the perceived legitimacy of our work, in the effectiveness of ad-
 15 vocracy, and in our policy impact. The challenges for networking and col-
 laboration of women's human rights movement participants are unrealized
 linkages, competition, lack of ethical reflection, and absence of, or under-
 developed institutional support for networking and collaboration. These
 challenges were identified by activists, scholars, and donors as they reflected
 on how to bring the insights from the small USC conference to the larger
 AWID 2002 workshop. The opportunities are:

- 17 (1) *Linkages*. How do we link up NGOs and scholars – particularly scholars
 19 who are institutionally located in academic institutions (local and for-
 21 eign)? How do we link local NGOs with one another in order that they
 23 may share the benefits of research and increase the effectiveness of their
 policy advocacy? How do we create communication between those who
 fund scholarship of women's human rights and those who fund program
 work? What benefits can accrue from such linkages?
- 25 (2) *Cooperation*. When forming these linkages, how do we deal with com-
 27 petition between NGOs (and between some funding organizations)?
 How can we mitigate the power dynamics that likely emerge in part-
 29 nerships among those who have been competitors for funding or per-
 ceive themselves as competitors for future funding?
- 31 (3) *Ethical partnerships*. How are we to work together? What guidelines
 should inform our working relationships? How can we monitor our
 working relationships so that they are ethical? What roles can NGOs
 and scholars play in informing donors' funding strategies?
- 33 (4) *Institutional innovation*. What needs to be in place for collaborative re-
 35 search to take place, be perceived as legitimate, and yield the much-
 needed information? What forms of institutional support would facil-
 itate networking and collaboration?

37 The distribution of resources among activists, academics, and donors, the
 39 funding processes that redistribute economic resources, the research pro-
 cesses that redistribute and package knowledge, and the publication and
 publicity processes that redistribute and circulate knowledge are *all political*

1
3 *processes*. Activists, scholars, and donors need to be aware of the power
5 dynamics that affect the outcomes of these processes. Moreover, to the
7 extent that these processes impact funding decisions, they must be aimed at
9 changing the size of the pie and utilizing funds more effectively. We must be
11 particularly attentive to not increasing competition for funds which would
13 undermine possibilities for linkages, cooperation, ethical partnerships, and
15 new institutions.

13 *Linkages*

15 Great steps can be made toward making women's human rights scholarship
17 valuable for policy advocacy if university-based academics can link up with
19 local activist and research NGOs. NGOs can save funds for programmatic
21 purposes if they partner with academics who get their funding in grant
23 competitions that do not compete with NGO-directed program funds.

25 Scholars, activists, and donors can facilitate linkages by discussing the
27 opportunities and challenges to developing linkages at existing forums that
29 bring together scholars, activists, and donors. Because of the limits of net-
31 working for those who are not already well-networked, we need institutions
33 to facilitate linkages.

27 *Cooperation*

29 Reliance on outside funding for programmatic work and research create a
31 potential for competitiveness between organizations working in women's
33 human rights related areas. The substantive value of the differences between
35 organizational approaches is undermined when groups perceive themselves
37 to be in competition with one another. Scholars, activists, and donors need
39 to address the threat of lost opportunities due to competition. Donors can
help by fostering collaboration among activists. Donors that receive a range
of grant applications are well positioned to observe opportunities for col-
laboration. Where they are not able to facilitate that collaboration them-
selves, we need institutional means to prevent the observed potential from
being lost.

Ethical Partnerships

1

3 Scholars, activist, and donors individually and collectively bear the burden
of reflecting upon ethical questions. Here I focus on the implications of
5 ethical considerations for scholarship. However, *the point* is that academics
need to reflect with activists and donors about the ethical concerns of part-
7 nership.

For action-oriented feminist scholars, the possibilities for doing trans-
9 formative research are exciting. However, as many feminist methodologists
have argued, traditional disciplinary approaches to research may also need
11 to be challenged (Ackerly et al., 2006; Harding & Norberg, 2005). Chal-
lenging disciplinary norms does not require visible disdain for accepted
13 practices, just a commitment to imagining new possibilities for productive
research (e.g. D’Costa, 2006; Stern, 2006). Especially for junior scholars and
15 other scholars whose professional life is invested in disciplinary norms, a
feminist research agenda and methods need not require abandoning disci-
17 plinary boundaries, though it does mean rearticulating them.

Research Question and Design

Not all research is best focused on what has happened. At the USC meeting,
21 an advocate for sweatshop workers in the US suggested “because activists’
work is often crises-driven and reactive, academics can help us to step back
23 and look at the big picture, as well as help us identify long-term solutions to
the problems we are addressing. The 2005 phase-out of garment quotas
25 under the General Agreement of Trade and Tariffs will likely have a huge
impact on the US garment industry and garment workers worldwide. The
27 garment industry is expected to shift production to the countries with the
lowest labor costs and most vulnerable workforce. Yet, garment worker
29 advocates have not yet begun to address this issue. We need to start as-
sessing what the impact will be for our constituency of garment workers in
31 California and develop programs that will help workers who lose their jobs
transition. Academics could help us with research, or with developing job
33 retraining programs.” In this way, a research question might be guided by
an anticipated change in the economic, political, social, or legal context of
35 activism.

In addition to influencing the topic of research, activists may influence
37 research design. Although the community may not need the information
that the researcher was planning on gathering, it may need other informa-
39 tion. After designing research in partnership with communities or NGOs, a
scholar may collect data that was not required by her research design. These

1 data may ultimately yield important information for the research. However,
3 even if these data end up not being useful to the scholar, their collection may
5 be an important part of carrying out a research design that is respectful of,
7 and valuable to, the research subjects.

7 *Methodology and Methods*

9 Activists' insights also provide methodological suggestions. Certainly,
11 scholars should explore the appropriateness of participatory action re-
13 search, action research methods, and feminist approaches to methods and
15 methodology for their research question (Fonow & Cook, 2005; Harding &
17 Norberg, 2005; Kesby, 2005; Kirsch, 2005).

19 Even when the scholar's research is not of *concrete* value to the activists, if
21 properly designed, research can be an opportunity for local capacity-build-
23 ing. For example, Renu Khanna (1999) describes a health study in Bombay
25 in 1992. The study was carried out, not by professional researchers, but by
27 auxiliary nurse midwives (ANM) who were para-professionals employed
29 by the local health department. This study built the capacity of the ANMs
31 for conducting research and enabled them to offer suggestions for the
33 woman-centered health plans to follow. In addition, the training they re-
35 ceived in order to conduct the research made them more capable of com-
37 municating with women about their health and sexuality in general.

39 The certain value of the research to those supporting it and the likely
41 value to enhancing the quality and scope of the research should make such
43 partnerships attractive to scholars and their donors. Moreover, partnership
45 between activists and scholars in research design can mitigate potential
47 power dynamics between them. NGOs have the ability to facilitate or ham-
49 per research and researchers have the ability to provide valuable research
51 and publicity for NGOs and their beneficiaries.

53 A research agenda expanded to meet the research subjects' needs may cost
55 more than an unmodified plan or it may cost less depending on the scholar's
57 ability to use existing data or new partnerships effectively. However, if
59 scholars include in the estimated total cost of their research the opportunity
61 cost that activists incur by *not* doing their work while being research sub-
63 jects, then by making research valuable to the subjects the researcher *de-*
65 *creases* the overall cost of the project.

67 Funding organizations may find this collaborative approach to research
69 attractive and may seek to foster it. Where donors have not considered the
71 possibility of such collaborative research design, the collaborative scholar's
73 research proposal itself will have an educational effect.

1 Because partnerships have in the past resulted in research subjects feeling
2 their time or knowledge being abused by researchers as in the example in the
3 prologue, and because researchers have likewise felt their time and knowl-
4 edge being abused, each partnership should be guided by a mutually agreed
5 upon code of ethics. A code of ethics should include an understanding of
6 how the knowledge generated by the research will be shared and with whom.
7

9 *Disseminating and Translating Research*

10 Another area for improving scholarship is in the area of making the knowl-
11 edge generated by research more accessible to the research subjects and to
12 policy audiences. Scholars and journals should provide abstracts of all
13 publications, thus making their findings more accessible to those who do not
14 have the time or the inclination to wade through sometimes discipline-spe-
15 cific academic language and methodological discussions in order to gain the
16 knowledge that might be valuable to them. Even those activists who would
17 like to take the time to become more aware of scholarly work in their field
18 do not have the time to read all articles that *might* be relevant in order to
19 determine which are. In addition, scholars can post their findings in pre-
20 liminary form and in accessible language on appropriate listservs and web-
21 sites and share them with independent media.

QA :2

22 Where appropriate, scholars can feed findings reflecting gender analysis to
23 the media to counter political analysis that is void of gender analysis.
24 Scholars can widen the media focus on sensational case studies by providing
25 breadth of knowledge.

26 As academics do research, they can become a clearinghouse for informa-
27 tion and research knowledge making particular use of organizations that try
28 to maintain active bibliographies in their respective areas of research.

29 When sharing findings with a broader audience, it may be necessary to
30 translate concepts into non-academic language, but scholars might consider
31 making the elimination of the need for such translation their goal. In ad-
32 dition to making arguments and conclusions understood in accessible lan-
33 guage, good translation means being able to communicate the import of
34 academic arguments for practice and policy.

35 Effective translation also means the ability to re-deploy academic argu-
36 ments in political and social life with a sense of urgency. When the subject
37 matter of academic arguments has direct bearing on the lives of people
38 around the world, activists play an essential role in translating arguments
39 and language intended for an academic audience into relevant law, ap-
40 proaches to funding, development programs, and military operations.

1 *Activist-Oriented Urgency*

3 Finally, scholars may feel that urgency and emotion should be outside the
 5 scope of research. Certainly, the urgency of a question or the passion with
 7 which scholars care about their work or those whose lives are the subjects of
 9 their work should not negatively affect the quality of their work. Rather,
 11 urgency and emotion should positively affect the quality of scholarship.
 Because people's lives are at stake, as Sima Wali stated during the USC
 workshop, "irrelevant research is a luxury". If scholarship is to be truly
 feminist, it needs, as Mies (1983) and so many others have said, to be action-
 oriented (e.g. Naples, 2003). (See also Schmalzbauer, Vadera, & Verghese,
 this volume; Agathangelou & Spira, this volume.)

13

New Institutions

15

17 In all of the discussions of collaboration – except for discussions of specific
 19 ethical breaches by activists or scholars – the power of donors figures large.
 Academics and activists tailor their agendas to perceived donor initiatives.
 21 NGOs compete with one another for funding. Academics' research projects
 are funded by particular initiatives that do not include activism or practice
 in their scope. The activities of scholars and NGOs are disconnected because
 they are not funded within the same sectors or even the same organizations.⁴
 23 With or without intent, donors are structuring the environment of net-
 25 working and collaboration among scholars and activists. Given the political
 importance, need for legitimacy, and pressing ethical and strategic dimen-
 27 sions of women's human rights work, donors need to be self-conscious of
 the incentives and disincentives created by their modes of operation.

Scholar-activist partnerships in research can be strengthened by funding
 29 support. Collaborative projects may take longer, require different research
 methods, require greater coordination of more people and needs, and
 31 therefore need flexibility as to when they take place. All of these demands
 may make the existing modes of funding research too confining.

33 Additionally, in the process of reviewing budgets, funding organizations
 need to provide guidelines and hold researchers accountable for the ways in
 35 which their budget exhibits inequality or could be exploited to foster in-
 equalities. Collette Oseen (1999) illustrates the problems associated with
 37 codifying hierarchy in budgets.

Even feminist academics who are aware of the need for collaborative
 39 research with activists face the twin challenges of lack of funding and lack of
 institutional support. To strengthen the reward system for feminist

1 academics within their universities and to counter the marginalization of
2 women's studies within the economic system of universities around the
3 world, donors could use Women, Feminist, and Gender Studies programs
4 and centers within universities as sites for the collaboration between women
5 activists and researchers (University of Minnesota Social Justice Group,
6 2000). Another strategy is to support feminist and gender scholarship within
7 mainstream programs. The most appropriate strategy will vary by context
8 as either strategy could constitute a capitulation to a power structure.

9 Where academia has not welcomed women's studies, donors may make
10 themselves a site for the collaboration between women activists and re-
11 searchers or partner with NGOs to create such spaces. Donor initiatives
12 might include offering a site for networking among activists and scholars (or
13 funding such meetings) and funding partnerships between local "scientists"
14 and foreign gender specialists to build local capacity in gender social science
15 work in the academy. In considering funding such projects, donors should
16 consider the geopolitics of collaboration.

17 Finally, we need to create opportunities for discussion of these and other
18 challenges to networking and collaboration. These opportunities must
19 promise to be worthy of the time invested in participating. It may be easier
20 professionally for academics to attend "academic" conferences. For NGOs
21 and activists meetings that offer concrete benefits such as a grant-writing
22 workshop (as at the USC workshop), discussion of activist-oriented research
23 questions and possible research designs will be more worth their opportu-
24 nity cost. Discussions need to be organized with these constraints in mind
25 and with the purpose of not indulging in pre-existing biases about kinds of
26 knowledge. Forums such as the WSF and the Sustainable Feminism confer-
27 ence can broaden the circle of participants.

28 Donor participation in discussions about networking and collaboration
29 (though potentially corrupted by the power of money) is essential. The
30 structural impediment of donor power can be overcome in the format of
31 such meetings and must be if donors are going to learn about the challenges
32 to these partnerships and if activists and scholars are to learn how to make
33 effective proposals to donors (Ackerly, 2007).

34 While dialogues are important, we also need to think differently about
35 how we network. An online moderated listserv with low volume, focused on
36 specific questions, accompanied by a secure and searchable database of
37 scholar, activist, and donor issues, strategies, resources, research questions,
38 and expertise, and supported by a moderator devoted to facilitating linkages
39 can be important resources for expanding the possibilities for linkages, co-
operation, and ethical partnerships (Ackerly, 2001, 2006). Internet access is

1 not possible for many of the participants in the WSF 2004 workshop who
2 were rural activists from within India. However, for most who are not
3 within reasonable travel of an international forum, internet-based network-
4 ing is more inclusive than face to face networking.
5

7 CONCLUSION

9 Today, at the dawn of the millennium, in anticipation of Beijing Plus Ten,
10 feminist scholars need activists in order to offer gender analysis with trans-
11 formative potential. Activists need academics who can use the material ex-
12 perience of activists, NGOs, and their beneficiaries to articulate policy
13 prescriptions with transformative potential. Donors need to invest in these
14 partnerships. All three need to articulate their results as policy prescriptions
15 that are comprehensible to the gender competent and gender incompetent
16 policy-maker alike.

17 Yet, we also know that it is hard to link NGOs to scholars. It can be hard
18 for activists to partner with one another. It is hard for scholars in the global
19 North and South to partner. Ethical questions confront those engaged in
20 collaboration. Collaboration is more likely with institutional support. In
21 this paper, I describe the differing purposes, time-frames, organizational
22 structures, and financial resources of activists, scholars, and donors. These
23 differences, and related power dynamics, create challenges to networking
24 and collaboration.

25 Conscious of it or not, feminist scholars, activists, and funding repre-
26 sentatives have embarked on a collective project. Trust among us is a po-
27 litical strategy. If we do our work while being self-conscious of our shared
28 responsibility for our relationships, we will be increasingly effective at mit-
29 igating power hierarchies, and sustaining our feminisms, as we go.

31 NOTES

33
34 1. Elsewhere I develop what this means for how women engage with each other
35 despite significant seemingly intractable differences (Ackerly, 2007) and offer an
36 account of the theory of human right that emerges from reflecting through their
37 differences (Ackerly, forthcoming).

38 2. Many activists who would agree with the general goals of feminists find the
39 connotation of “feminism” politically problematic. In recognition of a common
40 vision *in the most general sense*, I use the term “feminist” in this chapter. I do so with
41 apologies, with respect for those who eschew the term, and with optimism that our

1 common vision includes challenging the hierarchies within feminism as well as those
 2 that create obstacles to feminism. I refer to all women's human rights activists,
 3 scholars, donors, and policy-makers as "feminists," "participants" in the movement
 4 for women's human rights, or "advocates" for women's human rights.

5 3. Certainly, researches in untenured positions, including junior faculty, graduate
 6 students, and independent researchers, do not have the same security as tenured
 7 faculty; yet, like tenured faculty, they generally work in ways that are defined and
 8 confined by their disciplines (as opposed to their organizations).

9 4. There are exceptions that show just how valuable such collaboration can be.
 10 For example, Ford funds a partnership between the Wagner Graduate School of
 11 Public Service and a community-based organization in New York.

12 ACKNOWLEDGMENT

13
 14 Thanks to the Center for International Studies at the University of Southern
 15 California for sponsoring the first workshop that launched these productive
 16 dialogues and to Annie Hillar and Trees Zbidat for being willing collabor-
 17 ators.

18 REFERENCES

- 19
 20
 21
 22
 23 Ackerly, B. A. (2001). Women's human rights activists as cross-cultural theorists. *International
 24 Feminist Journal of Politics*, 3(3), 311–346.
- 25 Ackerly, B. A. (2006). Deliberative democracy theory for building global civil society: Design-
 26 ing a virtual community of activists. *Contemporary Political Theory*, 5(2), 113–141.
- 27 Ackerly, B. A. (2007). "How does change happen?" Deliberation and difficulty. *Hypatia*. QA :3
- 28 Ackerly, B. A. (forthcoming). *Universal human rights in a world of difference*. Cambridge:
 29 Cambridge University Press. QA :4
- 30 Alvarez, S. (1999). Advocating feminism: The Latin American feminist NGO 'boom'. *Inter-
 31 national Feminist Journal of Politics*, 1(2), 181–209.
- 32 Basu, A., & Mcgrory, C. E. (Eds). (1995). *The challenge of local feminisms: Women's move-
 33 ments in global perspective*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- 34 Clark, C., Sprenger, E., Vaneklasen, L., & Durán, L. A. (2006). *Where is the money for women's
 35 rights?* Washington, DC: Just Associates.
- 36 Clark, V. A. (1995). *Antifeminism in the academy*. New York: Routledge.
- 37 Collins, P. H. ([1990] 1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of
 38 empowerment, perspectives on gender* (Vol. 2). Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- 39 Ferree, M. M., & Tripp, A. M. (2006). *Global feminism: Transnational women's activism, or-
 ganizing, and human rights*. New York: New York University Press.
- Fonow, M. M., & Cook, J. A. (2005). Feminist methodology: New applications in the academy
 and public policy. *Signs*, 30(4), 2211.
- Goetz, A. M. (forthcoming). Should we swap gender? In: Cornwall, Harrison & Whitehead QA :5
 (Eds), *Repositioning feminisms*. London: Zed.

- 1 Harding, S., & Norberg, K. (2005). New feminist approaches to social science methodologies:
An introduction. (editorial). *Signs*, 30(4), 2009–2015.
- 3 Hawkesworth, M. E. (2006). *Globalization and feminist activism, globalization*. Lanham, MD:
Rowman & Littlefield.
- 5 Kesby, M. (2005). Retheorizing empowerment-through-participation as a performance in space:
Beyond tyranny to transformation. *Signs*, 30(4), 2037–2065.
- Khanna, R. (1999). Research and intervention. In: M. Porter & E. R. Judd (Eds), *Feminists
7 doing development: A practical critique*. London: Zed Books.
- Kirsch, G. E. (2005). Friendship, friendliness, and feminist fieldwork. *Signs*, 30(4), 2163–2172.
- 9 Lewis, S. (2006). Speech to a conference on UN reform and human rights. Paper read at UN
Reform and Human Rights, Harvard Law School, February 26.
- Mackinnon, C. A. (2006). *Are women human?: And other international dialogues*. Cambridge,
11 MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Mies, M. (1983). Towards a methodology for feminist research. In: G. Bowles & R. Klein (Eds),
13 *Theories of women's studies*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Moghadam, V. M. (2005). *Globalizing women: Transnational feminist networks, themes in global
social change*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- 15 Moraga, C., & Anzaldúa, G. (Eds). (2002). *This bridge called my back: Writings by radical
women of color. Women of color series* (expanded and rev. 3rd ed.). Berkeley, CA: Third
17 Woman Press.
- Naples, N. A. (2003). *Feminism and method: Ethnography, discourse analysis, and activist re-
search*. New York: Routledge.
- 19 Oseen, C. (1999). Women organizing for change: Transformational organizing as a strategy for
feminist development. In: M. Porter & E. R. Judd (Eds), *Feminists doing development: A
21 practical critique*. London: Zed Books.
- Peck, E. G., & Mink, J. S. (Eds). (1998). *Common ground: Feminist collaboration in the academy*.
23 Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Sandoval, C. (2000). *Methodology of the oppressed, theory out of bounds* (Vol. 18). Minneapolis,
25 MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sen, G., & Grown, C. (1987). *Development, crises, and alternative visions: Third world women's
perspectives, new feminist library*. NY: Monthly Review Press.
- 27 Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed
Books.
- 29 Sowards, S. K., & Renegar, V. R. (2006). Reconceptualizing rhetorical activism in contem-
porary feminist contexts. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 17, 57–74.
- Stanley, L. (1997). *Knowing feminisms: On academic borders, territories and tribes*. London: Sage
31 Publications.
- University of Minnesota Social Justice Group (2000). *Is academic feminism dead? Theory in
33 practice*. New York: New York University Press.
- 35
- 37
- 39

1 **AUTHOR QUERY FORM**

3

| | | |
|---|--|---|
|  <p>ELSEVIER</p> | Book: AGR-V011 Chapter: 11008 | Please eail or fax your responses and any corrections to: Eail: Fax: |
|---|--|---|

5

7

9 Dear Author,

9 During the preparation of your manuscript for typesetting, some questions may have arisen. These are listed below. Please check your typeset proof carefully and mark any corrections in the margin of the proof or compile them as a separate list*.

11

13 **Disk use**

Sometimes we are unable to process the electronic file of your article and/or artwork. If this is the case, we have proceeded by:

- 15 Scanning (parts of) your article Rekeying (parts of) your article
 Scanning the artwork

17 **Bibliography**

If discrepancies were noted between the literature list and the text references, the following may apply:

19

The references listed below were noted in the text but appear to be missing from your literature list. Please complete the list or remove the references from the text.

Uncited references: This section comprises references that occur in the reference list but not in the body of the text. Please position each reference in the text or delete it. Any reference not dealt with will be retained in this section

23

25 **Queries and/or remarks**

27

| Location in Article | Query / remark | Response |
|---------------------|---|----------|
| AU:1 | The references, Clark et al. (2004); Ackerly et al. (2006); D'Costa (2006) and Stern (2006) are not listed in the reference section. Please provide appropriate details for the same. | |
| AU:2 | Please check if a word/phrase is missing in the end of the sentence "Even those activists(determine which are." | |

31

33

35

37

39

| | | | |
|---|------|--|--|
| 1 | AU:3 | Please provide volume number and page numbers in Ackerly (2007). | |
| 3 | AU:4 | Please provide the year of publication in Ackerly (forthcoming). | |
| 5 | | | |
| 7 | AU:5 | Please provide the initials of the editors and the year of publication in Goetz (forthcoming). | |
| 9 | | | |

11

13

15

17

19

21

23

25

27

29

31

33

35

37

39