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ABSTRACT

In response to concerns raised by Northern and Southern feminists that development agencies neglected Third World women's needs, development agencies began in the 1970s to implement policies and projects geared toward women. These have taken various forms over the years. Most recently, international aid agencies have instituted gender equality policies. Despite these interventions, Third World women are still struggling to survive. In this thesis, I explore why this is the case: to what extent can gender equality policies crafted in the First World address the inequalities in the Third World?

To explore this question, I look at the participatory policymaking process the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) used in 1998 to update its gender equity policy, and the resulting policy. In its effort to ensure that its policymaking process was broad based, open, transparent and inclusive, CIDA chose the Internet as its medium.

By looking at CIDA's process and policy, I can begin to understand how systems are put together and the consequences of that configuration and outcome. I am using the local situation "as an entry point to the study of institutional and discursive forces and how these are related to larger socio-economic processes" (Escobar 1995, 109).

My examination demonstrates that CIDA's process was, in fact, a ritualistic exercise. The voices of Third World grassroots women, the very women the policy is intended to
benefit, were excluded, while individuals in institutions of ruling were explicitly included. By managing and controlling all aspects of the consultation to ensure the outcome it desired, staff co-opted feminist strategic goals to meet the agency’s bureaucratic needs. Through this cursory participatory process, gender staff at CIDA exercised their power over Third World women, thereby maintaining their status. CIDA’s gender equality policymaking process and policy are illustrative of how international development institutions whether wittingly or not perpetuate the racialization of Third World women. By doing so, they are (as Razack explains in the context of refugee hearings) “inevitably an encounter between the white First World and the racialized Third World” (1999, 89).
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

Developmentalism is not merely a policy of economic and social change, or a philosophy of history. It reflects the ethos of Western culture and is intimately intertwined with Western history and culture. Ultimately the problem of developmentalism cannot be settled in terms of political economy, nor in terms of social philosophy, the critique of ideas or the disembody of discourse; it requires a profound historical and cultural review of the Western project. This task we might term the deconstruction of the West.

(Pieterse 1991, 24)

*Development* has different meanings in different contexts and is understood and theorised differently by different people. “In ordinary usage, *development...* implies movement from one level to another...” (Reddock 2000, 24). To *develop* means “to bring about the capabilities or possibilities of; bring to a more advanced or effective state” (*The Random House Dictionary of the English*. 1987. 2d ed. Unabridged. s.v. “develop”).

Applying the term to societies, *development* implies economic advancement (Rodney 1981). Third World, anti-racist theorists have a different understanding of the term *development*. They see development as a “process whereby other peoples are dominated and their destinies shaped according to an essentially Western way of conceiving and perceiving the world” (Tucker 1999, 1). Regardless of how one defines or sees development, to understand how the concept of development has been deployed in the context of societies, it is necessary to gain insight into the history of colonialism: for the seeds of development were planted during colonial times.

Colonialism was a comprehensive project. Its success required the operation of two separate mechanisms working in concert: the substantive and tangible measures implemented
by colonial governments, and the colonial discourse that accompanied them. The substantive processes of colonisation were facilitated and buttressed by the colonialist discourse. Colonisation would not have succeeded had the discursive construction of the ‘other’ failed.

The concept of race emerged out of the colonial and imperial expansionism of the Western powers (Castagna and Dei 2000, Goldberg 1993). At that time, Western sociologists and anthropologists constructed race as biologically determined. Subjugation of certain peoples based on their race was justified on the basis that they did not have the ‘same’ capacity for language, culture and communication as their European counterparts. This narrow understanding of race restricted the understanding of racism and race relations. Race relations were not seen as power relations or as relations of domination and subordination (Castagna and Dei 2000, Goldberg 1993, Omi and Winant 1994). Rather, the value of a particular race was allegedly based on their technological and cultural accomplishments and their basis of social organization. Because Europe dominated the Third World\(^1\) politically, economically, militarily and culturally, all other models and races were judged according to the Western model. The accomplishments, values and cultures of other peoples were dismissed (Escobar 1995, Reddock 2000). Through this negation, European supremacy was emphasized. From this constructed position of superiority, European racialization and racist discourse took hold (Goldberg 1993).

The West’s depiction of itself as culturally, morally, scientifically and technologically superior contrasted with its simultaneous representation of the East as ‘uncivilised’, ‘immoral’, ‘backward’, and ‘inferior’. Whites viewed themselves as the saviours of people of

---

\(^1\) The term *Third World* arose in the 1950s from anticolonial consciousness that developed in the newly independent nation-states. The term was used to show neither their alliance with the First World (i.e., North Atlantic capitalist countries) nor the Second World (i.e., centrally planned economies of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union) (Reddock 2000, 28). I use the term *Third World* in this context. My usage of the term *Third World* is not intended to imply a hierarchy of nations. Throughout this document, I also use the term *Southern*
colour (Castagna and Dei 2000). The construction of Europe as ‘modern’ and the colonies as ‘backward’ provided a basis and justification for colonisation and the imposition of European values, religion and culture on Third World peoples. “These practices of naming and knowledge construction deny all autonomy to those so named and imagined, extending power, control, authority and domination over them” (Goldberg 1993, 150). Unequal power relationships gave the North the ability to articulate and project itself and its worldview on the South. To do this without violence and force, the West needed as much information about the ‘other’ as it could gather. Relying on dominant research within the social sciences, the West gained the information it needed to both implement its ruling and justify its oppressive actions (Goldberg 1993).

This ruling took various forms. During colonialism, the colonisers, utilising the labour of the colonised peoples, extracted the natural resources and raw materials of the colonies and brought them to the West to be manufactured (Rodney 1981). African workers did not receive fair wages for their work, being paid significantly lower wages than their European counterparts for the same labour. For example, Scottish or German coal miners could earn in an hour what the Nigerian miner was paid in a six-day week for comparable jobs (Rodney 1981, 150). In addition to exploiting Southern workers, the West also exploited their resources. Northern capitalists never paid the colonies for the natural resources they extracted, such as diamonds, gold, oil and copper. This process helped to advance Europe’s industrial growth, while simultaneously pushing the colonies into poverty. The colonial governments taxed the citizens of the colonies and used that money to build infrastructures needed to maintain and fund the occupation. Thus, roads, hospitals, and schools were built,
maintained, and run solely for the benefit of the colonial state and not for the local country or people (Rodney 1981).

The West also sought to impose Christianity and Western notions of femininity and masculinity on Third World women and men (Escobar 1995, Kabeer 1994a, Reddock 2000, Rodney 1981). Men were expected to be the breadwinners for the family and many were forced to migrate from rural areas to the cities to meet the industrialised needs of the colonial rulers and capitalist business owners. Even though they were at the centre of their societies, women were denied access to economic resources under colonialism. They were expected to take full responsibility for creating, maintaining and running the family, but denied the economic means necessary to do so. When the men migrated to the cities to work, the women were left to raise and support their families and communities on their own.

Resistance movements and struggles for national liberation, led by Third World women and men, gave rise to the downfall of colonialism. Though the colonies gained formal political independence, they still lacked economic independence. The economic structures of the former colonies remained the same as they had during colonialism. As the colonisers pulled out, they left in their place countries that lacked sufficient infrastructure to sustain themselves and economic structures and power relationships that entrenched control of the countries in the hands of a few elite men. Economic domination by the North continued unabated (Rodney 1981).

Local leaders collaborated with the former colonisers and capitalists to ensure their own power. Class divisions endured and strengthened. Property and ownership of natural resources were further privatised, benefiting Northern business owners and their Southern middlemen. Poverty, for the masses, was rampant. During colonial times, farming had been industrialised and transformed to meet the needs of the agricultural markets dominated by
multinational merchants of grain (owned by Northern businessmen). Farmers were forced to change their crops from food production to cash crops (Escobar 1995). Once property was privatised, women faced difficulties producing enough food on the small plots left to them to meet the needs of their families and communities. Consequently, food shortages were common (Rodney 1981). As Escobar explains, "... massive poverty in the modern sense appeared only when the spread of the market economy broke down community ties and deprived millions of people from access to land, water and other resources" (1995, 22).

Why Development?

Given these dire circumstances, Northern countries decided that the former colonies needed to be ‘developed’. Thus, the term development became popularly applied to societies at that time. For Europe and North America, development meant that the former colonies needed to be ‘modernised’. Relying on the colonial racialized constructions of the Third World as ‘backward’, ‘primitive’ and ‘underdeveloped’, Western governments claimed that responsibility for Third World problems lay not in the hands of the colonialists, but in the hands of the former colonies (Escobar 1995, Reddock 2000, Rodney 1981, Tucker 1999).

While one could not reasonably deny the need for ‘development’ of some form or another, Third World, anti-racist theorists question the form chosen by the North. Rather than seeing development as a project to modernise and advance Third World cultures and societies, they see the Northern development project as one that further imposes Western ideologies on Third World countries and their peoples. They also believe that development has resulted in the ongoing underdevelopment of the South to the benefit of the North (Frank 1969, Pieterse 1991, 1999, Tucker 1999).
According to Western racist ideology, poverty, illiteracy and other problems the former colonies faced were due to the 'primitive' nature of the peoples of these countries (Escobar 1995, Reddock 2000, Rodney 1981, Tucker 1991). Their 'primitiveness' lay both in their cultural ways and their forms of governance and economic systems. Former colonies needed only to be industrialised and modernised in ways similar to the West. If they transformed their structures to mimic the West’s, with liberal democracies and neo-liberal economic policies, they would benefit as Europe had. Thus, to ‘help’ the former colonies grow and prosper European governments tied their aid packages to conditions such as industrialisation, implementation of liberal democracies and economic reforms (Escobar 1995, Reddock 2000, Rodney 1981, Tucker 1999).

They also sought to further impose Western values and standards. These included the entrenchment of sex-role stereotypes and the gendered division of labour. The development apparatus, following upon the heels of colonialism, attempted to further dismantle Third World cultures and societies, imposed Western economic and political systems, and entrenched Western models of masculinity and femininity. For example, like the colonialists that preceded them, Northern development agencies saw men as responsible for the productive aspects of their society, relegating women to the reproductive sector (Jacquette 1982, Snyder and Tadesse 1995).

Why Women?

This division between men’s (i.e., productive) and women’s (i.e., reproductive) responsibilities intensified the sexual division of labour. Based on the Western model, men were expected to work outside of the home and in return were paid for their services. Women’s work, on the other hand, was contained within the home or to matters within the
'reproductive' realm. Women did not receive any financial remuneration for their services. Like in the North, this resulted in the sexual division of labour: paid labour for men and unpaid labour for women. Development projects were geared toward the 'productive' aspects of society (i.e., those activities done by men), making men the primary beneficiaries of development.

Development policies and programmes overlooked the critical role women played in the productive sector of their societies (Boserup 1970, Chowdhry 1995, Escobar 1995, Kabeer 1994, Reddock 2000). Thus, they were denied equal access to the economic resources that were provided to men. Due to the fact that the West neglected to see the centrality of women's role to the economic security and sustainability of their homes and communities, women were seen as insignificant to the development project. Not only were they viewed as inconsequential, they were also considered an impediment to development. Based on racialized constructions of Third World women as 'backward', 'primitive', 'uneducated', and 'dependent', Northern governments saw Third World women as 'victims' of their patriarchal societies and the men of their societies. They believed that women were more entrenched in the values of their 'traditional' societies than men, and thus were less able to be 'developed' than their male counterparts, who had migrated to the cities and were becoming 'modernised' in the process (Escobar 1995, Kabeer 1994, Reddock 2000, Snyder and Tadesse 1995).

Marxist, dependency, and Third World, anti-racist feminists have critiqued the West's construction of the Third World and its peoples. They argue that the real motivation behind development policies lay in Northern countries' self-interest. They maintain that Europe and North America sought to perpetuate the colonial project by developing the former colonies in ways that would benefit themselves and not the former colonies (de Sousa Santos 1999, Kabeer 1994, Matthews 1976, Porter 1999, Rodney 1981, Sanger 1976, Snyder and Tadesse
These theorists have shown how the imposition of modernisation development processes created in the First World has had dire consequences for Third World women. Because of the West’s narrow view of Third World women, development policies neglected their needs and interests. Through feminist interventions with development programmes, development agencies learned that women did, in fact, play a vital role in the sustainability of their communities (Boserup 1970, Kabeer 1994, Reddock 2000, Snyder and Tadesse 1995). When confronted with their lack of attention to women’s importance in their societies, many development agencies began to adopt and implement development policies and projects geared toward women. The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), seen as a leader in this field, is just one example. CIDA has implemented various policies over the last three decades in an attempt to incorporate women into its development programmes and policies. In 1976, CIDA instituted its first Women in Development (WID) policy guidelines. In 1984, it adopted its first WID policy and in 1986 CIDA instituted a five-year WID action plan (Alexander 1995, Jahan 1995). Since that time, the policy has been modified, updated, and transformed numerous times. Most recently, in 1999, it adopted its newest policy: CIDA’s Policy on Gender Equality.

Despite these interventions, Third World women are still struggling to survive. While for some development has meant the eradication of diseases, the expansion of individual choice and the increase of energy sources, for many others it has led to impoverishment, the entrenchment of fundamentalism and the erosion of cultural and biological diversity (Kabeer 1994). Class, ethnic and racial differences are what often divide those who have benefited from those who have not. What has gone wrong? Why, in spite of good intentions, have development policies been marred by failure, and even, in many cases, exacerbated the living conditions of the very women they sought to help?
Research Questions

To explore these questions, I decided to look at the participatory policymaking process CIDA used in 1998 to update its gender policy and the resulting policy itself. I have chosen to focus on CIDA because CIDA is seen as a leader in the gender and development field (Alexander 1995, Jahan 1995). Whereas multilateral agencies such as the World Bank, the United Nation Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and other bilateral agencies, such as USAID, are seen to be slow to address gender needs, CIDA is regarded as an innovative leader in this field. As I explain at length in Chapter 3, CIDA held Internet consultations to engage participation from people from diverse backgrounds. No other agency of its kind has engaged in the type of participatory policymaking process that CIDA chose to update its gender policy (CIDA staff 1, 2 interviews).

Because I am interested in discerning the extent to which gender equality policies crafted in the First World can address the inequalities in the Third World, I explore the following research questions. (1) How are liberal feminist strategic goals transformed to meet CIDA’s bureaucratic needs and what impact does that reformulation have on CIDA’s policymaking process and policy? (2) How do gender advocates within CIDA participate in the practices of institutions of ruling? Particularly, (3) to what extent do these advocates partake in discursive practices that racialize Third World women and what effect do those practices have on CIDA’s process and policy? (4) What participatory method did CIDA choose for its consultation, who participated and what was the consequence of these decisions? (5) How did CIDA address power imbalances in its process and policy?

I recognize that the broader issue I am interested in (whether policies crafted in the First World can address the inequalities in the Third World) is almost too enormous a
question to tackle. I do not propose that my research can answer that question as a whole. Nonetheless, I believe that my research, both from my interviews as well as my review of feminist critiques of bureaucracies and development processes and projects, sheds light on the impediments a Northern development bureaucracy confronts in its efforts to address the inequalities Third World women face. It also exposes how internal gender advocates utilise the processes of bureaucracies to secure their own power and authority. These processes work in concert to undermine development efforts to address Third World women’s needs. My research project is one very important example of how this happens.

**Methodology and Methods**

To conduct this research project, I have chosen to draw primarily on the works of women and men who I identify as Third World, anti-racist feminists, standpoint feminists, postcolonialist theorists and postmodern feminists. Thus, I rely on theorists such as Peggy Antrobus, Eva Chowdhry, Arturo Escobar, Cheryl Johnson-Odim, Chandra Mohanty, Jane Parpart, Sherene Razack, Dorothy Smith, Vincent Tucker and others. Some of these theorists argue that in addition to looking at the processes of development, it is equally, if not more important to look at how institutions of ruling work (Escobar 1995, Smith 1990a, b). Others point out the significance of language, discourse, power imbalances and knowledge production in the construction of development policies and processes (Antrobus 1995, Chowdhry 1995, Escobar 1995, Johnson-Odim 1991, Mohanty 1991, Parpart 1995, Razack 1999, Tucker 1999). I combine the work of these varying, although complementary viewpoints to conduct my analysis.

Feminists expose how the dominant class or group controls knowledge production, thus entrenching power imbalances. Dorothy Smith (1990b) explains this process in her
presentation of feminist standpoint theory and its application to the production of knowledge in the social sciences. She maintains that the social sciences have perpetuated the view that research is unbiased, in spite of the fact that historically white men with a particular perspective and viewpoint have conducted the research. Smith argues that because of this shortcoming, the social sciences present a biased view. Goldberg (1993) explains how this occurs in the case of race as well. Kabeer argues that "hegemonic forms of knowledge will always be partial because they are likely to reflect the interests of the dominant class" (1994, 80). Smith extrapolates from that observation and argues that because of their location in society, oppressed groups have a more comprehensive view of society (Smith 1990b). They see the world from the dual position of the oppressor and from that of the oppressed and thus the relationship between them. The dominant group, however, only has a partial view. This analysis provides a unique perspective on how power and knowledge operate. To challenge the limitations and constructions of knowledge production, development must be based on local claims to knowledge. This knowledge arises out of experience, not theory, although it may ultimately inform and improve theory. Development must be based on women's lived experiences (Antrobus 1989, Sen and Grown 1987).

Institutional ethnography is one method used in feminist research to uncover how systems work. Institutional ethnographers look at a particular setting to understand how things are put together and the consequences of that process and outcome (Dorothy Smith 1987). The purpose is not to conduct a case study per se, but to use the local situation "as an entry point to the study of institutional and discursive forces and how these are related to larger socio-economic processes" (Escobar 1995, 109). According to DeVault, institutional ethnography entails looking "from the margins inward – towards centres of power and administration – searching to explicate the contingencies of ruling that shape local contexts"
(1999, 48). To conduct an institutional ethnography, it is important “to discover the social relations that organise a particular setting” (1999, 48). A researcher engaging in this form of research needs to understand how and why things are organised in the way they are. Institutional ethnographers rely on a number of different research methods. They explore history to see how social relations are created (DeVault 1999, Stanley and Wise 1990). They study the sources of social power to understand how power operates (i.e., ‘studying-up’) (Judd 1999, Harding 1987, Smith 1990a). They examine texts and documents to gain insight into institutional processes (DeVault 1999, Judd 1999, Smith 1990a). And they interrogate the discourse to see how the material world is affected, shaped and created by it (Chowdhry 1995, Escobar 1995, Mohanty 1991, Razack 1999, Tucker 1999). I utilise all four of these research methods.

I have conducted an analysis of the concept of development, women’s interactions with development, and CIDA’s role in these processes to see how social relations are created. I have also interrogated the development discourse to see how the material world is affected, shaped and created by it. Because I am interested in examining the centres of power and administration, I do not conduct my research on Third World women, who are over-studied. Instead, I research and study a First World governmental development institution, namely CIDA, to see how it utilises its position of power as an institution of ruling. I shift my focus from Third World women and our need to ‘help’ them, to examine the ruling apparatus (Escobar 1995). This method of research, also referred to as ‘studying-up’, “might better serve the interests of the women affected” (Judd 1999, 220). As Judd explains, “[s]tudying-up” in development work will not only identify and analyse the barriers to feminist work, but will expand the available body of case material on how feminists have successfully reduced, eliminated or avoided these barriers and will eventually allow this knowledge to be
systematised and become a practical resource for feminists doing development” (1999, 223). To conduct research in this manner, “[m]uch of the research may have to be done . . . through the use of documents and analysis of policy development (Judd 1999, 222 emphasis added).

Studying-up has an added bonus for feminist researchers. It restructures the power imbalances typically present in research projects (Wolf 1996). In my project, the individuals I interviewed are mostly well-established leaders in their fields, based in institutions of ruling. Some are staff at CIDA while others are senior staff at non-governmental development agencies in Canada and elsewhere. Some are university professors, consultants to non-governmental organisations (NGOs), CIDA, and United Nations (UN) agencies. Only a small fraction is not affiliated with or has not worked with a government or non-governmental entity. Their location in institutions of ruling indicates that these individuals occupy positions of power in society. I recognise the power I have due to the fact that I am situated in an institution of ruling and am writing a research project that analyses CIDA’s work. However, my position of power in society is no greater than my interview subjects, and in many circumstances is significantly less.

The best model of studying-up would be one conducted by “the women affected or potentially affected by a programme or policy” (Judd 1999, 223). I am certainly not that woman. However, I am not currently, nor have I ever worked on a CIDA project or for any government agency. I have worked at non-governmental organisations and have been involved in grassroots projects. Thus, while a research project of studying-up conducted by the very women that are affected by CIDA’s policies would be enormously beneficial, my status and position as an outsider offers a useful and helpful perspective. It is not the final word on the matter, and I welcome and look forward to research completed by local women who are directly affected by CIDA’s policies.
Data Gathering and Analysis

I conducted a textual analysis of the documents and data to gain insight into institutional processes. According to Dorothy Smith, a textual analysis involves examining documents to understand what textual reality they are constructing. The documents frame the world in which participants are allowed to speak. It is also possible to examine the relations of power embedded in the documents (Smith 1987, 1990a, 1990b). The documents I studied included historical explanations and discussions of the history of CIDA’s gender and development policies and processes, numerous critiques of CIDA’s policies, their past and current policies, and the Internet consultation itself (i.e., the record of the consultation).

Using the record of the consultation, which included the names and email addresses of the guest panelists and participants, I sent emails to 22 people, including CIDA staff members, requesting their participation in my research project. 15 people responded to my request. Of the 15 who responded, 10 were willing and available to participate. I interviewed three guest panelists and two participants. I conducted in person interviews with two of the guest panelists and one participant. The other guest panelist and participant answered a questionnaire I sent via email. I also conducted an in person interview with an individual who did not participate in the consultation, but with whom CIDA consulted prior to the consultation. I conducted in person interviews with two staff members from Bellanet.² I conducted telephone interviews with three staff members, one of whom was the consultant CIDA hired for the consultation.

While both quantitative and qualitative methods have their respective benefits, I chose to conduct a qualitative study because such studies provide a more comprehensive

---

² Bellanet is an organization that specializes in using information and communication technologies (ICTs) for improving development (www.bellanet.org). Bellanet handled the technical aspects of the consultation for CIDA.
picture of the problem (Reinharz 1992, Stanley and Wise 1990). Instead of merely relying on statistical data, qualitative research offers greater insight into how a society is viewed by its members. All of the interviews were semi-structured. I chose to conduct semi-structured interviews because they provide greater latitude for reflecting the participants’ feelings and concerns, and opportunity for fuller answers. They also provided me the ability to follow the subjects’ train of thought when appropriate. With structured interviews there would have been no opportunity to follow-up on the answers provided by the subjects. In addition, as my research progressed, I reflected on the interviews and modified my questions as necessary.

Relying on the work of various authors, including Dey (1993), Huberman and Miles (1994) and Silverman (1993), I coded the data by themes. Some of the themes were those that emerged from my literature and readings, others arose from the data itself. To manage the amount of data and analysis I pulled on the themes that were relevant to my research questions. Again, these themes are participation, power, discourse, and the practices of institutions of ruling.

Through this research project, I hope to contribute to the development of a social theory, already begun by Third World, anti-racist feminists, that “reflects the concerns of actual groups of people in particular institutional settings” (Collins 1998, vii). Rather than creating a social theory that can be used to support hierarchical relations, I hope to contribute to one that can “challenge unjust ideas and practices” (Collins 1998, xvi).
Importance of Research

This research is important because of the lack of research examining how First World agencies create gender and development policies. There is plenty of research looking at how the policies are implemented and how Third World women access, utilise and resist these policies. However, few researchers have explored agencies’ policymaking processes to see if they adhere to the very principles the policies purport to value. A review of current literature on the subject revealed only one article that discussed how policies are made. That article was a critique of Oxfam’s gender equality policymaking process by Oxfam staff involved in the process (March 1999). There is no published article examining CIDA’s 1998 policymaking process.

Because I am a white woman living in the First World, my contribution to these important policy discussions comes from looking at a First World agency rather than from looking at Third World women. I turn my gaze inward, recognising that by choosing to conduct my research in this way I am failing to talk directly with the very women impacted by CIDA’s policy. However, my intention is not to create a document that speaks for Third World women about how development policies impact their lives. Rather, my goal is to look at CIDA, as an institution of ruling, to understand how it operates to perpetuate its own status as a ruling institution.

Thesis Organisation

Chapter 2 is a literature review that explores feminist critiques of bureaucracies, discursive practices, participatory methods, and power imbalances. This review helps us understand how bureaucratic practical needs impede the adoption and implementation of feminist strategic goals. We also see how development policies have been shaped by feminist
principles and how feminists working in development agencies perpetuate the practices of institutions of ruling. In chapter 3, I detail the history of CIDA's commitment to women in its development work and the process CIDA used to update its gender policy. I discuss and analyse CIDA's process and its impact on its policy in chapter 4 and draw my conclusions in Chapter 5.

Conclusion

Through its use of the Internet to conduct its consultation, CIDA sought to ensure that its policymaking process was broad based, open, transparent and inclusive. However, upon closer scrutiny, it is apparent that the process was, in fact, a ritualistic exercise. The voices of Third World grassroots women, the very women the policy is intended to benefit, were excluded while individuals in institutions of ruling, particularly those within CIDA, were explicitly included. By managing and controlling all aspects of the consultation to ensure the outcome it desired, staff co-opted feminist strategic goals to meet the agency's bureaucratic needs. Through this cursory participatory process, gender staff at CIDA exercised their power over Third World women, thereby maintaining their status. CIDA's gender equality policymaking process and policy are illustrative of how international development institutions whether wittingly or not perpetuate the racialization of Third World women. By doing so, they are (as Razack explains in the context of refugee hearings) "inevitably an encounter between the white First World and the racialized Third World" (1999, 89).
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW:
FEMINIST CRITIQUES OF BUREAUCRACTIC PRACTICES, DISCOURSE, PARTICIPATION, AND POWER IN DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTIONS

Feminist critiques of development practices unequivocally demonstrated that development agencies excluded women from development projects and that this exclusion impeded development. Women's exclusion conflicted with the practical needs of bureaucracies. These feminist cries came from across the globe. As early as the 1950s and 1960s, women activists in Third World countries began to challenge traditional development concepts and practices (Reddock 2000). Women argued that rather than benefiting all equally, if development projects excluded women, women would not benefit, even if the men in their families or communities did. In spite of these efforts, international development agencies still focused their programmes on men and failed to see the adverse effect their development strategies and policies had on women.

Development agencies did not respond to feminist concerns until the 1970s. During that decade, Ester Boserup (1970) published a book entitled Women's Role in Economic Development. In her book, Boserup demonstrates the crucial role women play in the economic life and sustainability of their societies. By highlighting the harmful effects of modernisation and colonialism, Boserup (1970) reasoned that development policy and
projects must be revamped to include women and address the unequal gendered division of
labour in development projects (Reddock 2000). Rather than helping women, development
projects created gender gaps that entrenched the subordination of women (Staudt 1997). Prior
to this publication, development practitioners and theorists overlooked the significant role
women play in sustaining their families and communities. Many believe that publication of
this book forced policy makers to rethink their development paradigms (Reddock 2000,
Staudt 1997).

Naila Kabeer (1994), however, argues that Boserup’s book would not have had the
impact it did, had the climate not been receptive to it. She points out that Boserup’s book was
published at a time when

various social movements gathered momentum. The sixties and seventies were marked
by protest – in the South against the injustices of international economic order, and in
the North against class and race privilege in the universities and factories. Civil-rights
and black-power movements combined with Third World liberation struggles to
heighten awareness of continuing forms of neo-colonialism across the global
landscape.
(Kabeer 1994, 2)  

This revelation forced bureaucracies to acknowledge that they did not operate in a
gender-neutral fashion, and thus they were neither efficient nor effective. Utilising Boserup’s
findings and this momentum, many second wave feminists working on development issues
lobbied their governments to ensure that development projects included women. The
declaration of the International Women’s Year by the United Nations in 1975 and the United
Nations Decade for Women (1975-1985) further helped to lay the groundwork for the
emphasis on women and development (Reddock 2000). In 1976 the Canadian International
Development Agency (CIDA) issued Women in Development (WID) policy guidelines. In
1984, CIDA had adopted a more detailed framework and in 1986 CIDA instituted a five-year
WID action plan (Jahan 1995). These efforts were designed to ensure the integration of women into CIDA’s assistance efforts.

Despite this progress, Third World feminists remained critical. At the three major United Nations international conferences on women held between 1970 and 1980 (Mexico City 1975, Wellesley 1976, and Copenhagen 1980) battle lines were drawn between First World and Third World feminists over what constituted a feminist issue (Johnson-Odim 1991). Third World feminists struggled to broaden the agenda of feminism from pushing for equality to seeking liberation. They wanted feminism to be treated “as a fundamentally political movement connected as much to the struggle of their communities for liberation and autonomy as to the work against gender discrimination” (Johnson-Odim 1999, 317). A Nigerian woman participant at one of the international conferences felt that First World women sought to define the needs, aims and priorities of Third World women (Johnson-Odim 1999, 317). For Third World women, justice is not limited to gender equality in the household, or on the local or national level. Rather, it is at the level of the world economic order. Third World women and men both suffer this oppression. While the impact of these oppressions may differ, their source does not (Antrobus 1989, Bessis 2001, Johnson-Odim 1999, Razack 1999).

Instead of looking at Third World women’s problems in a vacuum, Third World, anti-racist feminists encourage the West, particularly Western feminists, to examine their own role in the racialization, gendering, exploitation and oppression of Third World women. Specifically, they push First World feminists to think “about the ways in which there is First World complicity in both the sexual and racial persecution of Third World women” (Razack 1999, 91). The sea change that Third World, anti-racist feminists call for in development policies and programmes remains an elusive goal. To understand why this is the case, I first
explore how feminist strategic gender issues are translated within bureaucracies to meet their bureaucratic institutional needs.

When examining whether development policies empower Third World women, many feminist theorists and practitioners draw on a distinction, labeled by Caroline Moser (1995), between women’s practical gender needs and their strategic gender issues. Practical gender needs refer to women’s concrete living conditions and the immediate needs associated with those. According to Young (1997b), practical gender needs arise from the fact that women are allocated certain roles by the sexual division of labor. Thus, women’s practical gender needs include things such as health, education, shelter, water, and food. Women’s strategic gender issues, on the other hand, relate to women’s long-term needs and address existing gender hierarchies. They arise from the fact that women as a social category have unequal access to resources and power (Young 1997b). They include a redistribution (i.e., more equitable) of power and resources.

In my analysis of development bureaucracies and feminist interactions with them, I expand upon this distinction. I look at how feminist theory has influenced bureaucracies, development institutions and their practices. What we see when we conduct this review is that a tension mounts between meeting feminist strategic goals and bureaucratic institutional needs. Most often when feminist strategic goals are incorporated into bureaucracies, those goals are co-opted and diffused to meet the practical needs of bureaucracies. To see how this occurs, I first look at what bureaucracies are, their practical needs, and how they are constituted. I then examine the bureaucratic trappings of international development agencies and how feminists have attempted to influence them. This discussion is focused largely on liberal, radical and Marxist feminist critiques of bureaucracies and development institutions.

---

3 Maxine Molyneux (1985) initially defined this distinction.
Once this analysis is complete, I explore how Third World, anti-racist feminists critique development institutions. In addition to examining bureaucracies, and how they operate to disempower feminists, Third World, anti-racist feminists consider how feminists position themselves within these institutions of ruling and utilize the practices of institutions of ruling to perpetuate their own power. For this discussion, I look at how feminists working within development bureaucracies engage in and perpetuate the racialized development discourse, create cursory participatory processes and entrench power imbalances. Through this discussion, I expose some of the impediments of international development bureaucracies that interfere with their ability to address the inequalities Third World women face.

**Bureaucracies**

Bureaucracies are organisations with ingrained behavioural norms, structures and regulations. They institute socially constructed rules and norms that function to limit choice (Goetz 1997). By doing so, they reduce uncertainty and provide structure to everyday life, making certain forms of behavior predictable and routine (i.e., institutionalizing them). Classical views on bureaucracies considered them to be the most efficient means of completing a required task (Staudt 1997). Efficiency is both a strategic goal and a practical need of bureaucracies. The optimal bureaucracy works in the most efficient and effective manner. Staudt (1997) points out that some theorists believe that bureaucracies are a natural means of organizing human relations, and that by operating efficiently and effectively function in a neutral (gender-neutral) fashion.

---

4 I use the terms bureaucracies, institutions, and agencies interchangeably throughout this paper.
Liberal and radical feminist theorists, however, have shown how this so-called neutrality is mired in male norms that, in fact, are not at all neutral. According to these theorists, socially constructed societal norms are reproduced within institutions. These include gender norms (Davies 1999, Ferguson 1984, Kabeer 1994b, Staudt 1997). Gender norms are a “fundamental organizing principle of social life, deeply embedded both in the design and in the functioning of organizations” (Davies 1999, 37). Kabeer argues that “. . . gender is constructed as a relationship of inequality by the rules and practices of different institutions . . .” (1994b, 84). Marxist feminists maintain that, in addition to being gendered, institutions of ruling also mirror class structures in society (Smith 1990a, b). Bureaucracies function in ways to maintain these societal norms. Anti-racist, Third World feminists have pointed out that bureaucracies also operate in ways that benefit and ensure the perpetuation of the ruling class and race\(^5\) (Escobar 1995, Goldberg 1993, Mohanty 1991, Tucker 1999).

In an organisational setting, these gendered, racial and class norms, which have been (re)produced over time by the ruling class, race and gender (i.e., white men) work to advantage some (mainly white men) and disadvantage others (mainly women and other marginalized groups). Gender, race, and class, as socially constructed power relationships, affect all organisational policy, practice and behavior. Institutions are not egalitarian. Male privilege, along with race and class privilege, is institutionalised within bureaucracies. There is an unequal distribution of rights, obligations, resources, and responsibilities. Certain individuals within an organization, just as in society, exercise power and authority over others (Kabeer 1994b). This occurs because, like in the formation of the state, women (and other marginalized groups) have rarely had a voice in the construction of organisations.

\(^5\) See below, pages 42-5 for further discussion of this point.
It is therefore easy to see why and how bureaucracies benefit those with power.

Feminist theorising conceptualises organisations not as static entities, but as ongoing organising processes that recreate social meanings. As such, gender, as a social construct, is reproduced in subjective institutional activities and norms (Davies, 1999). In other words, societal relations (whether based on class, race, gender or any combination thereof) underpin organisational processes, and organisations are a site for the recreation of these unequal relations. Organisational processes are founded in historical social arrangements and understandings (Acker 1995, Goetz 1997, Kabeer 1994b). These arrangements and understandings work to continually recreate meanings and power relations. These power relations are not natural, fixed or gender-neutral. Rather, power imbalances are derived from historical social choices.

International development agencies reproduce bureaucratic practices that entrench gender norms within those very agencies working to transform gender relations (Kabeer 1994b, Kardam 1997, Miller 1998, Staudt 1997, Yudelman 1997). Feminists argue that socially constructed gender norms, which give men more power in society, are reproduced within development institutions, both in their internal structures and external policies. Policies that are seen to be gender-blind in fact are implicitly male-biased. As bureaucratic entities, development institutions were formed largely for the benefit of their creators (i.e., Northern governments and agencies), and secondarily for the benefit of Third World peoples6 (de Sousa Santos 1999, Kabeer 1994, Matthews 1976, Sanger 1976).

Because institutions are historically constructed frameworks for behavioral rules, transforming institutions to address women's needs is extremely difficult. Thus, when new

---

6 For elaboration of this point, see pages 39-41 and 51-2 below.
agents (e.g., women) and new orientations (e.g., gender equality) are introduced to institutions, change in outcome seems minimal (Goetz 1997). Institutional rules, structures and norms are embedded and designed to perpetuate the political and social interests that the institution is designed to promote in the first place (Goetz 1997, Smith 1990a, b). When feminists working in the development field attempt to introduce new ways of organizing or new means of conducting development, they are often forced to sell their ‘ware’ in a way that promotes the political and social interests of the agency. Thus, the feminist focus is often lost in the translation (Smyth 1999). This results in tensions for feminists attempting to transform development agencies, whether working from within or outside of the agency. In the following section, I explore these feminist efforts and the resulting tensions from those efforts.

**Feminist Engagements with Development Bureaucracies**

Women in Development (WID)

Western feminists’ seek integration of women into the ranks of development bureaucracies as well as in development projects and programmes. Grounding their arguments in liberal feminist discourse that values equality and individual freedom, these feminists initially fought for women’s equal rights in the workplace and in the home in their own countries. They now seek the same equality for women in the Third World. The strategic liberal feminist goal is equality for women, both within development agencies and in development projects.7

Believing bureaucracies function in a neutral (i.e., gender-neutral) way, liberal feminists do not seek a transformation of the development apparatus as a whole or its

7 This movement became known in the development field as Women in Development (WID).
underlying principles. They believe that modernisation is the appropriate path for
development. Modernisation theory is based on the belief that societies will become
‘modern’ through particular interventions applied and supplied by Northern governments,
modeled after the European notion of ‘modernity’ (read: capitalism, free market economy,
and Western democracy) (Aftab 1999, Bandarage 1984, Jacquette 1982, Kabeer 1994a,
and Whitmore 1994). Liberal feminists take issue not with development per se, or the
capitalist model on which it is based, but with whom it benefits.

Application of liberal feminism to development processes resulted in the
marginalisation of women to the welfare sector; projects focused primarily on population,
health, nutrition and education. These projects were seen as an effective and efficient use of
development resources. Studies had shown that an increase in women’s educational levels
resulted in a decrease in their fertility, which translated into an increase in their economic
stability (Razavi 1998). Women’s economic activity was considered in these reproductive
contexts. Thus, WID focused on income generating projects and educational programmes for
women and girls. To ensure the efficient functioning of the agencies, WID projects tended to
add women on as an after thought rather than structure projects from the outset with
women’s input and women in mind as agents of change (Iddi 1999). Little effort was paid to
women’s unequal access to resources, and power imbalances were left unchallenged (Parpart
2000, Snyder and Tadasse 1995, St-Hilaire 1993). The projects were chosen for their
compatibility with women’s reproductive and domestic roles rather than for their
profitability. These types of activities, it was believed, would lead to economic development.

Liberal feminists believe that once women’s practical gender needs (i.e., the inclusion
and participation of women in development, both within the agencies and in the projects) are
attained, women will begin to gain equality, thereby realising feminists' strategic goal. Bureaucracies, however, have different strategic goals and practical needs. They function to maximise their resources. Their bottom line is efficiency and effectiveness. Strategically, they need to place themselves within the structures of institutions of ruling and ensure their success and longevity (Staudt 1997). For feminists to successfully convince development agencies that including women is beneficial, feminists had to articulate their goal not as one that primarily focused on equality, equity, and fairness, but rather as one that maximised efficiency and effectiveness. Thus, they relied on the arguments presented by Boserup and others that excluding women from development was ineffective and inefficient. In this way, they could help ensure that women's needs were addressed.

However, as implemented, WID projects did not adequately address Third World women's needs or provide them equality with men. As discussed at length below, the liberal feminist strategic goal of gaining women's equality was ineffective when transformed within development agencies to meet bureaucratic practical needs.

Women and Development (WAD)

Marxist and radical feminists offered different solutions, giving rise to the Women and Development (WAD) paradigm. WAD begins from the premise that women have always been involved in development processes and are critical to the sustainability of their communities (Rathgeber 1990). Radical feminists argue that women have unique qualities and characteristics, and that women need to work outside of male dominated institutions (Ferguson 1984). Male dominated bureaucracies, they contend, cannot address women's needs. As the experiences of WID demonstrated, integrating women into male dominated

---

8 See section entitled Tensions between Feminist Goals and Bureaucratic Needs, pages 33-8.
institutions and projects failed to advance either women’s practical gender needs (i.e., to be included in and benefit from development) or their strategic gender issues (i.e., equality).

Radical feminists maintain that WID development projects that simply add women on to programmes designed for men are flawed. Instead, they argue there is a need for women only projects that address women’s needs. They believe that for women to truly benefit from development projects, they must operate outside of traditional patriarchal structures. These beliefs are based in radical feminist theory that maintains that patriarchy is the root of women’s oppression. For women to develop on their own, in whatever capacity, they must create women’s projects, programmes, agencies, etc. that are run by and for women only (Moghadam 1999, Parpart 2000).

Rather than focus on patriarchy as the root of women’s oppression, Marxist feminists believe that the redistribution of resources and jobs in the capitalist market system results in a sexual division of labour that oppresses women (Hirshman 1995, Moghadam 1999, Parpart 2000, Sen and Grown 1987). Thus, capitalism, not patriarchy, is the root of women’s oppression. Dependency theorists, expanding upon Marxist analysis, argue that capitalist production placed Third World countries in a relationship of dependency upon the metropolitan centres of the First World (Frank 1969, Pieterse 1991, 1999, Rathgeber 1990, Wilson and Whitmore 1994). While Marxists and dependency theorists see capitalism and global economic inequality alone as the source of women’s oppression, Marxist and dependency feminists understand that men benefit from the oppression of women and recognise how sexual inequality is tied to class inequality and global inequality (Bandarage 1984, Kabeer 1994a, Rathgeber 1990). They focus on the relationship between women and development processes and emphasize the importance of women’s work (both inside and outside of the home) in maintaining their societies. Arguing that the integration of women in
development perpetuates global inequality, they maintain that if class inequality is addressed, women’s position (both within the home and in society) will improve (Rathgeber 1990, Wilson and Whitmore 1994).

The reformulation of radical and Marxist feminist goals to meet bureaucratic needs resulted in a limited expenditure of resources for women only projects and income generating projects that further integrated women into an exploitative capitalist system, entrenched gender roles, perpetuated the unnatural divide between women’s reproductive and productive roles, and increased women’s workload (Rathgeber 1990, Staudt 1997).

Gender and Development (GAD)

The failure of WID and WAD projects to meet feminists’ strategic goals or to address Third World women’s needs, led some feminists to look at development from a broader perspective, examining gender and class simultaneously. For these feminists, the term gender refers to the socially constructed power relations between women and men, and the ideologies and values that support these relations. For example, Kabeer suggests that “[g]ender is seen as the process by which individuals who are born into biological categories of male or female become the social categories of men and women through the acquisition of locally-defined attributes of masculinity and femininity” (in Parpart and Marchand 1995, 14). Likewise, Moghadam uses gender to refer to “an asymmetrical social relationship between women and men based on perceived sex differences, and an ideology regarding their roles, rights, and values as workers, owners, citizens, and parents” (1998, 592). It is important to understand that gender - or the socially constructed relations between men and women - is an axis of power, whereby, in many cultures, men are privileged and women are subordinated (Reddock 2000). This understanding of the term gender is one of the principal theoretical
concepts underpinning the Gender and Development (GAD) paradigm. For GAD feminists, the change of terminology from ‘women’ to ‘gender’ was significant because it recognized that women and men are affected by development in different ways. Because both women and men’s roles and interests are socially constructed, they are both amenable to change (Goetz 1997).

For this reason, GAD feminists maintain that if gender analysis only focuses on women, it fails to truly address and challenge gender roles. They contend that by focusing solely on women, development agencies can avoid examining the socially constructed concepts, roles and responsibilities of women and men (Cornwall 1997, Sweetman 1997). “If gender is about relations between men and women, then the male side of the equation must also be figured in. If women’s gender identities are to be changed, then men’s must change also” (White, in Macdonald 1994, 20). Not only must women and men’s roles be examined, but it is equally important to look at the dominant members of a community to understand the socialized roles that are expected of those in power. Practitioners need to uncover which masculinity(ies) are favored and which disfavored. This will help explain the socialized expectations of men and women in that community and allow practitioners to explore what happens to men and women who do not meet those expectations. “Not all men . . . have power; and not all of those who have power are men” (Cornwall 1997, 10). Some men, just like women, are marginalized due to Western ideals of masculinity. For example, the emphasis on men’s role as the sole economic provider for the family is rooted in Northern industrialized gender relations. When these Northern constructs of masculinity were commingled with local notions of masculinity, new configurations of male identity emerged. These new configurations benefited some men and worked to the detriment of those that did not fit the new norm (Cornwall 1997, Sweetman 1997).
Some argue that this understanding of men and masculinities will help uncover the traditional expectations of men and provide more freedom for both men and women to be different from the expected norms. This line of thinking is in keeping with the idea that some men act certain ways to meet the expectations of their community. To address this problem, these theorists believe that development projects must take a comprehensive look at men and masculinities and attempt to dismantle socially constructed gender roles that impede both men and women’s freedom (Cornwall 1997, Sweetman 1997). Other feminist theorists critique this analysis and argue that by focusing on men, women’s issues and needs get diffused⁹ (Baden and Goetz 1997, Harrison 1997, Iddi 1999).

Drawing as well on socialist feminist ideology, GAD links the roles of production and reproduction, taking into account both aspects of women’s lives (Rathgeber 1990). Socialist feminists examine why women have been ascribed to inferior or secondary roles. They understand that the socially constructed differences between men and women, which evolve through engagement with various social institutions such as the educational system, the legal system, the church, etc. are not inherent and are thus changeable. Unlike radical and Marxist feminists, GAD theorists focus on examining hierarchical relations that result from power imbalances due to both class and gender (Parpart 2000, Rathgeber 1990, 1995, Wilson and Whitmore 1994). They believe that the complex interaction between these multiple oppressions must be explored.

GAD feminists emphasize the importance of exploring power imbalances.

Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era (DAWN), a collective of Third World Marxist feminists call for empowerment through mobilisation and consciousness raising with grassroots women (Sen and Grown 1987). They argue that development projects should

⁹ For further discussion of this point, see pages 35-7.
focus on poor Third World women because “in her [a Third World woman] we find the
conjuncture of race, class, gender and nationality which symbolizes underdevelopment”
(Antrobus 1989, 202). They emphasize the need for women to have access to and control
over land, credit, education, and training. Because the benefits of development will not
trickle-down, development projects should be created for the poorest of the poor. Thus,
development programmes must start at the bottom. When women are participants in
development, rather than objects of development, power imbalances will be undermined.

GAD theorists explore the gender division of labour, consider the unequal access to
and control over resources, and examine the power imbalances inherent between women and
men. Recognising diversity, political, social and cultural analyses play an important role
alongside economic analysis. Instead of incorporating women into already existing projects
or developing women only projects, GAD theorists argue that development projects need to
investigate women’s material conditions and class position as well as the patriarchal
structures and ideas that define and maintain women’s subordination (Rathgeber 1990,
2000).

Drawing on the distinction between practical gender needs and strategic gender
interests, GAD theorists attempt to politicise practical gender needs (e.g., clean water,
education, sanitation, food) by transforming them into strategic gender interests (e.g.,
women’s control of and access to clean water, education, sanitation and food). GAD theorists
believe that by doing so, power imbalances will be exposed, challenged, and eventually

However, rather than transforming the system, development projects have integrated
women into an unequal and exploitative system. This has resulted in the entrenchment of
male legal control over women both in the home and in the state (Staudt 1997). The vast majority of development resources continued to be directed to men only widening the gap between women and men. Although some women experienced improvements in their lives (such as increases in literacy and life expectancy), many others continued to suffer gravely (Kabeer 1994a). Women in high export-oriented industrialising countries, who are largely employed in manufacturing industries, such as garments and electronics, face painstaking jobs that require long, uninterrupted work hours and are poorly paid (Jacquette 1982, Staudt 1997). Although the working conditions in these multinational corporations in Third World countries have recently gained public notoriety, these industries continue to exploit Third World women and children to bankroll the pocketbooks of their directors and stockholders and to ensure low cost products for First World consumers.

Tensions Between Feminist Goals and Bureaucratic Needs

[For a new issue like gender to be taken up by an organization, it needs to be moulded into a shape that ‘fits’ the institutional goals, culture and procedures. (Razavi 1998, 29)]

When contorted to fit institutional needs those feminist goals that advance the institution are incorporated, while those that do not are diffused and lost. Over and over again, feminists working in development agencies have encountered resistance and difficulties, whether they worked at more traditional bureaucracies such as the World Bank or the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) or more progressive organizations such as Inter-American Foundation or Oxfam. 10

In some instances, agencies have resisted systematic adoption of a WID policy for years (Kardam 1997). In many agencies, very few staff members are dedicated to women’s

---

10 I discuss the challenges development practitioners confront at CIDA in the following chapter.
issues; and there is a serious lack of commitment to women’s issues by leadership (Goetz 1998, Jensen 1997, Razavi 1998). To accommodate both bureaucratic needs and feminist goals, international development agencies created WID or GAD desks, positions or officers. However, because these positions were established within bureaucracies entrenched in societal gender norms, in many agencies, whether international, bilateral or multilateral, WID/GAD ghettos were created. During the 1990s at the World Bank, for example, the WID office consisted of only three staff members (one full-time advisor, a part-time advisor and a part-time secretary) (Kardam 1997).

Harrison (1997) describes a similar lack of commitment at the FAO. Few women worked in the organisation, especially at the professional level. While a women’s group was established to deal with gender issues, they were not provided any funding. WID was given lip service without any teeth. WID and GAD offices often have limited resources (both financial and personnel) and lack oversight powers and managerial support (Goetz 1998, Kardam 1997, Iddi 1999, Yudelman 1997).

Male preference, both internally (in terms of hiring and promotion practices, and organisational structure) and externally (in terms of development projects) frequently continues to dominate (Iqbal 1999, Kardam 1997, Yudelman 1997). At the Inter-American Foundation (IAF), an organization that prides itself on being less bureaucratic and hierarchical, and as engaging in participatory, responsive and progressive practices, Yudelman found that “a tradition of male preference is still strongly embedded in the agency” (1997, 152). Staff lack understanding of how meeting women’s needs advance the goals of the agency. Many still believe that if development benefits men, those benefits will trickle-down to women (Goetz 1998, Kardam 1997, Yudelman 1997).
Furthermore, staff is often inadequately trained to address women's needs and lack knowledge on how to incorporate women into development projects (Goetz 1998, Iddi 1999, Yudelman 1997). Iddi (1999) explains that when Oxfam established a GAD unit in the mid-1980s, staff did not know what gender meant or how to conduct a gender analysis. In practice the lack of training and understanding of how to conduct gender analysis results in projects being implemented based on WID principles. Rather than creating projects that are mindful of the complexities of gender, race, or class relations, GAD projects continue to add women on as an afterthought, and thereby fail to challenge power imbalances (Iddi 1999, Rathgeber 1990).

Critics of GAD argue that the failure to address power imbalances is due partly to the lack of common understanding of the meaning and usage of the word 'gender'. Staff are often uncertain about what exactly gender means to organizational development in concrete terms (Harrison 1997, Iddi 1999, Rao and Kelleher 1997). Even when the term gender is used, it is not always clear that it refers to the power imbalances between social groups in society. Often it is interpreted to simply mean women (Davies 1999). This has many implications for institutional practices, including how gender equality initiatives or development strategies are formulated. For example, if gender is interpreted to mean women, then a gender equality initiative in an organization will focus on how to improve the situation of women within the current set of organizational values and structures. This effort does not challenge the current system, which is inherently inequitable. Efforts to transform gender relations will be undermined or completely lost if some members of an organization are utilizing gender as an analytical tool to critically examine and challenge gendered hierarchies, while the rest are using gender simply to look at the differences between men and women. "The ways multiple meanings of key words are (or are not) negotiated between
people positioned differently in such hierarchies not only reveal different theoretical and ideological approaches to social organization, they also introduce issues of power” (Nelson and Wright 1998, 7).

Focusing on women, rather than gender, may also de-politicize efforts to transform patriarchal social relations. Gender analyses, which aim to be transformational, require the examination of the power imbalances between men and women, including the historical contexts that created them, and the ways in which they manifest in the everyday lives of men and women. Development agencies have translated feminists’ demands for the integration of gender issues into an emphasis on the need to ‘mainstream’ gender within their organisations. Ideally, if truly mainstreamed, organisations would face a “radical overhaul” of all their “structures and procedures to ensure that women receive equal benefit from all activities carried out by the organization” (Miller 1998, 150). According to Miller, mainstreaming involves “integrating gender issues into an organization’s procedures and policies, and diffusing responsibility for attention to WID/gender concerns to staff members throughout the organization through the introduction of new institutions and procedures” (1998, 150). The feminist goal of mainstreaming is to transform the organisation (i.e., its mainstream) to more accurately reflect all members of the organisation or society.

However, in practice, when gender mainstreaming is implemented, gender, as a feminist analytical tool to understand and overcome power imbalances between men and women, becomes de-politicized. At the Beijing conference, Southern activists argued that mainstreaming gender, a concept advocated for by many GAD theorists, de-politicizes the issue of power and subordination of women - thus resulting in a focus on men (Baden and Goetz 1997). Baden and Goetz maintain that as gender is mainstreamed, and men are incorporated into gender mainstreaming, women’s perspectives are undervalued or
dismissed. Further, as gender becomes more mainstreamed (i.e., digested within the bureaucratic structures) it is further removed from feminist ideology. Rather than being seen as a defining or universally relevant factor, gender is looked at as an interesting statistical variable (Baden and Goetz 1997). This results in a failure to examine the power dynamics of gender relations. A disjunctive arises between a feminist transformative agenda and the ways in which it is employed to minimize the political and contested character of relations between women and men. Thus, when gender is used synonymously with women, as often occurs in gender mainstreaming, it is trivialized and fails to carry any theoretical weight (Davies, 1999).

If gender is interpreted to mean the relations between men and women and the ideologies that underpin these relations, then gender analysis will examine the historical societal norms that underpin the organisation’s structure and focus on efforts to restructure the organisation in a way that challenges these normalized gender relations. Because truly engaging with feminist principles and in gender analysis threatens those with power, the leaders of these organisations most often do not see it as in their interest to participate in this form of transformation and thus are reluctant to engage with these principles. As Elson points out, “[p]olicy makers have other goals aside from policy implementation and preserving male privilege may well be among the more important” (1991, 203).

Not only do feminist advocates within development institutions face these incredible challenges within their own agencies; they also have to overcome obstacles within the bureaucracies with which they work, e.g., governments in Third World countries (Goetz 1998, Iqbal 1999, Jahan 1995, Razavi 1998, Staudt 1997). “The role of the internal [gender] advocate is thus inevitably conservative, as she works within the constraints posed by her
institution” (Razavi 1998, 2). These combined impediments make feminist bureaucrats jobs not simply challenging, but almost impossible.

Third World, Anti-Racist Feminist Visions and Critiques of Development

As the above discussion highlights, internal gender advocates work under enormous institutional and political constraints. Some feminists concede that the achievements of internal advocates are “limited to ensuring ‘least-worst scenarios’ or damage control ([citing] Sawer 1996) rather than the more ambitious agenda set out by feminist activists” (Razavi 1998, 35). However, Third World, anti-racist feminists argue that feminist bureaucrats working within these agencies are not simply victims or puppets of the bureaucratic structures in which they work, doing the best job they can in the difficult circumstances. Instead, they contend that in many ways feminist bureaucrats perpetuate the very problems of bureaucracies that they confront and challenge. They look not only at how bureaucracies function to maintain control and power, but also examine how internal gender advocates position themselves within institutions of ruling to perpetuate their own power.

The adoption by the mainstream of the issues that were at the forefront of second-wave feminism (e.g., equal opportunities, sexual harassment and, in some cases, violence against women), has meant that these issues can now be integrated into development agencies without great threat to the status quo. As these feminist issues are incorporated into development processes, it paves the way for the more radical elements to be screened out (Nelson and Wright 1998, Razavi 1998). The incorporation of more and more relations into the bureaucratic channels (i.e, the development apparatus) results in a tying together and thus multiplying of bureaucratic power (Nelson and Wright 1998, 10). Through this process, those
aspects of the feminist agenda that are integrated into development institutions work to solidify the very bureaucracy feminists are attempting to transform.

For example, it is now common for development agencies to have gender and development policies and to insist that their partners in the Third World have the same. Gender is often included as a programming priority and data is disaggregated by gender. Development agencies recognize the important role that women play within their families, communities and societies as a whole. At the Beijing Conference, countries throughout the world signed commitments to gender equality. Through this integration, more and more women are brought into development processes, strengthening the development apparatus.

The superficial incorporation of the liberal feminist agenda at this stage, almost three decades after its introduction, is testimony to the strength and fortitude of bureaucracies to ensure the status quo as well as their longevity and power. Adopting policies that advocate gender equality, at this date, cannot be seen to be particularly progressive or earth shattering, particularly for Northern international development agencies that pride themselves on being more 'modern' than their Southern counterparts. However, while some aspects of the liberal feminist strategic goal (i.e., women's incorporation into development and women's equality) are finally being paid lip service, the more radical voices of Third World, anti-racist feminists remain silenced. Liberal feminists have succeeded in getting their issues screened through the bureaucratic cheesecloth. Their perseverance and success are to be applauded. Their success has resulted in strategic gains for some women and have "legitimatized a place for gender issues in development" (Goetz 1998, 42).

However, Third World, anti-racist feminists maintain that while some women have benefited many others have not (Kabeer 1994a). For example, Snyder and Tadesse explain that "financial flow to Africa declined by 14% in 1991 and by an almost unbelievable 43% in
1992" (1995, 7-8). During those same years, financial flow rose by eleven percent and twenty-one percent, respectively, to developing countries overall (Snyder and Tadesse 1995, 7-8). To gain economic support and resources from the North, Third World governments have been forced to adopt Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs). SAPs are based on a neo-liberal economic model that was also implemented in Northern countries. Neo-liberal economists believe that if state control over and expenditure on public services are decreased, the free market economy will allocate resources in the most efficient and hence beneficial way (Kabeer 1994). These benefits, it is believed, will trickle-down to all. However, experience has shown this not to be the case. SAPs have had devastating consequences for women in the North and South.

Under SAPs, social programmes, such as health and education, are privatised and public sector jobs are cut. Prior to the implementation of structural adjustment programmes, women held many of these public sector jobs. These were full-time jobs with good pay and benefits. SAPs not only destroyed these jobs and left women unemployed and uninsured, but also left women in the position of having to step and fill the gaps left by the cuts. The same women who previously received full-time employment, pay and benefits for their work now provide the same service without being paid or receiving benefits (Antrobus 1995, O'Connell 1996). This added workload further burdens women who were already overworked. Structural adjustment programmes survive only because of women’s unpaid work in the home, community and economy. The “result has been a dramatic decline in household income and living standards, the burden of which fall disproportionately on women” (O’Connell, 1999:27). Women are forced into situations where they have to fight for jobs with exploitative wages. Those unable to find jobs, or those whose jobs do not provide sufficient wages to support their families, have been forced into the ‘informal sector’ (such as
petty trading and prostitution) (Jacquette, 1982). In these desperate situations, it is impossible for women to exercise their ‘rights’. They are focused on daily survival for themselves, their children and their families.

The consequences, in development terms, have been similarly dire. Under Mozambique’s structural adjustment programme, “primary school enrollment rates fell from 47 percent in 1987 to 40 percent in 1990. . . . state expenditure on education fell from 17 percent of the state budget in 1986 to 10 percent in 1988” (O’Connell 1996, 28). For development to benefit all, rather than a few, development policies and programmes must address issues significantly broader than gender equality (Johnson-Odim 1991). Nonetheless, development agencies’ policies and projects fail to do so. This occurs because when feminist issues become tangled with the ruling apparatus, feminist topics, language and actions get appropriated for imperialist purposes (Escobar 1995, 179).

Like liberal, radical and Marxist feminists, Third World, anti-racist feminists maintain that it is important to look at how societies are organised, how that particular organisational method resulted, and the ramifications of that organisational system (DeVault 1999, Escobar 1995, Smith 1990a, Tucker 1999,). According to Dorothy Smith, societies are organised and managed by institutions of ruling (1990a). Institutions of ruling include more than the notion of the government as political organisation, but the “total complex of activities, differentiated into many spheres, by which our society is ruled, managed and administered” (Smith 1990a, 14). This includes government, businesses, academia and other institutions that educate and train those who will govern and who participate in the governing process (Smith 1990a). These institutions rule us and we participate in the ruling. Development agencies, such as CIDA, are one of these institutions. They have been
established and conceived of by governments while businesses and academic institutions participate in their process of ruling. (Escobar 1995)

In addition to being gendered and classed, Third World, anti-racist feminists argue that bureaucracies are also racialized. Institutions of ruling create abstract symbols and concepts to govern and manage societies and peoples (Smith 1990a). As Chandra Mohanty, Geeta Chowdhry, Arturo Escobar and others demonstrate these abstract symbols and concepts guide and govern the development apparatus. Concepts such as ‘backward’, ‘primitive’, ‘illiterate’, and ‘underdeveloped’ “transpos[e] the actualities of people’s lives and experience into the conceptual currency with which they can be governed” (Smith 1990a, 14). In her seminal article, Under Western Eyes, Chandra Talpade Mohanty articulates how the abstract symbols and concepts in most feminist literature on development describe Third World women as having ‘needs’ and ‘problems’ but few choices and no freedom to act.

This average third world woman leads an essentially truncated life based on her feminine gender (read: sexually constrained) and her being “third world” (read: ignorant, poor, uneducated, tradition-bound, domestic, family-oriented, victimized, etc.). This, I suggest, is in contrast to the (implicit) self-representation of Western women as educated, as modern, as having control over their own bodies and sexualities, and the freedom to make their own decisions. (Mohanty 1991, 56)

Chowdhry (1995) maintains that Western liberal feminists most frequently draw upon this construction of Third World women, for it is through an alleged shared or common gendered oppression that Western liberal feminists base their claims of knowing and understanding Third World women’s needs. From this position, Western liberal feminists also believe they can speak for Third World women and help ‘save’ them from their patriarchal male counterparts. Western liberal feminists homogenize Third World women, and thereby fail to grasp the multiple realities of their lives (Chowdhry 1995, Mohanty 1991). Just as racist and gendered constructions facilitated and justified the colonial project; these
abstract constructions of Third World women buttress the development project (Mohanty 1991).

Utilising these symbols and concepts, institutions of ruling create and implement (gender) policies to ensure the perpetuation of their own power (Smith 1990a). To gain the mechanisms needed to know and understand the 'other', the state has relied upon the social sciences (Goldberg 1993, Smith 1990a). In this process, the state both constructs the 'other' and gains information about the 'other' that will allow it to "more effectively govern, control and manage them without force" (Goldberg 1993, 150). It is through this process that development is constructed by the state, an institution of ruling, to control Third World women and men.

In the case of women in development, development institutions, through their WID, WAD and GAD projects, gained knowledge about Third World women. Because the feminist agenda in development policies have been appropriated by the very institutions purporting to improve women's lives, the incorporation of women into development projects "generates powerful contradictions for feminists working within the development apparatus" (Escobar 1995, 179). By reducing Third World women's experiences of oppression to those that are more easily managed and addressed, First World feminists allow selective elements of feminist struggles against oppression to be integrated into development, meeting institutional needs, while the more critical elements of the feminist anti-racist movement are removed (Das Gupta 1999). When feminist issues become tangled with the ruling apparatus, feminist topics, language and actions get appropriated for imperialist purposes (Escobar 1995, 179). As a result, feminist practice and discourse partake of the institutional practices of development: incorporation, integration, quantification and classification.
Third World, anti-racist feminists maintain that in addition to engaging in the practices of institutions of ruling, development institutions and feminists working within those institutions partake in discursive practices that racialize Third World women, create participatory practices that in reality sustain institutions of ruling and further marginalize Third World women, and perpetuate First World/Third World power imbalances. Combined, these practices impede the ability of international development agencies and feminists working within those institutions to address Third World women's needs.

Role of Discourse

The real power of the West is not located in its economic muscle and technological might. Rather, it resides in its power to define. (Sardar 1999, 44)

As touched upon in the previous section, Third World anti-racist feminists argue that WID, WAD and GAD paradigms are steeped in institutionalised racist discursive practices. Liberal, radical and Marxist feminist critiques of bureaucracies look merely at the structures of bureaucracies and how feminist goals are subsumed within bureaucratic practices. Third World, anti-racist feminists, however, argue that institutional practices (such as policymaking) and discourse are intricately connected.

Development is the process whereby other peoples are dominated and their destinies are shaped according to an essentially Western way of conceiving and perceiving the world. The development discourse is part of an imperial process whereby other peoples are appropriated and turned into objects. It is an essential part of the process whereby the 'developed' countries, manage, control and even create the Third World economically, politically, sociologically and culturally. It is a process whereby the lives of some peoples, their plans, their hopes, their imaginations, are shaped by others who frequently share neither their lifestyles, nor their hopes, nor their values. The real nature of this process is disguised by a discourse that portrays development as a necessary and desirable process, as human destiny itself. (Tucker 1999, 1-2)

Beyond looking at how societal norms become ingrained in institutions, these theorists highlight the power of language and discourse to shape those very societal norms that become socialised and entrenched over time (Chowdhry 1995, Escobar 1995, Mohanty 1991, Sardar 1999, Tucker 1999). To gain insight into this socialisation process, they believe it is crucial to locate women’s voices and experiences in the context of the multifarious realities of their home and work lives. Rather than highlighting and remaining embedded in Western binary constructs, Third World feminists celebrate the differences and multiple identities of women. They recognise that those with power have the ability to name and construct the ‘other’ in ways that racialize them (Chowdhry 1995, Escobar 1995, Goldberg 1993, Mohanty 1991). By emphasizing the role knowledge production and development discourse play in development processes, these feminists force us to engage in a “conscious effort to situate one’s own knowledge and a willingness to open oneself to different world views” (Parpart and Marchand 1995, 18-19). However, because First World feminists rely on racialized constructs of Third World women, their ability to listen to Third World women, and to construct policies that address the unique needs of different women is impeded (Escobar 1995, Mohanty 1991, Razack 1999).

Just as those with power have shaped bureaucracies, development policies and programmes have been based upon social scientific ‘findings’, or more accurately, First World creations, fabrications and constructions of the Third World. When examining development processes, we can see how racialized knowledge is formally produced, particularly by the social sciences and the State (Goldberg 1993, 52). Not unlike the colonialist discourse that preceded it, the development discourse also produces knowledge
about and creates an apparatus for exercising power over the Third World. Development “results in concrete practices of thinking and acting through which the Third World is produced” (Escobar 1995, 11). These constructions result in the racialization of the peoples of the Third World, viewing them as ‘primitive’, ‘backward’, and ‘inferior’. The underlying premise of development is problematic because it is steeped in this colonialist racialized discourse. The colonialists and development practitioners who followed believed in their own superiority and did not value the social, political, economic or cultural attributes of the colonised peoples. Rather, they believed that Northern experts could help ‘save’ the South through their devised colonialist and development policies and practices (Chowdhry 1995, Escobar 1995, Mohanty 1991, Reddock 2000, Tucker 1999).

Through their understanding of the intersections of race, class, gender and North/South inequalities, and the critical role that discourse plays in constructing the problems of and solutions for Third World women, Third World, anti-racist feminists demonstrate how development perpetuates the racialization of Third World women.

**Participatory Practices**

Participation has often been used to describe very rudimentary levels of consultation between agency staff and community members. (Guijt and Shah 1998, 9)

Like GAD theorists, Third World, anti-racist feminists believe it is critical to look at the social construction of women and men and how historical, cultural, social and economic issues have impacted women and men differently. However, they take this inquiry one step further by being mindful of the interactive experiences of racism, colonialism, and the legacy of being viewed as subjugated ‘others’ (Antrobus 1995, Escobar 1995, Goldberg 1993, Nnaemeka 2001, Razack 1999). By looking at the interplay of different forms of oppression
and subordination, these feminist theorists turn current development practices on their head. They argue that to understand Third World women’s needs development policies and projects need to be created by listening to Third World women’s voices through dialogue, rather than monologue. Third World women themselves most accurately represent their issues and concerns (Barreteau 1995, Iddi 1999, Nnaemeka 2001, Razack 1999, Tucker 1999).

Third World, anti-racist feminists insist it is imperative to listen to Third World women if policies and projects are to be relevant in the lives of the people for whom they are created. Third World women’s experiences and perspectives on their own lives carry more weight than the perspectives of outside ‘experts’. For these reasons, policies and programmes must be grounded in local women’s experiences with the goal of meeting their self-identified needs. If pre-designed packages of assumptions and generalisations are tested upon women, they are destined to fail (Aftab 1999, Barreteau 1995, Chowdhry 1995, Escobar 1995, Iddi 1999, Parpart and Marchand 1995).

By building concepts of race, class and sexual identity into a theory that exposes the complex and shifting identities of women, they highlight women’s diversity and differences (Barreteau 1995, Chowdhry 1995, Kabeer 1994, Mohanty 1991). Instead of comparing women to men, they ask questions such as, “what do Caribbean women consider political?” (Barreteau 1995, 149); what do Zimbabwean women consider political?; and what do Indian women consider political? The questions need to be focused on women’s concerns in their different countries, towns, villages, classes, and ethnicities. Barreteau explains how this feminist approach
sensitizes researchers to the multiple realities of women’s lives, thus avoiding an essentialist, modernist approach to women's problems. It calls for a different kind of development policy and practice, with different outcomes for Caribbean women, depending on the complex, circumstances of their lives. (Barritteau 1995, 155)

To address these concerns, development agencies have begun to engage local community members in programme and project design, utilizing participatory action research (PAR) methods. One of PAR’s main principles is to ensure that grassroots organisations and people are consulted and participate in the process of project development and implementation. However, Staudt (1997) argues that often the only people that development organisations seem to consult with at the grassroots are men. Because women are marginalized and their voices unheard in these organisations, and because development organisations fail to do adequate outreach to local women, women’s issues and needs remain unidentified and not addressed. For this reason, many feminist researchers working with participatory models have challenged participatory action researchers to engage with feminist principles.

Feminist action research (FAR) puts the social construction of gender at the centre of its inquiry and action. FAR methods aim to democratise the research process through collaboration with participants (Lather 1991, Reinharz 1992). Theory, method and praxis are inseparable as FAR aims to be political, a source of personal and social transformation (Reid 2000). Not unlike the practice of participatory research, central to the practice of FAR are processes of democratic decision-making, participatory organising, and reflexivity. In this process, FAR draws on feminist principles and concerns about agency, representation and voice (Cornwall 2001). Feminist action researchers explore who participates, in what capacity, and on what basis, and who is excluded from participating and why. In addition, they examine who benefits and who loses out from these processes, and explore whether
participatory processes incorporate the needs of women (Cornwall 2001, Guijt and Shah 1998). To engage in this form of participation, agencies must commit substantial time and resources. Participatory development cannot be done in weeks, and requires institutional and political commitment. (Guijt and Shah 1998).

Third World, anti-racist feminists look beyond gender issues and argue that participatory processes are only useful if they explicitly address gender and other dimensions of social difference. False claims of inclusion or empowerment only undermine commitments to and participation in these processes. Inclusion of women from different classes and races is critical to the success of a participatory model. When international development agencies only rely on well-established Southern organisations, they perpetuate hierarchical divides within those societies (Mayoux 1999). They must find ways to help ensure that all the women in fact participate, not just those from the ruling class and race. One way to do so is to use a range of techniques to facilitate discussion and encourage participants to step outside their zone of comfort (March 1999). While this methodology seems to assist in offering possibilities for greater inclusion of different voices, it is unclear whether, in fact, women will actually participate in these circumstances (March 1999), or how one would even make this determination. Perhaps a re-examination and re-definition of participatory models is appropriate (Beall 1998, Beer and List 1999, Kalu 1999). In critiquing films and literature, Third World, anti-racist feminists force us to examine what it means to listen to local women’s voices. They remind us that we need to look beyond Western strategies for participation and explore the culture’s literary and film representations as well as local women’s movements and struggles for gender equality to gain a greater understanding of women’s values (Beall 1998, Beer and List 1999, Kalu 1999).
In addition, just as gender means different things to different people, so too does the word participation. Nelson and Wright distinguish between participation used as a “means (to accomplish the aims of a project more efficiently, effectively or cheaply) as opposed to participation as an end (where the community or group sets up a process to control its own development)” (1998, 1). The latter type of participation involves shifts in power between community members and agencies, while the former brings community members into bureaucratic channels, expanding bureaucratic power.

Perpetuation of Power Imbalances

Nelson and Wright argue that those who engage in participatory practices need to examine “how the discourse and procedures of participation work in practice” (1998, 1-2). To do this, they examine three different models of power: “power to,” “power over” and a more “decentered” model of power. They explain how power is not just a ‘thing’ which people have, but a description of a relation. Quoting Nancy Hartsock, a standpoint feminist theorist, they explain that the point of power to “‘is to develop an account of the world which treats our perspectives not as subjugated or disruptive knowledge, but as primary and constitutive of a different world’” (1998, 8). Power over involves gaining access to ‘political’ decision-making. In this construct of power, marginalized groups gain treatment as equal partners, giving them long-term access to resources and decision-making. This view of power implies that there is a finite amount of power available, so that as some gain power, others lose some power (Nelson and Wright 1998, 9). Under the third construct of power, power is seen as “an apparatus, consisting of discourse, institutions, actors and a flow of events” (Nelson and Wright 1998, 10). This form of power results in the incorporation of more and
more relations into the development apparatus, tightening bureaucratic powers and control over Third World women and men.

Feminists, particularly standpoint and Third World, anti-racist feminists, have been pushing development agencies to look at, value and incorporate women’s ways of knowing into development processes. Despite these attempts, the two latter forms of power most frequently operate in the development context. Although billions of dollars have been spent to ‘develop’ Third World countries, many parts of the Third World are worse off than they were before. This failure does not lie in the fact that Third World peoples are not ‘developable’, but rather in the policy and practices of development practitioners, particularly Northern governments (Nnaemeka 2001). For example, Third World countries pay foreign creditors money that is diverted from health care and education, both of which are key components of development strategies and projects. “Each year, African governments pay over US$13 billion to Northern creditors, more than double their expenditure on health and primary education” (O’Connell 1996, 29).

The North creates and perpetuates the development façade because development policies, not unlike colonialism, benefit the designers of the policies (i.e., the North) and not the intended beneficiaries. Government development assistance in the South is tied to business needs in the North. In 1972, at least half of Western government’s development assistance “was tied aid that provides jobs for people in donor countries rather than in recipient countries” (Sanger 1976, 298). Canadian development policies are no exception. Canadian development policies towards Africa were not designed to serve the needs of the African people. Instead, they were designed to meet the needs of Canadians (Matthews 1976). Historically, these interests have included maintaining ties with the West against the Soviet Union, finding markets for Canadian goods and services, and sustaining a favourable
image of Canada as a non-racist state (Matthews 1976, 61). In 1982, 83% of Canadian grants were “tied aid” (that is, aid that must be spent on Canadian goods, products or services), the highest percentage of six bilateral donors, including the United States (Kabeer 1994, 71).\(^{11}\)

As the following quotes demonstrate, loans provided to Southern countries cost them more than they get in return. “Third World countries have been contributing to the wealth of the developed countries in liquid terms, by paying them each year an average of $30 billion more than what they get as new loans” (de Sousa Santos 1999, 30). de Sousa Santos continues, “[t]he advanced capitalist countries, amounting to 21% of the world’s population, control 78% of the world production of goods and services and consume 75% percent of all the energy produced” (1999, 30). “Africa’s indebtedness in 1992 equalled 93% of its gross domestic product (GDP), and debt servicing cost about a third of foreign exchange earned” (Snyder and Tadesse 1995, 7-8). The development of the markets of Southern countries is “only responsive to what the Western world is prepared to buy and sell and hardly responsive to our internal development needs” (Babu 1981, 285).

Third World, anti-racist feminists emphasize that examining power imbalances and taking steps to dismantle these imbalances is critical if development policies are to be successful (Escobar 1995, Goldberg 1993, Tucker 1999). Engaging in partnership and dialogue alone is insufficient because power imbalances are perpetuated when there is unequal power to make decisions. When those with ‘power over’ others initiate efforts to empower others through participatory processes (and other mechanisms), it masks their attempts to maintain power and control. “This potentially bottom-up concept can be used to perpetuate and disguise continued top-down attitudes and approaches” (Nelson and Wright 1998, 11).

\(^{11}\) Britain was second highest at 78%, followed by the U.S. at 55%, then France at 47%, West Germany
This can be seen in the case of gender equality policies. Northern feminists have pushed for gender equality policies on the assumption that once attained, women’s oppression, on all fronts, will be alleviated. However, Third World, anti-racist feminists point out that while gender oppression is a significant source of Third World women’s oppression, it is not the sole, nor the primary source (Antrobus 1995, Johnson-Odim 1991, Razack 1999). As discussed previously, First World feminists’ efforts to mainstream gender into existing societal structures not only fails to transform those structures, but also entrenches power in the hands of the elite. When First World feminists choose to limit their efforts to gender inequality, they ignore the multiple forms of oppression facing Third World women and perpetuate the hierarchical division between First World and Third World women (Antrobus 1995, Bessis 2001, Johnson-Odim 1991, Nnaemeka 2001, Razack 1999).

Summary

Liberal, radical and Marxist feminists provide a constructive and useful critique of bureaucracies. They demonstrate how bureaucratic institutions operate in gendered and classed ways that ensure their status quo. Rather than diffusing power and thereby empowering others, development agencies bring more and more relations into bureaucratic channels thereby tightening their control and multiplying their power. Through this process, feminist strategic goals are diffused and often lost to meet bureaucratic needs. Liberal, radical and Marxist feminists portray feminists working in development agencies as instruments of bureaucracies working their best in challenging and difficult circumstances.

Third World, anti-racist feminists argue that more than being simply cogs in the bureaucratic wheels, feminists working within development bureaucracies utilise the

at 34% and Sweden at 16% (Kabeer 1994, 71).
practices of institutions of ruling to ensure their own power and control. Development institutions and feminists working within those institutions partake in discursive practices that racialize Third World women, perpetuate First World/Third World power imbalances, and engage in participatory practices that in reality sustain institutions of ruling and further marginalize Third World women. Combined, these practices impede the ability of international development agencies and feminists working within those institutions to address Third World women's needs.

In addition to examining how institutions of ruling manage and control Third World women and thereby usurp their feminist anti-racist agenda, they demonstrate how institutional practices and discourse are intricately connected. The latter provides the underlying mechanisms on which the bureaucracy is structured and functions. They also highlight the importance of deconstructing participatory processes to uncover the racist, gendered and classist norms that structure those processes. Participatory processes that fail to examine these essential constructs perpetuate power in the hands of the elite rather than diffuse power and empower marginalized groups. The challenge faced by development organisations is to be aware of and understand these issues and to envision and create ways to implement policies and projects that are mindful of them. I rely on the work of Third World, anti-racist theorists to conduct my analysis of CIDA's policymaking process.
CHAPTER THREE
CIDA's POLICYMAKING PROCESS:
A MEANS TO ACCOMPLISH AN END

In this chapter, I explain CIDA's policymaking process, beginning with a historical discussion of CIDA's commitment to women in development. As early as 1976, CIDA issued Women in Development (WID) policy guidelines. In 1984 CIDA implemented a more comprehensive WID strategy. The policy went through numerous stages and transformations from 1984 to the present. The first section explores these changes and looks at critiques of these policies both in terms of the challenges practitioners faced when implementing the policies in the field and the struggles internal gender advocates faced within the bureaucratic structures of CIDA.

The second section explores why CIDA changed its policy in 1998. In 1998, CIDA's gender policy focused on 'equity' issues. As will be discussed at length below, CIDA decided to change its policy from one that focused on 'equity' to one that highlights 'equality'. I examine why CIDA decided to change the terminology, what theoretical differences exist between those two concepts and the consequences of those changes.

I then turn my attention to CIDA's policymaking process. When CIDA decided to update its policy, they chose to engage in a consultative process using the Internet as its
medium. CIDA sought input from women and men from throughout the North and South, both individuals based in governmental development bureaucracies and grassroots peoples. In an attempt to ensure broad participation, CIDA conducted outreach via various means. In this third section, I discuss these efforts and the means chosen for the consultation. I also explain the decision-making process within CIDA that led to its choice to use the Internet and the structure of the Internet consultation. I then explore some of the shortcomings of the process.\footnote{Chapter 4 is devoted to a more complete analysis of the shortcomings and process.}

In this paper, I do not intend to critique how women’s issues have been and are presently handled within CIDA. My discussion of CIDA’s commitment to women’s issues provides historical background that is relevant to my exploration of CIDA’s policymaking process and my analysis of that process and the resulting policy. I am not examining the evolution of gender issues within CIDA, other theorists taken on that particular task in great detail (Alexander 1995, Jahan 1995). I am also not explicitly looking at the priority that gender issues have received within CIDA. I only explore those issues to the extent they shed light on the challenges gender advocates face working within the constructs of CIDA, an institution of ruling. Rather, using Third World, anti-racist feminist theorists, I am conducting an analysis of CIDA’s gender equality policymaking process, and to a lesser extent, the resulting gender equality policy.

**History of CIDA’s Commitment to Gender Equality**

CIDA has long been recognised as a leader in the international development community for its commitment to gender issues (Alexander 1995, Jahan 1995). Whereas multilateral agencies, such as the World Bank, the United Nation Food and Agricultural
Organization (FAO), and the IMF, and other bilateral agencies, such as USAID, are seen to be slow to address gender needs, CIDA is regarded as an innovative leader in the field (Alexander 1995, Jahan 1995). CIDA’s dedication to gender dates back to 1976 and continues today.

Rajani Alexander (1995) provides an excellent historical picture of CIDA’s work in the field of women and development, dating from 1984-1994. She explains that it is important to look at CIDA’s progress in this field in the context of international and national efforts to address women’s issues. CIDA issued its first WID guidelines in 1976 shortly after the International Decade for Women, which began in 1975 and the first World Conference on Women in Mexico City that same year. At that same time, women’s issues were gaining prominence on the national level as well. The 1970s were a budding year for the formation of women’s desks and programmes in Canada. In 1970, the Royal Commission on the Status of Women was appointed; in 1973 the Women’s Programme of the Secretary of State and the Canadian Advisory Council for the Status of Women were created; and in 1976 the federal department Status of Women Canada was established (Alexander 1995, 80). These gains for women did not arise out of whole cloth. As discussed in the previous chapter, WID and other advances for women are also a “manifestation of the strength and vitality of the women’s movement and feminism throughout the world” (St-Hilaire 1993, 57-58).

During 1975, CIDA engaged in nation-wide workshops with women’s groups from throughout Canada to discuss Women in Development. In response to a 1976 government directive that all departments identify a centre to integrate women into all its programmes, CIDA named an officer in the Policy Branch as the coordinator (Alexander 1995, 80). At the same time, it issued a set of five WID guidelines. “These were very broad and brief (one page), urging the ‘equitable integration of men and women into the mainstream of the
Agency's work in all sectors'. No schedule of activities or targets accompanied the Guidelines" (Alexander 1995, 81).

CIDA established its first WID Directorate in 1983 and implemented its first WID policy in 1984. "The goal of the 1984 Policy Framework was '... to ensure that the full range of (CIDA's) development assistance will contribute to the realization of the full potential of women as agents and beneficiaries of the development process'" (Alexander 1995, 81 emphasis added). It outlined seven policy objectives including supporting Third World women's "efforts to participate in development and their initiatives to improve their situation;" gaining greater understanding of women's multiple roles and their potential roles; to increase their participation in the "design, implementation and evaluation of development interventions"; ensuring proportionate representation of women in CIDA's projects and programmes; working with recipient governments to make efforts to close economic gaps between Third World men and women by focusing on income-generating projects and programmes, particularly those that "alleviate women's time and constraints;" and supporting separate women's programmes where deemed necessary (Alexander 1995, 81).

These objectives highlight CIDA's focus on equality of opportunity and the eradication of systemic discrimination. This comported with national and international movements at the time. In keeping with liberal feminist ideology, the policy focused on institutional changes and inherent organisational biases against women. It did not attempt to change individual beliefs or attitudes. The articulation of women as mere "agents and beneficiaries of the development process" exposes how CIDA, at that time, constructed women as passive recipients of development rather as actors shaping and contributing to their development. CIDA's policy was applauded for being progressive and received much
attention, both nationally and abroad. In the years that followed, CIDA became a “recognized advocate for the cause of WID in numerous fora” (Alexander 1995, 81).

CIDA continued to modify its WID policy during the 1980s. In 1986, CIDA developed a five-year Plan of Action. The plan focused on integrating the WID policy into all of CIDA’s programmes and activities. Mechanisms were established to collect sex-disaggregated data, and to work with non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and multilateral organisations. Five additional issues were highlighted for further planning. These included, for example, staff performance evaluations for accountability, training policies, the WID analytical framework and the provision of WID expertise (Alexander 1995, 82).

The WID advocates at CIDA were optimistic about the action plan. However, bureaucratic priorities and obstacles prevented full implementation of the action plan. “[T]he WID Directorate was moved out of the Policy Branch to the Social and Human Resource Development Division of Professional Services Branch, and the whole question of accountability for WID among staff was not clear enough to guarantee the genuine ‘institutionalization of WID’ at CIDA” (Alexander 1995, 82). As a result, as happened at other development agencies,¹³ WID became marginalized. Rather than being seen as important on its own, WID was viewed as a subset of other social development issues. However, despite the lack of managerial support and commitment, some dedicated staff members truly “did WID” (Alexander 1995, 83).

Colette St-Hilaire argues that even those projects that “did WID,” “mainly served to institute sophisticated mechanisms to manage women” (St-Hilaire 1993, 57). She examined a

¹³ See chapter 2, pages 33-8.
CIDA-funded project that began in the Philippines in 1988: SHIELD (Sustained Heath Improvement through Expanded Livelihood Development).\(^{14}\) Contrary to the principles of CIDA’s WID policy, all stages of project planning, development and implementation were defined \textit{before} the women beneficiaries entered the picture (St-Hilaire 1993, 59). In congruence with bureaucratic needs, the project classified the women, created mechanisms for managing the women, and only supported women’s participation in the defined activities of the project. “The project [did] not support the autonomous organization of women or the setting up of cooperatives; it [did] not cover any education on the national debt, militarization, human rights, women’s rights in the areas of sexuality and reproduction or agrarian reform” (St-Hilaire 1993, 59). Through these mechanisms of control, CIDA was able to measure the success of the project using quantitative means. Arturo Escobar points out that efforts to measure equality through tangible, quantitative means “makes inevitable a certain erasure of women’s experiences” (Escobar 1995, 179). However, bureaucracies need to demonstrate that their programmes are efficient and effective. The most efficient means of doing so is by creating labels and categories that provide an easy tool for measuring the success of the programmes. The effect of this labelling is to “cut women off from their history and reorganize them according to categories and relations over which they have no control” (St-Hilaire 1993, 59).

St-Hilaire’s critique demonstrates how institutions of ruling, even well-intentioned arms of those institutions, create and implement policies in ways that allow the government to manage the people to ensure the perpetuation of their own power (Smith 1990a, b). It also shows how a liberal feminist agenda fails to incorporate the more comprehensive criticisms of development launched by Third World feminists, thus ensuring the incorporation of Third

\(^{14}\) Interestingly, out of a total of 70 million Canadian dollars for the project, 20 million went to the
World women into development projects that perpetuate their own oppression. By choosing to push for women’s inclusion into the existing development structures, the feminist strategic goals of WID were co-opted by development bureaucracies’ practical needs. This meant that in practice, WID became an instrument of the development agencies rather than a rallying point for feminists or a means of addressing Third World women’s needs.

Despite these pitfalls, CIDA gained an international reputation for its commitment to WID. Unlike many other agencies during that time, CIDA successfully implemented special projects aimed at women and developed mechanisms to ensure that WID was considered in all its projects and programmes (Alexander 1995). The fact that the projects failed to adequately address women’s needs did not tarnish this reputation.

In 1992, CIDA implemented an Interim WID Policy. “The two key concepts [of the interim policy] were the empowerment of women and their role as decision-makers in the development process (moving beyond the 1984 definition of ‘agents and beneficiaries.’). . . .” (Alexander 1995, 83). It contained four main objectives. These included increasing “women’s participation in economic, political and social processes” so as to increase their income, improve their economic conditions, their level of education, their access to health and family planning services, and to promote and protect their human rights (Alexander 1995, 83). It emphasized promoting the elimination of discriminatory barriers against women and supporting partners efforts to integrate gender considerations into their development work. Importantly, it also focused on CIDA’s own need to build its institutional capacity so that gender considerations could be fully integrated throughout CIDA’s work (Alexander 1995, 83).

__________________________________________

University of Calgary in Canada as project administrator (St-Hilaire 1993, 59).
These objectives squarely place CIDA within a liberal feminist framework. As discussed in the previous chapter, the liberal feminist development model (i.e., WID) resulted in the marginalisation of women to the welfare sector. The objectives listed above (in line with liberal feminist ideology and WID practice) focused primarily on population, health, welfare, nutrition and education. They also pushed for internal changes to bureaucracies that provide for equal opportunity, rather than for a complete restructuring of bureaucracies. A final review of CIDA’s WID policies from 1984-1992, issued in July 1993, identified how CIDA’s bureaucratic needs overshadowed feminist goals to include women in development projects and secure women’s equality.

This review, titled *Gender as a Cross-Cutting Theme in Development Assistance: An Evaluation of CIDA’s WID Policy and Activities, 1984-1992* (CIDA 1993), detailed the strengths and weaknesses of CIDA’s WID policies, and the challenges WID advocates within CIDA faced. In particular, the report indicated that from 1990-1993, significant momentum for WID projects was lost (CIDA 1993, 65). Funding to address women’s needs and projects that targeted women were reduced during those years. Just like internal gender advocates elsewhere, those at CIDA faced a lack of institutional and managerial support and commitment to WID. No staff assigned to WID had authority to ensure its implementation. While the majority of staff interviewed agreed that gender inequality was an impediment to development, more than half of staff in the bilateral branches did not regard gender as a serious constraint to development (CIDA 1993, 34). To support their contention, staff referred to the success of the newly industrialised countries of Asia as examples of how economic growth can occur without gender equality (CIDA 1993). This emphasis on economic development further highlights CIDA staff’s entrenchment in liberal political theory, including traditional modernisation principles and policies.
In May 1993, responsibility for WID moved back to the Policy Branch, under a Senior Policy Advisor. “The Advisor had no staff, although Branch WID specialists were assigned to full-time positions within the geographic branches and Partnership branch” (Alexander 1995, 84). A year later, the WID unit was completely revamped. A Director was appointed in the Policy Development section of the Policy branch. The Director had two full-time staff as well as administrative support. It became known as the Women in Development and Gender Equity Division. One month later, the government announced six programming priorities for Canada’s Official Development Assistance (ODA). These included women in development and gender equity (CIDA 1998, 3). Specifically, it read: “to support the full participation of women as equal partners in the sustainable development of their societies” (Alexander 1995, 85). This commitment to women and gender equity was emphasized again in 1995.

That same year CIDA implemented a new policy entitled “Women in Development and Gender Equity Policy” (WID&GE). Although the policy objectives of the 1995 policy and the 1992 WID Interim Policy are organized differently, but for one objective, they are identical. The 1995 policy added one additional objective: “Support partners of the South in voicing their concerns on gender issues in development and to enhance understanding of these issues in the Agency, the Canadian government and among the Canadian public” (CIDA 1998b, B4). This goal addresses critiques of WID and WAD policies by opening the possibility of dialogue between Southern partners and CIDA. It appears to provide a space for the voices of Southern partners on gender issues.

A review of this policy, titled “Women in Development and Gender Equity 1992-1995,” was published by CIDA in 1998. According to CIDA,
CIDA’s policy was revised in 1995 to emphasize the importance of gender equity and women’s empowerment. CIDA’s use of a gender equity approach aimed to ensure fairness in the way women and men are treated and involved the adoption of special measures to tackle gender inequalities and to increase women’s autonomy. These special measures and the process of empowerment remain essential elements in remedying unbalanced power relationships between men and women. (CIDA 1999, 1)

This report discusses advances made within CIDA from 1992-1995, including the appointment of full-time WID&GE specialists in most programme branches, positive approaches to the implementation of WID&GE by staff, gains in scholarships provided to women, and an increase in individual commitment to WID&GE (CIDA 1998b, 8). These improvements, the report states, directly benefited Third World women as well: “specific initiatives have had a positive impact on the lives of women and on gender equity relations in developing countries” (CIDA 1998b, 8).

However, the report also paints a less rosy picture. For example, insufficient funding for WID&GE Policy objectives within CIDA’s programming expenditures demonstrated that “the policy is a low priority within the Agency” (CIDA 1998b, C5). In fact, from the years 1989/90 to 1994/95, funding for improving women’s economic, social, and political well-being remained within the 10-15% range of overall funding (CIDA 1998b, B9). The report continues to explain that “[a] more serious investment of Agency time and funds in gender equity training is required” (1998b, B9). Significantly, according to the report, staff did not believe CIDA had made the case that gender equity is important in and of itself or essential to economic development and therefore did not fully embrace gender equity development principles as key to their work (CIDA 1998b, B9). This finding demonstrates how little progress had been made since 1993 when over half of bilateral staff indicated that they did not regard gender as a serious constraint to development (CIDA 1993, 34). Perhaps little movement was made because training was insufficient and there was a lack of managerial
support (CIDA 1998). While the majority of the staff said they could recognize when gender analysis is needed, they lacked skills to carry out that analysis (CIDA 1998b, 23-24). Approximately fifty percent also felt that senior management did not regard gender equity as key to their work (CIDA 1998b, 12).

To successfully implement the 1995 policy, management needed to address five specific areas. These included “incorporating WID&GE throughout CIDA, operationalizing policy, accountability for results, management issues, and training” (CIDA 1998b, 1). Specifically, the report states that while CIDA had been successful in those projects directly aimed at benefiting women, it “has not been as successful at ‘WID&GE integration’” when WID&GE objectives are one among many (CIDA 1998b, 11). According to the authors, WID&GE “policy does not inform the development action and decisions of CIDA as broadly as it should. It is neither embedded nor incorporated into current corporate planning and reporting” (CIDA 1998b, 12). Perhaps most disturbing, the reports states that staff attitudes to WID&GE are “ambiguous” (CIDA 1998b, 12). Over the year, “the number of sceptics has not decreased” and “some staff still see WID&GE as ‘women’s business’” (CIDA 1998b, 12). Approximately 25% were “unsympathetic” to WID&GE issues, believing that WID&GE is essentially a “social-sector issue and is not among the main constraints to development” (CIDA 1998b, 12). One of the reasons identified for the lack of institutional support for WID&GE lies in the fact that it is not funded adequately and that accountability for results is diffused (CIDA 1998b, 12). The report found that the policy lacked clear guidelines for staff to implement the policy, gage their performance, and to conduct follow-up (CIDA 1998b, 15). In many instances, the evaluators had difficulty assessing the progress in WID&GE because there were no measurable targets or identified expected results for WID&GE
projects (CIDA 1998b, 17). Practitioners working in the field relay how these problems affected them.

In her article, *Women Organizing for Change: Transformational Organizing as a Strategy for Feminist Development*, Collette Oseen (1999) discusses the struggles she faced when working on a CIDA project in China. While CIDA’s guidelines try to ensure women’s integration into the development project, the budget was insufficient to do so and GAD practitioners were not taken seriously (Oseen 1999). She argues that “[c]onventional hierarchical ways of organizing prevent women from learning how to overcome inequitable relations between themselves or to challenge effectively the inequitable relations within male-dominated projects or the wider world” (1999, 110). She emphasizes that GAD practitioners within CIDA are marginalized and thus unable to effectively carry out their mandate. Like Dorothy Smith, she highlights the power of institutions of ruling to perpetuate the status quo. Succinctly, Oseen states:

> Organizational processes are about power, and we must not ignore this if we are to succeed as feminists doing development rather than just women dutifully carrying out projects aimed only at making the cage in which women exist a little prettier.  
> (1999, 111)

Oseen (1999) and St-Hilaire (1993) demonstrate how as more and more relations and Third World women are drawn into the development apparatus, bureaucratic powers and control over Third World women are tightened (Nelson and Wright 1998). By simply focusing on improving women’s lives through social welfare programmes advanced under WID, development projects geared toward women still fail to tackle more complex issues, particularly power imbalances on a global level. In addition, these projects promote eurocentric models of economic development. In this way, the 1995 policy failed to be truly transformative.
The 1998 review, just as prior reports had, largely identified a lack of managerial commitment and institutional support to WID&GE. To remedy these problems, the report lists a number of recommendations to improve policy implementation. These include a focus on accountability of staff and managers, clear and measurable means of assessing, demonstrating and comparing results, improved guidelines on acceptable targets and measures for gender equity, support and training for staff and partners, monitoring processes to ensure integration of WID&GE into all stages of project design, and more clearly defined roles and responsibilities between CIDA and its partners (CIDA 1998b, 13-25).

The Change of Policy in 1998

Did these shortcomings and suggested improvements mean that CIDA’s policy needed to be revamped? Could improved training, managerial support and greater integration of the policy into CIDA’s work have addressed these problems? This section explores where the push to change CIDA’s policy originated.

In response to changing national and international development thought on gender issues as well as past performance reviews, “CIDA’s Policy Committee recommended that the WID and Gender Equity Policy be updated” (CIDA 1999, 2). Explaining how CIDA reached its decision to update its policy, one CIDA staff member relayed the following story (CIDA staff 1 interview\(^{15}\)). In the fall of 1997, during a CIDA policy committee meeting, the gender equity staff of the policy branch began a discussion concerning the Organisation for

\(^{15}\) Throughout this document, I identify my interview and questionnaire subjects by referring to each by his or her location (or position) (for example, CIDA staff, Bellanet staff, Guest Panelist or Participant, meaning participant in the consultation). I then assign each person a number within that category (for example, CIDA staff 1, CIDA staff 2, Guest panelist 1). Included in the category ‘CIDA staff’ is the individual who was hired as a consultant by CIDA to moderate the Internet consultations. I am citing my research participants in this way to ensure their anonymity and confidentiality.
Economic Cooperation and Development\textsuperscript{16} (OECD) guidelines on gender equality and empowerment of women. In 1998, the development arm of the OECD published its guidelines on gender \textit{equality} and women’s empowerment. The purpose of this meeting was to provide discussion points for CIDA’s OECD representative to bring back to OECD. It was during this meeting that some members of the policy branch identified the disparity between the term ‘gender equity’ contained in CIDA’s policy and ‘gender equality’ in OECD’s policy. When members of the policy committee inquired why CIDA’s policy differed from OECD’s in this way, the staff member informed the policy branch that “basically well we’re behind the times” (CIDA staff 1 interview). The policy branch members indicated that “CIDA should stay as a leader in this area and update this policy to be in line with Beijing . . .” (CIDA staff 1 interview).

The \textit{Beijing Platform for Action}, the final document of the 1995 United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women, contains commitments to gender equality. Canada is also a signatory to all major international human rights treaties, including the \textit{Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women} (CEDAW), and has committed itself to the agreement on the \textit{United Nations Declaration on Violence Against Women}.

Approaches to gender issues had recently undergone changes on the national level as well. In 1995, the government issued a foreign policy statement entitled, \textit{Canada in the World}. This document underlined the government’s commitment to sustainable development and poverty reduction and identified the full participation of women as equal partners as one of six programming priorities (CIDA 1999, 1). In the same year, the Cabinet approved Canada’s \textit{Federal Plan for Gender Equality}. In addition, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms

\footnote{\textsuperscript{16} The OECD is the umbrella group of the thirty most industrialized countries in the world.}
guarantees the right to equality in the law and equal benefit of the law for women and men (emphasis added).

CIDA’s policy states that “gender equity is the process of being fair to women and men” and thus compensation is required for historical and social disadvantages that have prevented women from operating on a level playing field with men (CIDA 1999, 7). Gender equality, on the other hand, “means that women and men enjoy the same status” (CIDA 1999, 7). As these distinctions make clear, gender equity recognizes differences while gender equality treats everyone the same. Equity initiatives, such as affirmative action, craft remedies for historical discriminatory practices, whereas equality initiatives presume that everyone has the same opportunities. The language of gender equality does not provide avenues for acknowledging or addressing past or present gender inequalities. Women and men enjoy the same status, have the same capacity to achieve human rights, and contribute to their societies. Gender equality involves the equal valuing of women and men, while recognizing their similarities and differences.  

Gender equality, as a means of addressing Third World women’s oppression, is an ideal steeped in liberal feminist ideology. Liberal feminism proposes that as long as women are given equal access to the same resources and opportunities, they will not only actually attain them, but also benefit equally from them. Liberal feminists do not push for the transformation of societal structures, but rather seek women’s integration into them on an equal basis. By focusing on this one narrow aspect of women’s oppression, CIDA ideologically aligns itself with liberal feminists, and thus perpetuates the status quo of bureaucracies and institutions of ruling.

---

17 For further discussion of the consequences of this change in terminology, see pages 88-91, chapter 4.
CIDA also relied upon "recommendations from the five years of evaluations, including the evaluations of gender equality policy [sic], but also infrastructure evaluations . . ." (CIDA staff 1 interview). The new policy states that "the conclusions of the review, published in 1998, indicated the need for CIDA to demonstrate clear and sustainable results in promoting gender equality in line with CIDA’s policy on results-based management" (CIDA 1999, 1-2). As will be discussed in chapter 4, the change in terminology to gender equality meets this bureaucratic need as well. Yet, as outlined above, a more comprehensive scrutiny of the documentation shows that an increase in resources and an enhanced commitment to gender issues was needed, not the rewriting of a policy that places new and different requirements on a staff already struggling to implement gender analysis.

The 1998 review sets forth a number of recommendations for improving implementation of the 1995 policy. Specifically, the report recommended that CIDA

- Carry out more research at the field level to find answers or alternatives to the problems of defining and measuring WID&GE results. The results should involve all program branches . . . along with our partners in developing countries. *Action-oriented research,* think pieces and debates on the concerns should be used to foster staff learning and training.

(CIDA 1998b, 19 emphasis added)

These suggestions could have been implemented through enhanced engagement with the policy as written and, more significantly, through increased institutional and financial support for the implementation of the WID&GE policy. In the 26 page review and the accompanying 64 pages of annex, not once do the authors suggest a complete rewording of the policy. Despite the fact that the policy was conducted during the time of the Beijing conference and was not completed until three years after Beijing, it does not recommend that the policy be brought in line with the Beijing platform. Of equal significance is that while

---

18 See pages 88-91.
this review looked at the internal operation of WID&GE within CIDA, it did not examine how the policy impacted Third World women in the field.

What is not specifically addressed by the Review is what is the impact of CIDA’s WID&GE policy on women in developing countries. Given the focus of the Corporate Evaluation on CIDA’s efforts to implement the policy, it is too early to assess the impact of the revised policy.

(CIDA 1998, A5 emphasis added)

In fact, neither the draft nor final policies, my interviews or the policy reviews indicate that Southern grassroots women contacted CIDA and expressed concern with the old policy. However, rather than waiting to see how the policy impacted women in the Third World, or engaging in research to find answers or alternatives to the problems of measuring WID&GE results, CIDA decided it was time to change the entire policy. This decision was made to meet CIDA’s bureaucratic needs that the policy comport with Beijing, that CIDA remain a leader in the field, and that the policy contain means by which to demonstrate results in promoting gender equality.

The following section explores CIDA’s policymaking process, from the drafting of the consultation document to its choice to use the Internet as its means for the consultation. In addition, it examines CIDA’s outreach efforts, the structure of the consultation and the identified shortcomings in all stages of the process.

**CIDA’s Policymaking Process**

After the gender equity division within the policy branch received the mandate to bring CIDA’s policy in line with Beijing, CIDA needed to begin its policymaking process. To do so, the gender equity division of the policy branch held brainstorming sessions with
the gender equality network\(^{19}\) and other paid consultants. During these meetings, this group of Northern experts crafted the draft policy that provided the framework for the consultation (CIDA staff 1 interview). Once the draft was complete, staff needed to decide how to conduct the consultation. Approximately six months earlier, a CIDA staff member had returned from a conference on women and the Internet (CIDA staff 2 interview). She was very enthusiastic about this tool. The head of the gender equity division of the policy branch of CIDA, who was equally enthusiastic, decided to try Internet consultation for the 1998 policy update. CIDA staff felt that the Internet would not only allow Canadians and CIDA staff to provide input, but also women and men from the South (CIDA staff 1, 2 interviews).

According to one staff person, Internet consultation was preferable to a “travelling road show” because of the “immediate feedback [available on the Internet] which can either reinforce an idea or sink it” (CIDA staff 2 interview). To illustrate her point, she gave the following example:

Let’s take for an example the gender equality, what comes first, women’s right to gender equality or cultural requirements, let’s say, or cultural fantasies, whatever you want to type them, I can’t think of the word right now, you know that exist in different cultures. What comes first? So this way, if we send the question out on the Internet, well we get an answer from South America saying yes, human rights are important and come before culture. Then you get an answer back from someone in Africa saying, no, culture comes first. But then you have three more people from Africa saying no, human rights are very important. So you have this really quick feedback to questions. Whereas if you’re on a travelling road show, you’d never have this feedback because by the time you get to Africa from Asia and then off to Latin America, how do people find out what was said in other countries or other cities, or whatever? You don’t, unless you share all this information when it’s available. (CIDA staff 2 interview)

\(^{19}\) The Gender Equality Network (GEN) is a part of CIDA. It consists of the gender specialists within the geographical branches of CIDA as well as the gender equality staff in the policy branch (CIDA homepage. http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/equality).
Another staff person indicated that travelling road shows were simply not feasible. "CIDA works in 110 countries now, how do you decide which country to organise a consultation in? It becomes tricky" (CIDA staff 1 interview).

Thus, to begin the process of conducting the consultation on the Internet, CIDA consulted with one of its own funding beneficiaries – Bellanet\(^2\) (CIDA staff 1 interview). Bellanet is an organisation that specialises in using information and communication technologies (ICTs) for improving development (www.bellanet.org, visited June 17, 2002). CIDA and Bellanet held numerous meetings to determine how to do this. At the time of CIDA’s consultation, neither Bellanet nor CIDA had previously conducted online consultations (Bellanet staff interview, CIDA staff 1 interview). Admittedly, they were breaking new ground. "Just undertaking a project like this is really taking a step out there; [it] took enormous courage" (Bellanet staff interview). To ensure its success, CIDA needed to publicise the consultation.

The Outreach Effort

When an agency structures its outreach, numerous decisions are made with far-reaching consequences. The inclusion of some voices and the exclusion of others are inevitable. However, steps can be taken to ensure that the agency seeks input from those it deems important. This section explores the choices CIDA made in this regard.

CIDA took various measures to ensure broad participation in the consultation. Because CIDA wanted input from Southern women and men, CIDA hired six gender and development experts to help guide the discussions. Of these six guest panelists, four were women, two men; three were from the South and three from the North; two spoke English,

---
\(^2\) Bellanet receives approximately 10-12% of its funding from CIDA (Bellanet staff interview).
two French and two Spanish\(^\text{21}\) (Record of Consultation,\(^\text{22}\) CIDA staff 1 interview). CIDA circulated the draft through various avenues. CIDA wrote to fifty Canadian organisations informing them of the consultation and asking for their input (CIDA staff 3 interview). They wrote to all visible minority organisations across Canada (even those not involved in gender and development) and to all Canadian partners (i.e., those organisations that receive CIDA funding). They sent it to the Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada as well as the association of exporters and importers. They asked these umbrella groups to send it out and alert people about the consultation (CIDA staff 2, 3 interviews). The policy also was distributed to various United Nations bodies (CIDA staff 1, 3 interviews). Bellanet assisted with marketing as well. Bellanet sent “the announcement out to some of [their] contacts that are on the Internet. They’re not particular to gender” (Bellanet staff interview). In fact, they sent it to somewhere between five thousand and ten thousand email addresses, 20 percent of those were in developing countries (CIDA staff 3 interview). CIDA relied significantly on more informal avenues of outreach to the general public, including “word of mouth” (CIDA staff 2). It sent emails to various list serves and organisations and asked these groups to distribute the information to their members. The invitation to participate was also posted to a list serve at the University of Guelph (Participant 1 questionnaire). The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada sent the email to all Canadian universities (Participant 2 interview). The document was sent in embassy packages to all the embassies that have a

\(^{21}\) The consultation was held in three languages, English, French and Spanish.

\(^{22}\) References to the “Record of Consultation” refer to the Internet consultation conducted by CIDA through Bellanet. The consultation emails are archived at [www.bellanet.org/lyris/helper](http://www.bellanet.org/lyris/helper). Once you access that page, you need to then scroll down and click on the Gender Equality Virtual Consultation - “equality-egalite-1”. When I accessed and downloaded the consultation for my research, it was in a document format. It is currently stored by individual emails, not as an entire document.
CIDA desk along “with an email to all the CIDA staff at [those] embassies asking them to consult locally” (CIDA staff 1 interview).

In addition to the public voices, the gender equity staff conducted outreach to the rest of CIDA staff. The packages sent to the embassies were intended to engage the interest of staff there. According to its Workplan, CIDA’s outreach to staff included a memo from the President to all staff and a meeting with all branch management groups to discuss the process and content of the consultation (“A Gender Equality Plan for the New Millenium [sic]: Notes for a Policy Revision Workplan”). CIDA also sought input from its own staff on specific sections of the policy. For example, when the gender equity staff felt the policy inadequately addressed poverty issues, they said to the poverty group, “I think we need help on this. You know I’d like your reflections on how these things go together. So they helped with the rewrite of that section” (CIDA staff 1 interview).

Because of decisions such as these, CIDA’s process resulted in the exclusion of some voices. CIDA did not send the policy to CIDA partners in the South because the gender advocates in the policy branch don’t work directly in the South, those contacts are through gender advisors in the geographic branches. The only opportunity for the policy to reach partners in the South is through these gender advisors. This occurred only one time at a meeting held in the field in South Asia when the gender advisor for Asia took a copy of the draft policy with her to South Asia. She sent headquarters a seventeen-page fax from that meeting. The meeting was not planned and similar meetings were not conducted elsewhere (CIDA staff 1 interview). Furthermore, when interviewed, the guest panelists indicated that they did not assist with outreach. “They did not ask me, can you identify people [in certain

---

23 I discuss whose voices were excluded, how the process resulted in their exclusion and the consequences below. See pages 81-5 (chapter 3) and pages 105-12 (chapter 4).
regions in the Third World] who can take part. We have tons of contacts and organisations and they never asked" (Guest panelist 1 interview). This particular individual felt that the outreach methods were insufficient and the Internet was a poor choice for consultation with Third World women because Third World women do not have access to the Internet. "It was not a discussion which covered stakeholders, all the stakeholders, so that was my main piece with it" (Guest panelist 1 interview).

The Structure of the Internet Consultation

After numerous meetings with Bellanet, CIDA decided to conduct the consultation in English, French and Spanish in the hopes that more people would be able to participate (CIDA staff 1 interview). In June 1998, a moderator was hired for the consultation that could speak and read all three languages (CIDA staff 3 interview). The consultation ran from August 17, 1998 until September 11, 1998. Bellanet staff organised the technical aspects of the consultation. They provided instructions on how to join the list serve and access the document, and they managed the website (Bellanet staff interview). If participants encountered difficulties, the moderator would work with them to solve the problem. If unsuccessful, she would ask Bellanet for assistance (CIDA staff 3 interview). Individuals could either participate by going to the website or by joining the list serve. Participants' comments were posted in the language in which they were submitted. They were not translated (CIDA staff 1 interview). However, at the end of each week, the moderator summarised the comments from both the public and private consultation (CIDA staff 1, 3 interview).

---

24 As explained below, see pages 77-8, CIDA held a private consultation for CIDA staff.
As mentioned above, CIDA also hired six gender and development experts to help guide the discussions. Like the general public, the guest panelists offered suggestions to the document. The consultation was not structured in any formal way. Participants were free to provide any input or make any comments they desired. Nonetheless, CIDA envisioned some framework for the consultation. According to CIDA’s internal Workplan, the virtual consultation outside CIDA was to be conducted by “BellaNet (sic) with carefully framed guidelines about this being an update of an existing working policy for a government agency” (“A Gender Equality Plan for the New Millenium [sic]: Notes for a Policy Revision Workplan”). On the first day of the consultation, in an email welcoming participants, the moderator set the framework for the consultation. She outlined topics for conversation for the first two weeks.

The first week’s discussion will look at concepts/definitions (e.g. empowerment, gender equality), policy making and the goal and principles to try and develop a common understanding of what is being discussed. In the second week, the discussion will turn to specific elements of the policy and how these can be achieved (measures for achieving gender equality results, good practices, gender analysis, etc.). (Record of Consultation)

She then explained how participants could post messages and suggested “some ‘ground rules’ to help the discussion flow more easily” (Record of Consultation). These included clearly titling one’s postings, identifying oneself with one’s name and email address at the bottom of the message, and being brief. In this regard, participants were asked to keep their comments to one or two screens in length and to stick to a single subject in each message (Record of Consultation).

Interestingly, CIDA also held a separate, private consultation that was only accessible to CIDA staff. This was done to ensure staff participation and to meet the wishes of staff. Entre Nous, the private Intranet consultation, was established because when surveyed CIDA staff said they “didn’t want their views posted on the outside” (CIDA staff 1 interview).
Another staff member indicated that the reason for the internal consultation was because of “insecurity” (CIDA staff 2 interview). CIDA staff had access to both consultations. When they turned on their computers in the morning, they received the comments posted on the public consultation. However, if they wanted to post a message, they did that on Entre Nous, not on the public consultation\(^2\) (CIDA staff 2 interview). Those staff members who were uncomfortable posting their views, even within Entre Nous, were able to provide written comments directly to the gender equality staff, anonymously if they desired (CIDA staff 1 interview).

Any consultation process is open to scrutiny and criticism. In CIDA’s case, difficulties with the process and means chosen were identified by those involved in the process as well as by CIDA staff. The following section explores some of these deficiencies.

The Shortcomings

The shortcomings identified with CIDA’s consultation process can be categorised in four groups: time limitations, inadequate resources, insufficient follow-through, and Internet constraints. According to one staff member, the consultation process timeline, from its inception to its completion, was “quite short” (CIDA staff 2 interview). Looking at CIDA’s bureaucratic structures sheds light on why this was the case. CIDA’s internal Workplan sets forth the timeline for policy making from its beginnings on April 2, 1998 to its completion. ("A Gender Equality Plan for the New Millenium [sic]: Notes for a Policy Revision Workplan"). The launching of the new policy was scheduled for March 8, 1999 to coincide with International Women’s Day. The importance of finalising CIDA’s policy by this date can be seen by examining an internal CIDA documented entitled “International Women’s

---

\(^2\) Staff was not prohibited from posting comments on the public consultation, and one staff
Day March 8th, Minister Marleau Program: Draft Scenario” (hereinafter referred to as “International Women’s Day program”).

According to this document, the policy would be announced via satellite at the New York meeting of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women. The objectives of the day included hosting an event that can promote the Gender Equality Policy, making the event unique to Canada, delivering Canada’s message on the world stage, linking into the UN component, launching the policy on the Internet and CIDA’s Entre Nous, and providing the Minister with an opportunity for “announceables” (International Women’s Day program). Included in the program is a plan for a pre-taped video statement by the Prime Minister that would reflect the theme of the New York conference, but could also “reinforce the Canadian position, direction and progress that we have made” (International Women’s Day program). To meet this timeline, the policymaking process, from its inception to its launching in March 1999, had to be completed in approximately one year.

The moderator for the consultation joined the working group in June – two months before the consultation began (CIDA staff 3 interview). During that time, among other things, she had to secure the guest panelists, work with Bellanet to ensure that the list serve and website were operating appropriately and gain an understanding of CIDA’s draft policy. Bellanet staff explained how difficult it was to meet this short timeline while working within the confines of a bureaucracy.

The bureaucracy was extremely frustrating. We had instructions on how to sign on, etc. and then it would go through translation and all the way to the Minister for his signature and then it would come back and a slash would be going the wrong way or something and we couldn’t simply change it and have it be done, it had to go back through the whole chain of command. (Bellanet staff interview)

member did so (CIDA staff 2 interview).
More preparation time was needed to deal with these complexities. One CIDA staff member likened the process to a business-marketing plan.

[I]t’s all nice to work on the concept [the draft policy], but please don’t forget you’ve got a container to deal with. You might be working for Campbell’s and marketing chicken soup but you have to think about the way marketing is going to be and how you’re going to do it and we were kind of caught off guard on that, but hey, this is a learning process.

(CIDA staff 2 interview)

The timeline also meant that people who may have wanted to participate were unable to do so. “[B]y the time the conversation got going or they got interested in posting it was almost over” (CIDA staff 3 interview). Reading the consultation itself, it is apparent this is the case. “Thank you for your reminder yesterday of the impending deadline for response. It made me realise that I do not have time to read the previous discussion or even the draft for consultation that I found time to download” (Record of Consultation). Many interview subjects reiterated the fact that a lot of people looked at the website even if they didn’t participate in the consultation (CIDA staff 1, 2, 3 interviews, Bellanet staff interview).

If CIDA’s process lacked sufficient time, it also lacked adequate resources.

According to one staff person, CIDA spent “peanuts” on the consultation (CIDA staff 2 interview). The costs to CIDA included the amount paid to each of the six guest panelists and undisclosed amounts to the consultant who helped formulate the draft policy, the moderator and the translation costs (CIDA staff 1 interview, Guest panelist 2 interview). No resources were available to obtain feedback on the policy in the field. Face-to-face meetings were not feasible in any country, let alone the 110 countries where CIDA works, because there were no resources (CIDA staff 1 interview). There was one consultation in Asia

---

26 Interview subjects recollections of the amount paid to the guest panelists varied from $80.00US (Guest panelist 3 questionnaire, translated by Kika Konzen) to $250.00Cdn (CIDA staff 1 interview) to $500.00Cdn (Guest panelist 2 interview).
because the gender specialist’s trip to Asia happened to coincide with the consultation.

“There were no similar meetings happening in other regions. If there’d been a regional meeting we might have tapped into it, we didn’t have the resources to organise any regional meetings” (CIDA staff 1 interview, emphasis added). Furthermore, it would have been “really difficult to organise” similar meetings elsewhere (CIDA staff 1 interview) “You have to send money to an embassy and then an embassy has to pull people together and then you have to be able to travel” (CIDA staff 1 interview). Although gender experts within CIDA staff were asked to consult locally and circulate the packets to their constituencies, no one followed through to ensure that this occurred (“A Gender Equality Plan for the New Millenium [sic]: Notes for a Policy Revision Workplan”, CIDA staff 2 interview). When asked why, one CIDA staff member said:

They [the packets] were probably distributed. No follow-up was done on that. If I knew that hiding Karo milk in all those packages would have meant instant success for us, I would have done it. However, you know if there’s a CIDA package on gender consultation and it’s buried under 10 other packages that you have to deal with when the diplomatic pouch arrives, what are you going to do with it? You’re going to sort out your priorities and then try to deal with it in a certain timeline. So informal contacts are also very important. (CIDA staff 2 interview)

The shortcomings of the process were exacerbated by the limitations of the consultation means chosen (i.e., the Internet). Because outreach was largely conducted via the Internet, the ability to reach those without Internet access was significantly hampered. While comments could be sent to CIDA, accessing the consultation document required Internet capabilities (CIDA staff 2 interview). One of the guest panelists raised these concerns during the consultation. Highlighting the limitations of virtual consultations, he said:

I believe that we should keep in mind and admit that, though this is a very much participatory, open and transparent process, the presence of the voices from the grassroots level are lacking. The problems for the participation from the grassroots
level, that I anticipate are: language barriers (even a trilingual consultation like this is not adequate to cover the globe); no access to computer; no access to tools for information technology; even some of the participants here have only e-mail access not web access. Therefore, the voices of women (and men) for whose benefit (apparently) we are trying to design this policy are missing.

(Record of Consultation)

When interviewed, this same panelist raised these concerns again. "We feel very comfortable that we are communicating with ourselves online and that we are reaching everyone. I don’t think we are doing that in Canada either" (Guest panelist 1 interview). Another guest panelist echoed this view. “The professional views can be found in many different places, but that other perspective is often missing” (Guest panelist 2 interview). A third guest panelist pointed out that while the Internet was useful, “it was not enough. For example, it is possible that for Central America, CIDA considered internal opinions and reports of its programmes, projects and consultants in the area. As we know, the views of these people don’t always reflect a complete vision of the sub-region” (Guest panelist 3 questionnaire). Highlighting this concern, an interview participant said,

[i]f they [CIDA] were only relying on the list serve then it would be from an elite viewpoint that they would have their analysis, some academics, some people who managed to indeed take the time to insert their letters, very few activists in my view were involved in this process, very few women from the developing world.

( Participant 3 interview)

Yet, one staff person believed that Southern women had better access to the Internet than Canadian women’s groups “because we’ve got cheap and reasonably reliable mail and we’ve got cheap telephone service whereas women in the South, the email was probably as reliable, if not more reliable than any other means of communication” (CIDA staff 1 interview). However, one of the guest panelists, who works directly with grassroots organisations in the Third World felt quite differently. “I also would like to express that this

27 Translated from Spanish by Kika Konzen.
so-called digital divide is very strong in the South and in Canada. People who are on-line are not the struggling people; they’re not the grassroots people” (Guest panelist 1 interview). This is so because the vast majority of grassroots people do not have access to phone service. In Bangladesh, for example, in 2000 (two years after the consultation), five people per one thousand people had fixed phone lines or mobile telephones. The numbers are slightly higher in Sri Lanka: sixty-three people per one thousand. In Sub-Saharan Africa, out of twenty-seven selected countries where the World Bank provides statistics, in fifteen of them, fewer than ten people per one thousand have fixed phone lines or mobile telephones. In Chad, only one person per every thousand people has a phone line and in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, less than one person (exactly 0.6) per one thousand has a phone line. South Africa and Botswana have the highest number of fixed phone lines and mobile telephones in Sub-Saharan Africa, with 304 and 216 per 1,000, respectively. The remaining ten countries listed range from ten people to forty-eight per one thousand with phone access.

CIDA staff admit that participation by local women, whether in Canada or in the Third World, is also difficult to obtain because “women are very busy. It is hard to get them to participate in these kinds of things” (CIDA staff 1 interview). Although she felt if held now the consultation would attract more participants, one staff member acknowledges that Internet consultations have their limitations. The “Status of Women held an email

---


29 Ibid.
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consultation last year and only 11 people participated inside Canada and they wrote letters to 800 people and organisations” (CIDA staff 1 interview).

The limitations of the Internet may have been what led two guest panelists to believe that the consultation was not open to the public. One explained his understanding of the nature of the consultation in the following way: “Well, was this really a public consultation? My sense of it was, [that] it was a few people who were being asked by CIDA to participate rather than a public consultation” (Guest panelist 2 interview). Another said, “I don’t believe there was enough public participation. [CIDA] chose and invited those ones [the people] it considered should participate. To make my point, I believe this consultation was not open to the public” (Guest panelist 3 interview).\textsuperscript{33}

Ultimately, the thousands of email addresses to which Bellanet sent notice of the consultation, the packets sent to Canadian organisations, embassies and partners, the outreach to United Nations organisations, the postings to list serves, the notice on CIDA’s website and publication by ‘word of mouth’ resulted in nineteen people participating in the consultations. This number includes four of the six guest panelists.\textsuperscript{34} Of these, nine appear to be aligned with NGOs, and three with Universities; five are from the South.\textsuperscript{35} Out of the fifty packets sent to Canadian organisations asking for input, CIDA received one or two responses (CIDA staff 1 interview). By far, the most comprehensive feedback CIDA received was the seventeen-page fax sent from the local meeting held in Asia (CIDA staff 1 interview). When asked how CIDA could have gained wider participation from Third World women, one staff

\textsuperscript{33} Translation by Kika Konzen.

\textsuperscript{34} Two of the six guest panelists, one from the North and one from the South did not provide comments during the public consultation.

\textsuperscript{35} 12 people, including 3 of the guest panelists, are from the North. I cannot decipher where the other two participants are located.
member acknowledged, “we might have to organise more meetings in the field” (CIDA staff 1 interview). Participation on Entre Nous was even lower than that on the public consultation (Bellanet staff interview). Nonetheless, CIDA did receive minimal comments verbally and in writing from some CIDA staff (CIDA staff 1 interview). Even though only a small number of people participated, there was a feeling amongst CIDA staff that the process was open and transparent. Unlike other policies, that are “written by a bunch of people who go off in a little room, . . .” this process “was really broadly based” (CIDA staff 1 interview).

CIDA attempted to create a process that was open, transparent and broadly based. This chapter identified some of the challenges CIDA faced in this regard. In the following chapter, I discuss how CIDA’s need to be efficient and effective impedes its ability to encompass feminist ideologies and concerns even while those concerns are being moulded to fit CIDA’s goals, culture and procedures. I further show how through this process, CIDA pulls more and more relations into bureaucratic structures thereby tightening its hold on power, and how, as a result, those aspects of the feminist agenda that are integrated into CIDA work to solidify the very bureaucracy feminists are attempting to transform.

Specifically, I look at the challenges CIDA faced in its policymaking process and how the process impacted the final policy. I look at how feminist strategic goals are transformed within CIDA to meet its bureaucratic needs, thereby sustaining its power. I also discuss how feminists working within CIDA participate in the practices of institutions of ruling to sustain their power.
CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION: BUREAUCRACIES AND FEMINISTS MAKE STRANGE
BEDFELLOWS

The fact that women are now included in development practices and policies is seen
as an advancement for women and a remarkable improvement from the past. Feminists from
across the globe fought hard to guarantee women’s inclusion in development processes, and
they should be applauded for their efforts and success. However, while integration is a step in
the right direction, numerous theorists and practitioners have shown how development
policies and programmes still fail to address Third World women’s needs. This occurs in part
because international development bureaucracies function according to gendered, classed and
racialized norms, and operate to ensure their status quo and longevity.

Feminists working within these institutions face significant challenges in their efforts
to modify institutions to meet their strategic goals. When transformed within bureaucratic
structures to meet institutional needs, feminist goals get watered down and often lost in the
process. Confined as she is by the constraints imposed by the institution, the role of the
internal gender advocate is often very conservative, limited to ensuring the least-worst
scenarios (Razavi 1998). Oseen (1999) warns feminists working within development
agencies to be careful so as to avoid becoming part of the bureaucratic machinery,
strengthening its hold on power.
In this chapter, I look at how CIDA, an institution of ruling, co-opts the feminist agenda to perpetuate its status quo as well as how gender advocates within CIDA get caught in that process. From there, I expose how internal gender advocates are not simply co-opted by CIDA, but also utilise the practices of institutions of ruling to perpetuate their own status. They do this, whether intentionally or unintentionally, by drawing on a racialized development discourse, creating cursory participatory practices and sustaining global power imbalances. This analysis is undertaken from the perspective of Third World, anti-racist feminists. By listening to Third World women’s voices as articulated in Third World, anti-racist feminist writings, and placing their realities within intranational and international systems of power, I attempt to understand Third World women’s concerns. However, instead of focusing on Third World women and our need to ‘help’ them, I shift my gaze to the ruling apparatus, in this case, CIDA, and see how it exercises its power to manage and control Third World women.

The Management and Control of Third World Women: Usurping Their Agenda

[Development policies and projects] have mainly served to institute sophisticated mechanisms to manage women. These mechanisms inscribe women in economic, social and political structures which are beyond their control, and which, via the development industry, manage their fertility, sexuality and productivity.” (St.-Hilaire 1993, 57)

Two processes work in concert to sustain institutions of ruling. In one process, feminists shape their ideals to fit bureaucratic goals, culture, and procedures. This occurred when liberal feminists constructed gender equality in ways that would allow it to be incorporated into bureaucracies. In the second phase, bureaucracies transform those ideals even further to support their bureaucratic needs. This results in the superficial adoption of feminist principles without any substance or resources with which to institutionalise them.
Through this process, bureaucracies present a façade that they are open, inclusive and even transformatory, when in fact they are co-opting feminist principles to serve their own interest, namely maintaining their status, and (in the case of international development agencies) managing Third World women. By co-opting feminist ideals and transforming them into policies and projects that meet bureaucratic needs, the more radical elements of the feminist movement are strategically overlooked. Internal gender advocates become pawns in this process, thereby solidifying the institution itself. In this section, I discuss how these processes work in concert to solidify and sustain CIDA’s status as an institution of ruling and its reputation as a leader and innovator in gender equality policies and policymaking processes.

Feminist Ideals Undergo a Transformation

**Equity versus Equality**

CIDA’s decision to change its policy focus from gender equity to gender equality illustrates how feminist ideals are reformulated to meet bureaucratic demands. As the discussion in the previous chapter demonstrates, the push to change CIDA’s policy originated within CIDA itself, and the driving force behind that decision was the desire to change CIDA’s policy from one that discussed gender equity to one that emphasized gender equality. When the Policy Branch learned that CIDA’s policy used the term ‘equity’ while the OECD and the Beijing Platform for Action used the term ‘equality’, the mandate to update the policy was handed down. CIDA structured its entire consultation around this change in terminology. As one staff member made clear, there were certain things that she felt strongly about and a change in terminology to gender equality from gender equity was one of them (CIDA staff 1 interview). The new policy also had to allow for means of
demonstrating “clear and sustainable results . . . in line with CIDA’s policy on results-based management” (CIDA 1999, 1-2). These issues were non-negotiable. In this way, the symbols and concepts of the policy were articulated and determined by CIDA even prior to the consultation.

CIDA’s reformulation of its policy from ‘gender equity’ to ‘gender equality’ is one example of Dorothy Smith’s premise that institutions formulate issues because they are administratively relevant rather than significant in the lives of those who experience them (1990b, 15). By changing its policy from gender equity to gender equality, CIDA accomplished two bureaucratic needs at one time. First, CIDA was able to bring its policy in line with international protocols, thereby sustaining its reputation as a leader in the field. Second, CIDA was able to institute a mechanism that more easily provides a means of demonstrating clear and sustainable results in line with CIDA’s policy on results-based management.

Gender equality, unlike gender equity, allows for tangible measurement tools. When assessing the success or failure of a project, staff can utilise quantitative measurements, such as gender-disaggregated data that can quantify whether women’s employment and educational opportunities have increased and whether women have more equal access to development resources. Gender equity, however, is significantly harder to measure. This is so because as CIDA’s policy explains

Gender equity is the process of being fair to women and men. To ensure fairness, measures must often be available to compensate for historical and social disadvantages that prevent women and men from otherwise operating on a level playing field. Equity leads to equality. (CIDA 1999, 7)
The 1995 policy states that gender equity "calls for the differential treatment of groups in order to end inequality and foster autonomy. Thus, special measures for women (e.g. women-specific projects) are often required" (CIDA 1995, 2). Gender equality, on the other hand, means that women and men enjoy the same status. Gender equality means that women and men have equal conditions for realizing their full human rights and potential to contribute to national, political, economic, social and cultural development, and to benefit from the results.

Gender equality is therefore the equal valuing by society of both the similarities and differences between women and men, and the varying roles that they play. (CIDA 1999, 7)

Gender equality meets CIDA's bureaucratic needs to report quantifiable changes in women’s lives and sustains CIDA’s reputation as a leader in the field. However, it fails to address historical discriminatory practices, to examine and recognize power imbalances, and to establish any means for addressing these. Gender equality requires no transformation of societal structures or the status quo. In this way, it entrenches these historical discriminatory practices and power imbalances.

Many Third World and anti-racist feminists echo this theme (Antrobus 1995, Barriteau 1995, Nnaemeka 2001, Razack 1999). Had CIDA chosen to engage in action-oriented research such as that recommended in the 1998 review, perhaps then staff would have learned that while gender equality is important and is "a major goal on which all feminists can agree, gender discrimination is neither the sole nor perhaps the primary locus of the oppression of Third World women" (Johnson-Odim 1999, 315 emphasis added). CIDA’s policy, however, is “Canada’s tool for its development co-operation program” (CIDA staff 1 interview). It is constructed for CIDA, rather than for Third World women; and thus is not derived from Third World women’s self-identified needs. In fact, CIDA staff acknowledge that women in the Third World will only find some aspects of the policy useful, while others they will dismiss as being “too Canadian” (CIDA staff 1 interview).
By changing its policy, CIDA met both of its institutional needs: namely, to provide a quantifiable way of measuring the success of its policy, and to remain a leader in the field. In doing so, it simultaneously addressed liberal feminists’ strategic goal that had been elusive for years – working to attain gender equality. However, the incorporation of gender equality results in projects and policies that mainly serve to create mechanisms by which to manage Third World women (St-Hilaire 1993, 57). Efforts to measure equality using quantitative means cuts women off from their history, erases their experiences and reorganizes them “according to categories and relations over which they have no control” (St-Hilaire 1993, 57). The incorporation of liberal feminist goals into the bureaucracy strengthens it, allowing for the dismissal of more radical elements (i.e., Third World, anti-racist feminists) of the feminist movement.

**Results-Based Management**

Looking at how gender equality is to be implemented and measured provides further insight into how CIDA converts feminist principles to meet bureaucratic needs. As discussed above, CIDA staff wanted to ensure that the policy contain objectives that could be reformulated as results-statements (CIDA staff 1 interview). The policy lists three objectives that focus on gaining equality between women and men. These include equal participation in decision-making, supporting women and girls in realising their human rights, and reducing gender inequalities in access to and control over the resources and benefits of development (CIDA 1999, 7). The policy then lists various results, which if realised, will contribute to the achievement of gender equality. For example, in the area of poverty reduction, one result CIDA highlights is increased access to and control over reproductive health (CIDA 1999, 11). Under basic human needs, the policy purports that increasing girls’ access to education will contribute to the achievement of gender equality (CIDA 1999, 11). An increase in the
number of women employed in non-traditional jobs will similarly lead to gender equality in the field of infrastructure services (CIDA 1999, 12). National policies on gender equality will improve the likelihood of gender equality in the policy and programming priority of human rights, democratisation and good governance (CIDA 1999, 12). The policy also articulates the ways in which CIDA will help empower Third World women by supporting processes that “increase women’s self-confidence, develop their self-reliance, and help them set their own agendas” (CIDA 1999, 8).

Certainly improvements of this sort are welcome. Efforts to improve women and girls’ educational levels are to be encouraged and applauded when successful. Women also benefit when they gain control over their reproductive health. However, as Third World, anti-racist theorists point out these material gains still fail to address the more complicated issue that Third World women and men face, specifically, global inequality. When CIDA chooses to focus on certain narrow aspects of women’s oppression (that of gender equality in all its manifestations), CIDA categorises women in the third world as a homogenous group (i.e., oppressed victims of a patriarchal society). This simplifies their lives and the solutions needed to address their needs. As Mohanty explains, when women are constituted as a coherent group, that group exists prior to and outside of the particular analysis in question (Mohanty 1991, 59). Policies can then be constructed to address that one simplistic problem. The defined problem can then simply be moved, like a chess piece, from one square to another, with each square representing a policy and programming priority. Looking at the examples above, we can see that women’s inequality is moved between and amongst the programming priorities. In each priority, the goals are essentially identical: to increase women’s participation in, access to or control over whatever the particular priority is (e.g., education, job training). Measuring whether women have gained equality in the areas of
basic human needs, infrastructure creation, poverty reduction, or human rights is now possible. CIDA projects will work to achieve these goals, and reports will quantify the success or failure of these goals.

Women will then be integrated into mainstream institutions through equality reforms. These efforts, while well intended, too often result in projects that manage and regulate women's lives (St-Hilaire 1993). In this way, CIDA co-opts the language of feminism and transforms it into mechanisms that can be used to manage Third World women, thereby furthering CIDA's bureaucratic needs. At the same time, the projects neglect to address global issues of concern to the women. Thus, issues such as the inequities of structural adjustment programmes and the impact that the spread of multinational corporations has on Third World women are disregarded.

**Change in Policy Language**

Another example of how CIDA co-opted feminist ideals to sustain its status and how feminists participated in this process is by comparing some of the language contained in the consultation draft policy and the final policy. Principle c) of the consultation document (i.e., the draft policy) states that “achieving gender equality will require specific measures designed to address systemic discrimination” (CIDA 1998a, 3). Elaborating on this point, the draft policy explains that because women have been discriminated against, they do not operate on a level playing field with men, thereby acknowledging the historical discrimination women have experienced. The final policy, on the other hand, states that “achieving gender equality will require specific measures designed to eliminate gender inequalities” (CIDA 1999, 9). In addition to being somewhat circular and void of meaning (i.e., achieve gender equality by eliminating gender inequality), the explanation fails to articulate an understanding of the historical patterns of discrimination women have faced.
While it mentions ingrained disparities between women and men and how equal treatment is insufficient to achieve gender equality, it neglects to expose or problematise how these inequalities reflect gendered power imbalances. There is no language that discusses how women are disadvantaged vis-à-vis men. Rather the language is much more neutral and disguises where those inequalities lie and who suffers from them. There is a huge difference between addressing systemic discrimination and eliminating gender inequalities. The former recognizes the historic nature of the problem and provides means to support affirmative action policies that address and correct these historical patterns. The latter does not do either; it only supports projects that provide equal opportunities. Providing equal opportunities when there is systemic inequities does not result in equal outcomes.

In the consultation draft, gender equality is articulated in the following way.

Attaining gender equality demands a recognition that current social, economic, cultural and political systems are gendered; that women’s unequal status is systemic; that this pattern is further affected by race, ethnicity and disability; and that it is necessary to incorporate women’s specificity, priorities and values into all major social institutions. (CIDA 1998a, 2)

The explanation of gender equality contained in the final policy, however, does not include any discussion of how systems and institutions are gendered, how women’s unequal status is systemic, or that race, ethnicity and disability affect women’s status as well.36 In fact, it involves a more benign look at how both women and men are affected by discriminatory practices. While attention to how these practices affect women and men addresses GAD theorists concerns regarding men and masculinities,37 as feminist critiques of this ideal point out, ignoring systemic discrimination and inequities women have faced sustains power imbalances.

36 See page 90 for a recitation of CIDA’s description of gender equality in its final policy.

37 See pages 30-1 in chapter 2 for further elaboration on this concept.
The goal statements differ between the two policies as well. In the draft policy, the goal is “to achieve gender equality whereby women and men are able to realize their full human rights, participate as decision-makers in shaping the sustainable development of their societies and benefit equally from the results” (CIDA 1998a, 2). The goal, in the final policy reads as follows: “to support the achievement of equality between women and men to ensure sustainable development” (CIDA 1999, 7). What is interesting about these two goal statements, is that in the first, the goal is to achieve gender equality so that women (and men) realize their human rights, participate in shaping their societies and benefiting from the results of that. In the final policy, the goal of equality is to ensure sustainable development. It is not tied directly to the needs of Third World women. It has nothing to do with either women’s practical or strategic gender needs. Instead it focuses on sustaining development. The final policy does contain three objectives that address this concern. These include advancing women’s participation in shaping their society, supporting women in the realization of their human rights, and reducing inequalities so women gain access to and control of the resources and benefits of development (CIDA 1999, 7). As a bureaucracy, CIDA’s policies, projects and programmes must function efficiently and effectively. Thus it is imperative that gender equality be shown to advance CIDA’s ultimate goal (i.e., sustainable development). Therefore, it is not surprising that the goal of the final policy is to promote equality to ensure sustainable development. Articulated in this way, the goal meets CIDA’s bureaucratic need to be able to demonstrate that equality fosters development.

The changes I have identified demonstrate that the draft policy is a more progressive transformatory policy than the final. It acknowledges past discrimination and recognizes that steps must be taken to address these systemic patterns, including “changes in institutional
practices and social relation through which disparities are reinforced and sustained” (CIDA 1998, 2). The final policy dismisses these factors and simply articulates a more benign vision of gender equality in which both women and men experience disparities, without recognition of who benefits from those inequities.

It is interesting to note that the final policy went through months of fine-tuning and redrafting (CIDA staff 1 interview), working its way through bureaucratic channels before it was finally adopted. It had to first be accepted by the different branches (geographic branches, partnership branch, etc.) within CIDA and then by the Vice Presidents for their approval (each branch has its own Vice President). Once approved at that level, it went to the President of CIDA and then to the Minister for International Cooperation (CIDA staff 2 interview). One can imagine that as the policy worked its way up through these bureaucratic channels, the more progressive elements of the policy were diffused to meet bureaucratic needs.

Commitments Only Run Skin Deep: CIDA Gets a Facelift

CIDA’s bureaucratic need (to remain a leader in the field and to have its policy comport with international protocols) and feminist strategic goals (to advance gender equality policies within international development agencies) fit comfortably together, like a parent holding a child’s hand. Because CIDA needed to incorporate the feminist goal to ensure its reputation, the bureaucracy worked to guarantee its inclusion in the bureaucratic structures. Incorporating these feminist ideals allows CIDA to bring more and more relations into its institutional structures, including those that previously resisted and challenged the authority and operating procedures of CIDA. Once these dissenting voices are engulfed in the draft policy.
within CIDA’s bureaucratic structures, CIDA’s hold on power and its position as leader in the field is strengthened. This seemingly seamless mesh of these two different ideals works to benefit both the bureaucracy and feminists working within the bureaucracy. CIDA retains its status as a leader in the field and internal gender advocates gain a reputation as innovators who can push their agency to new limits. However, when we look beneath the surface and explore with a fine-tooth comb how the policymaking process really worked and the consequences of that process, a very different reality is exposed.

What we see is that while gender equality is incorporated into the bureaucracy, it is still only paid lip service. The resources committed to gender equality both for the policymaking process itself as well as for policy implementation are wholly inadequate. The amount spent on the consultation was “peanuts” and the commitment by managers at CIDA only superficial. The policymakers at CIDA wanted the policy to meet their own need – to bring the policy in line with international protocols so CIDA would retain its reputation as a leader in the field. Any creative and innovative means, such as Internet consultation, to do so was simply window dressing. Those at CIDA who wanted the policy changed were not committed to how that process occurred, their only concern was that the policy be updated. By engaging in a process that appeared participatory and inclusive but in reality was not, CIDA staff solidified the reputation and strength of CIDA as an institution of ruling. In doing so, it assisted in the dismissal of the more radical elements of the feminist movement, thereby silencing the voices of Third World, anti-racist feminists.

While the 1998 policy review indicated that further engagement with the policy, exploration of how the policy works in the field, and research to find answers or alternatives to the problem of defining and measuring WID&GE results were what was needed, CIDA chose to revamp the policy instead. Additional funding to gender equality and greater
institutional commitment to gender issues were not forthcoming. Instead, the agency committed itself to changing its policy on paper; the changes were only on the surface. The blood, veins and organs of the bureaucracy functioned in the same gendered, classed and racialized ways. While the review indicated that the internal workings of CIDA needed to be ironed out and remoulded to address the failings of CIDA to institutionalize WID&GE, CIDA got a facelift instead. The wrinkles, however, do not only run skin deep.

For example, while there is a new gender equality policy, CIDA now has a number of policy initiatives in addition to gender equality; these include child protection, HIV/AIDS, environment, and human rights. CIDA has a “very crowded policy environment” such that it’s “difficult to see where gender equality is from the outside” (CIDA staff 1 interview). When I asked this same staff person for the funding breakdown for CIDA’s six programming priorities she indicated that there was no way to calculate the expenditure of resources on gender equality initiatives. This is so, she explained, because gender is a cross-cutting theme and should be taken into consideration in all project design, planning and implementation. However, a review of CIDA’s Report to the Parliament for the period ending March 31, 2000 calculates this very funding breakdown. Of the six programming priorities, gender equality received the lowest funding at 5.5 percent of Canada’s Official Development Assistance (ODA). The environment, another cross-cutting theme, received ten percent. Basic human needs received 36.9 percent, private-sector development received 13.3 percent, infrastructure services received 12.5 percent, and human rights, democracy, good governance received 16.6 percent.

---

39 CIDA is not alone in its devaluation of gender issues. The fact that women’s organisations in Canada lacked sufficient resources to be online in 1998 reflects the general apathy towards gender issues throughout Canada. In fact, current government cuts to women’s programmes and services in British Columbia illustrate the continued disregard for women’s issues.

40 The six priorities are basic human needs, infrastructure services, private-sector development, gender equality, environment and human rights, democracy, good governance.
percent.\textsuperscript{41} This information demonstrates that while gender equality was incorporated into CIDA on a policy level, this commitment was only skin-deep. It does not appear from these numbers that the adoption of the gender equality policy resulted in a simultaneous increase in resources to gender equality. In fact, the 1998 review stated that insufficient funding for WID&GE demonstrated that “the policy is a low priority for the Agency” (CIDA 1998b, C5). Interestingly, funding for women’s issues at that time (from 1989/90 to 1994/95) was within the ten to fifteen percent range of overall funding (CIDA 1998b, B9). The report explained that a more serious investment of resources in WID&GE was needed. The lack of institutional resources and support impede the ability of gender advocates within CIDA to do their job.

The incorporation of liberal feminist ideals into CIDA’s bureaucratic structures by no means guarantees that the commitment to gender issues runs deep. What it does ensure, however, is that more and more relations are brought into bureaucratic channels. This strengthens the bureaucracy and tightens its control over dissenting voices. As liberal feminist goals gain credibility within the bureaucracy, it provides space for the dismissal of the more radical elements of the feminist movement. This dismissal of Third World feminists’ concerns perpetuates First World domination. Despite the progressive rhetoric in CIDA’s gender equality policy, “the compatibility of the policy with capitalist [and globalist] goals is reconfirmed” (Das Gupta 1999, 201). CIDA’s policymaking process and policy accomplish CIDA’s goals. However, the needs of Third World women remain unmet.

Third World anti-racist feminists argue that internal gender advocates are not simply passive participants in this process, but rather partake in the practices of institutions of ruling

to strengthen and sustain their own power. In the following section I explore how feminist
development practitioners, particularly those working at CIDA, draw on racialized
constructions of Third World women and men that were instituted during colonial times and
that continue to be perpetuated in the development discourse today.

An Encounter between the White First World
and the Racialized Third World

This power of the development apparatus to name women in ways that lead us to take
for granted certain descriptions and solutions has to be made visible, for in the very
process of naming . . . habitates the possibility of a colonialist effect.
(Escobar 1995, 179)

Responses by CIDA staff to interview questions are laden with racialized constructions
of Third World women and men. These racialized stereotypes shape staff's vision of Third
World women's problems and the solutions needed to solve them. The power of the
development apparatus to define the 'other' has to be exposed so we can understand and
begin to dismantle the colonialist effect. Until that occurs, however, development processes
and practices will remain steeped in and perpetuate racialized constructs of Third World
women and men.

CIDA staff portray Third World women as uneducated, unliberated women who need
the help of their educated and liberated First world 'sisters'.

I think that both men and women in developing countries in rural areas who are not
very well educated have very little understanding of their own sexuality and their own
bodies. We know that women are afraid of getting IUDs because they think it will
migrate through their bodies and come out through their nose, you know. We know
that in South Africa men are gang raping three-month-old babies because they think if
they sleep with a virgin they'll be cured of HIV.
(CIDA staff 1 interview)

She continues in the same vein when discussing how 'bad' other countries are compared to
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42 I am referring here to Razack's (1999, 89) description of refugee hearings in Canada.
Canada on gender relations. To prove her point, she relied on television commercials. “When I go to other countries and look at their television and the sexualization and objectification of women, I think, you know, that wouldn’t go on in Canada because people would say, oh forget it, men and women [would say this]” (CIDA staff 1 interview). Another staff member views Third World men as unhelpful members of their families. She explains that if a man grows vegetables and sells them at the market, “most of the money’s going to go to his own needs, rather than to his family’s needs. We’re not talking about your family or my family, where it happens differently” (CIDA staff 2 interview).

These excerpts demonstrate with uncomfortable clarity the racialized constructions of Third World women that Mohanty, Chowdhry and others deplore. Staff racialize and depict Third World women and men as the primitive and backward ‘other’, particularly when compared to ‘our’ enlightened and liberated selves. They focus on what they perceive as ‘cultural differences’ while ignoring the history and current realities of First World/Third World relations. Issues of social and economic injustice are translated into issues of culture (Bannerji 2000). Once the problem is defined as ‘culture’, development experts can then examine and study who these Third World ‘others’ are, define their problems, and devise policies and projects to solve them. There is then no need to explore how First World policies influence Third World women’s lives, limiting their options and constricting their decisions.

Rather than understanding how Third World women’s histories of exploitation and oppression by the First World, particularly in terms of fertility control mechanisms, may influence Third World women’s lives and decisions regarding birth control, the staff person racializes Third World women as ‘uneducated’ and ‘ignorant’. If she had knowledge of this history, perhaps she would have a greater understanding of Third World women’s opposition to the use of IUDs. This history would teach her that new fertility methods are often tested on
Third World women before they are allowed to pass stringent laws for use in North America. For example, Health Canada has rejected the injectable Depo Provera for contraceptive use in Canada based on health safety issues three times. Nonetheless, Depo Provera has been used on women in the Third World for 25 years (Inter Pares 1995, 24). Would this staff person have similarly mocked a Canadian woman’s choice to not use an IUD because she was concerned about its health risks? Mohanty explains that when Third World women are constructed as a coherent group, they are seen as having “‘needs’ and ‘problems,’ but few, if any have ‘choices’ or the freedom to act” (Mohanty 1991, 64).

Likewise, staff’s depiction of Third World men as lazy and uncaring in contrast to ‘our’ men draws on colonial racialized stereotypes. The contrasts drawn between Third World women and men, read: ‘backward’, and First World women and men, read: ‘modern’, is grounded in a long and sordid history of colonisation and racialization, and “habitats the possibility of a colonialist effect” (Escobar 1995, 179).

Racist Policies Disguised as Helpful Gestures

These racialized understandings and views of Third World women impacted the consultation draft and final policy, finding a home there as well. According to the consultation document, “women’s empowerment is central to achieving gender equality. Through empowerment, women gain control over their lives and a greater voice to challenge inequality in their home, workplace and community” (CIDA 1998a, 3). The final policy states that empowerment gives women the clarity to “become aware of unequal power relations” (CIDA 1999, 8). Continuing in the same vein, the policy explains how CIDA will help Third World women increase their self-confidence, develop their self-reliance and set their own agenda (CIDA 1999, 8).
By constituting women as a coherent group that places their gender above all else, CIDA can then define the problem and its solution narrowly. In this policy, the identified problem is gender inequality. Western norms of equality are the standard by which Third World structures are judged. Through this ethnocentric construction, the Canadian development expert is born. This Canadian expert possesses the knowledge and skills to help ‘educate’, ‘liberate’ and ‘save’ Third World women. Only through this process will Third World women become aware of their unequal status vis-à-vis Third World men.

As Dorothy Smith explains, institutions of ruling create and use concepts and symbols to “transpos[e] the actualities of people’s lives and experience into the conceptual currency with which they can be governed” (1990, 14). The transposition of the multifaceted issues Third World women face into concepts and symbols (i.e., self-reliance, self-confidence, etc.) simplifies the task of institutions. CIDA does not have to deal with global injustice and inequality (and in fact its policy does not). It can continue to gaze at Third World women, instead of turning its stare inward. It is then their lack of self-confidence, their lack of self-reliance, and their lack of knowledge that are the defined problems that need addressing, not our racism, sexism or eurocentrism (Razack 1999, 10). As Razack argues, this “approach reinforces an important epistemological cornerstone of imperialism: the colonized possess a series of knowable characteristics and can be studied, known, and managed accordingly by the colonizers whose own complicity remains masked” (1999, 10).

Failing to acknowledge the complexity and diversity of Third World women’s lives, their engagement with feminist and nationalist struggles, and their histories of genocide and exploitation, beginning with colonialism and continuing to the present with development, globalisation and imperialism, CIDA’s policy perpetuates the racialization of Third World women and men. Mohanty argues that eurocentric assumptions that define women in a
particular way (e.g., uneducated, oppressed, unequal, lacking self-reliance, etc.) prior to their
entry into social relations reinforce the notion that the Third World has not evolved to the
same extent as the First World. This racialized construction of the Third World is
exacerbated when “there is no connection drawn between first world and third world power
shifts” (Mohanty 1991, 72).

The terminology contained within the policy demonstrates how CIDA does not frame
the problem in terms of North/South power imbalances. CIDA portrays itself as an
international “co-operation” agency: a neutral and helpful friend. This portrayal disguises
power imbalances between CIDA, an agent of the Canadian government, and Third World
women, the recipients of CIDA’s policies. CIDA is constructed as an agency whose purpose
is to ‘help’ the Third World modernise. It will “co-operate” with Third World countries to do
so. In reality, however, CIDA’s projects are only ‘co-operative’ if the agencies, government
entities and organisations that CIDA contracts with agree to abide by the various conditions
that CIDA sets. Third World women must jump through various hoops to participate in
CIDA-funded programming. As is common in most contract negotiations, the power between
the party with the goods (i.e., the First World) and the party who wants or needs the goods
(i.e., the Third World) is inherently unequal. “Contract always generates political right in the
form of relations of domination and subordination” (Pateman 1988, 8). This point is key.
CIDA, just like men, hold the power. As one consultation participant noted: “I think we have
to be very clear that CIDA itself is heavily invested in not threatening the status quo at the
very least” (Record of Consultation, emphasis added). CIDA’s policymaking process
established the principles and guidelines to which recipients must adhere to obtain CIDA
funding. This process was flawed because it failed to provide a meaningful way to ensure the
inclusion of the voices of Third World women. In doing so, CIDA silenced them. Thus,
CIDA's policymaking process involved an interaction between those with power, who were largely white and from the First World, and those without power, who were largely racialized and from the Third World (Razack 1999, 88). It thereby perpetuated the exercise of racialized power. CIDA's perspective on governing is embedded in how CIDA defines the problem. By constructing the problem in terms of gender equality on a local level, global issues remain unexamined and North/South power imbalances intact.

**Policymaking Process: CIDA Talks to Itself**

Until the lion has a voice, the tales of the hunt will be only those of the hunter. (Eritrean proverb, qtd. in Nnaemeka 2001, 177)

This one-sidedness, this tendency towards monologue rather than dialogue, is rooted in the unequal power relations that still characterize the social production of knowledge. (Tucker 1999, 10)

As discussed in chapter 2, Third World anti-racist feminists emphasize the importance of participatory processes. They maintain that for policies to address Third World women's needs, they must be created by listening to Third World women's voices through dialogue rather than monologue. Different strategies are recommended for doing so. Participatory action research and feminist action research are the most common. Third World, anti-racist feminists argue that these processes must not only examine who participates, who is excluded from participating and why, but must also explicitly address gender and other dimensions of social difference (Guijt and Shah 1998). However, successfully practising participatory development and creating opportunities for partnership and dialogue are extremely difficult, time consuming and challenging. It "takes time ... costs money ... [and] makes you move physically from your comfortable situation" (Guest

---

43 See pages 46-50.
panelist 1 interview). Nonetheless, Third World, anti-racist feminists insist it is imperative to listen to Third World women if policies and projects are to be relevant in the lives of the people for whom they are created (Barritteau 1995, Iddi 1999, Nnaemeka 2001, Razack 1999, Sen and Grown 1987).

The 1998 review reiterates this point. “The richness of responses from Southern women is a modest illustration that consultations with those affected by CIDA’s programming can be both interesting and useful” (CIDA 1998b, C22). The seventeen-page fax CIDA received from the consultation with stakeholders in Asia bolsters this observation. Not only are these consultations “interesting and useful,” they are imperative. Without this consultation, CIDA does nothing more than engage in dialogue with itself. Despite appearances otherwise, this is exactly what CIDA did.

The Exclusion of Third World Women’s Voices

Although CIDA’s policymaking process was intended to be broad-based and open, in fact it was moulded to meet CIDA’s bureaucratic needs. It was hierarchical and non-participatory. The international and national policies and protocols CIDA relied upon to justify its need for an updated gender equality policy were those written and developed by government entities; they were not written by, nor with input from the very women CIDA’s policy is intended to benefit. Rather, they were crafted by “mostly well-heeled, well-connected, educated and articulate women” (Porter 1999, 8). CIDA turned to these same women (and men) when updating its policy. Southern grassroots women’s voices were not actively sought at any stage of the process. Neither the policies, nor the interviews, nor the policy reviews indicate that Southern women contacted CIDA and expressed concern with
the old policy. Nor does it appear that Southern partners or beneficiaries openly resisted implementing CIDA’s old policy.

In fact, the update occurred only 3 years after a previous update and before there was adequate time to assess “the impact of CIDA’s WID&GE policy on women in developing countries” (CIDA 1998, A5). This exclusionary process supports Dorothy Smith’s premise that institutions of ruling formulate issues because they are “administratively relevant, not because they are significant first in the experience of those who live them” (Smith 1990b, 15). The ‘need’ for policy change was institutionally constructed to comport with conceptualizations of gender equality already put together in various capitals throughout the world (Escobar 1995). It was also constructed to sustain CIDA’s reputation. One Nepalese NGO organizer, who participated in the 1998 performance review, credits CIDA as being “one of the most progressive aid agencies in its attitude and gender perspective in WID&GE policy” (CIDA 1998b, 15). She believes that CIDA’s “strength lies in its prospects to influence UN agencies and national governments to undertake engendered development projects” (CIDA 1998b, 15). For CIDA to maintain this reputation and power, it needs to ensure that its policy is not “behind the times.”

CIDA’s decision to update its policy and the process used to do so were not informed by Third World women, and they were not given an opportunity to participate in a meaningful way. CIDA staff and a paid consultant were the only individuals involved in writing the draft policy for the consultation (CIDA staff 1 interview). The decision to conduct the consultation on the Internet was made by CIDA as well, without consultation with Southern partners (CIDA staff 2 interview). The minimal resources CIDA allocated to the consultation were spent on well-established and well-connected consultants who already have jobs, and on distributing the policy to its embassies, its Canadian partners, the
governing body of Canadian universities, Canadian businesses and other institutions of ruling. CIDA did not send the policy nor notice of the consultation to Southern partners, beneficiaries, non-governmental or grassroots organisations (CIDA staff 1 interview). No direct outreach to Southern women was conducted; no computer stations were established in community centres, halls or other local gathering places in communities throughout the Third World. There were no organised or planned meetings at the local level (CIDA staff 1 interview).

The data shows that CIDA’s outreach efforts resulted in a ridiculously small number of participants and responses. Internet consultations are not an adequate means of engaging participation. Even in 2001, when the Status of Women held an email consultation, “only eleven people participated inside Canada and they wrote letters to 800 people and organisations” (CIDA staff 1 interview). When CIDA was conducting outreach for the consultations, they learned that most Canadian women’s organisations were not online in 1998 (CIDA staff 1 interview). Nonetheless, CIDA decided the Internet would be a good medium to conduct its outreach and consultation. Staff indicated they believed that more Southern women were online than in the North because phone service and mail are neither as reliable or as inexpensive as in Canada (CIDA staff 1 interview). Had CIDA consulted with Third World women, or looked at the statistical data provided by organisations such as the World Bank, they would have learned otherwise. Of the 155,651,088 Internet users worldwide in 1998, 93.46 percent were either living in OECD countries or other high-income countries. In fact, Third World women were not online in 1998 exactly because they did not
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44 See page 84; only nineteen people participated, including the guest panelists.

have access to phone service. As discussed at length in chapter 3, in most Third World countries fewer than ten people per one thousand had access to phone service in 2000. These statistics contrast with the numbers of people with phone access in Canada and the United States. In 2000, 961 Canadians out of 1,000 had access to phone lines. In the United States, the numbers were even higher, 1,097 people out of 1,000 had access to phone lines in 2000. This might help explain why the majority of the participants in the consultation were from Canada and the United States.

In addition to phone service, those who participated also needed access to computers, knowledge of how to use them, and the ability to read, write and understand English, French or Spanish. The World Bank provides statistics for adult illiteracy rates by gender in numerous countries and by regions. According to the World Bank, the "[a]dult illiteracy rate is the percentage of people ages fifteen and above who cannot, with understanding, read and write a short, simple statement on their everyday life" (World Bank 2000). Based on this definition, the World Bank estimates that the female adult illiteracy rate in East Asia and Pacific in 1998 was 22 percent (World Bank 2000). In the Middle East, North Africa and Sub-Saharan Africa, the illiteracy rate was 49 percent, in South Asia, 59 percent (World Bank 2000). The numbers are significantly better in Europe and Central Asia, and in Latin America and the Caribbean, where the percentage of illiterate adult females was 5 percent and 13 percent, respectively (World Bank 2000). This data fails to make clear whether the
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46 See pages 83.
48 Ibid. This statistic indicates that there is more than one phone line available to every person in the United States.
illiteracy rate is determined by one's understanding of her first language or a second
language. One of CIDA's six social development priorities is basic education, including adult
literacy (CIDA, 2000\textsuperscript{51}). Nonetheless, CIDA staff created a consultation process that
required Third World participants to be literate in a language that more than likely was not
their first language.

Finally, Third World women need to have the time and the willingness to participate
in Internet consultations about a policy that admittedly reflects "Canadian values" (CIDA
staff 1 interview) and not the values of grassroots women themselves. Most importantly,
before any of this can happen, Southern women need to be told that a consultation process is
happening and that their input is sought. CIDA did not do this. Unlike the direct outreach to
Canadian partners, non-profits organisations, particularly women's groups, and Canadian
embassies, no letters, emails or packets were sent to Southern partners or women's groups
(CIDA staff 1 interview). CIDA staff neglected to take appropriate steps to ensure
participation from Third World women.

Perhaps the most striking example of CIDA's entrenchment in institutions of ruling
and its failure to truly engage in dialogue and partnership on equal footing is evidenced by
CIDA's decision to hold two separate consultations. Through consultation with CIDA staff,
the gender equality division learned that staff did not want to post their views publicly, and
were uncomfortable participating in the public consultations (CIDA staff 1, 2 interviews).
For those reasons, CIDA held a private internal consultation with CIDA staff. There is no
indication that Southern women were similarly consulted. Southern women, however, might
have even greater concerns than staff about publicly posting their opinions because the policy
was drafted by an agency from which they may well receive or seek funds (March 1999).

\textsuperscript{51} \url{http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/education-e.}
Once the consultation process was complete, CIDA missed yet another opportunity to include Southern women's voices. CIDA staff finalised the policy. The consultants, guest panelists and participants were not invited to participate (CIDA staff 1 interview). During this stage, the gender equality division determined that the policy inadequately dealt with poverty issues. To remedy this problem, the gender equality staff did not turn to the consultation participants, the guest panelists (a few of whom work specifically on poverty and development issues) nor, most importantly, the Third World women who live with poverty on a daily basis. Instead, they turned to CIDA's own poverty group, which is based in Ottawa (CIDA staff 1 interview).

CIDA's participatory process involved a rudimentary level of consultation between agency staff and Third World women. The timeline was incredibly short, the consultation was not inclusive and CIDA neglected to look at Third World women's culture, needs and priorities. However, even if the timeline had been longer, the process more inclusive, and Third World women's culture, needs and priorities understood, the policy would still have failed to tackle the complex issues Third World women face. This is so because the consultation was a smokescreen to mask CIDA's true agenda. It gave the appearance of being inclusive and broad-based, but the issues open for discussion were quite minimal. The substantive issues were decided well before the consultation even began by gender 'experts' at CIDA. These issues were not open for negotiation. CIDA had other priorities in mind – those of a bureaucratic nature.

The policymaking process needed to be finished in time for the Prime Minister's speech in New York ("A Gender Workplan for the New Millenium[sic]: Notes for a Policy Revision Workplan"). CIDA staff felt it imperative that the policy "talk about equality, not equity" (CIDA staff 1 interview). It also "had to express Canadian values" (CIDA staff 1
Third World women were not consulted to see whether they wanted the terminology changed from ‘equity’ to ‘equality’.

CIDA staff also wanted to show that the process influenced the final product. “I really want for people at the end of the consultation to look at the pre-draft and the post-draft and be able to see that there’s movement and that the discussion has influenced the final document” (CIDA staff 1 interview). To prove that CIDA attained this goal, this staff person pointed to the fact that they “changed the goals statement for goodness sakes” (CIDA staff 1 interview). She continued, “if you see the original draft we put up and then the final, I mean you can see that we made big changes. We really listened” (CIDA staff 1 interview). As articulated in the previous section, changes were made between the two policies. Unfortunately most of these changes resulted in the watering down of the draft policy to meet bureaucratic needs. In addition, as discussed below, changes suggested by participants were not incorporated.

CIDA used participation as a means of accomplishing its aims efficiently, effectively and cheaply, rather than giving power over to Third World women to determine, shape and manage their own development policies and projects. When those initiating participatory processes have ‘power over’ those participating, women’s worlds, needs, and contributions are obscured “making equitable participatory development an elusive goal” (Guijt and Shah 1998, 1).
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52 The ramifications of this change have been discussed at length already. See pages 88-91.

53 See pages 93-6.

54 See pages 121-24.
Gender Equality and Power Imbalances

It is difficult to separate the issues of race, class, gender, nationality and imperialism, and it is important to see the link between all forms of oppression, rather than singling out one as the primary factor.

(ANTROBUS 1995, 55)

[T]he examination of how gender roles are racially constructed can only deepen our analysis of how gender oppression is firmly tied to racial oppression and class oppression.

(BRAND 1999, 95)

Nelson and Wright argue that it is important to examine “how the discourse and procedures of participation actually work in practice” (1998, 1-2). They maintain that using participation as an end (where the community “sets up a process to control its own development”) results in shifts in power between the agency and community members. Using participation as means (to accomplish one’s project), however, brings participants into bureaucratic channels, thereby tightening the institution’s control and power. CIDA’s participatory policymaking process was used as a means to accomplish its end – the creation of a gender equality policy utilising participatory means that appeared open, transparent and broad-based. When agencies such as CIDA attempt to empower others through rudimentary participatory processes and other mechanisms, it masks their efforts to maintain power and control, and perpetuates and disguises top-down attitudes and approaches (Nelson and Wright 1998, 11).

Rather than conducting participatory research and listening to Third World women before updating its policymaking, CIDA relied on institutions of ruling. CIDA ignored the issues of concern and importance to Southern women. Had CIDA listened to Third World women, staff would have learned that gender equality is not the panacea for Third World women’s oppression. As discussed in chapters 2 and 3, if development policies focus solely on gender equality, women’s needs will not be addressed. Third World anti-racist theorists
emphasize that examining power imbalances and taking steps to dismantle these imbalances is critical (Escobar 1995, Goldberg 1993, Tucker 1999). Simply engaging in partnership and dialogue without examining power imbalances will result in unequal power in decision-making and perpetuate power imbalances.

Partnership and Dialogue Disguised as Equality

While CIDA’s policy states that women should be able to participate equally in decision-making, participation without equal power to make decisions is meaningless. As one participant in the consultation pointed out, “[p]articipation should mean having equal power to make decisions” (Record of Consultation). However, the final document does not say that women should have equal power in decision-making. Rather, the stated goal is to “to advance women’s equal participation in decision-making” (CIDA 1999, 7). This objective fails to recognise the inherent power imbalances between women and men.

One participant highlighted the importance of this concept. She pointed out that partnerships are very often unequal and unless the partnerships are equal, “equality under unequal conditions leads to inequality” (Record of Consultation). She felt that the draft addressed this concern by incorporating the following language: “Because of current disparities equal treatment of women and men is insufficient as a strategy for gender equality” (Record of Consultation, CIDA 1998a, 2, Box ii, emphasis added). She also suggested changing principle ‘d’ in the draft from “gender equality can only be achieved through partnership between women and men” (Record of Consultation, CIDA 1998a, 3) to “gender equality can only be achieved through equal partnership between women and men” (Record of Consultation). CIDA’s final policy disregards both these suggestions. In the first
instance, the language she valued was dropped from the final; and in the second, it was not incorporated into the final policy.55

Other participants raised these issues as well. “In partnerships, the balance of power is seldom even” (Record of Consultation). This participant questioned how conflicts would be resolved between CIDA and its partners when differences arise in policy interpretation and implementation. “Whose views will be given the most weight in the event of a disagreement?” (Record of Consultation). Issues of unequal partnerships, whether between women and men or between CIDA and its partners, and the imposition of viewpoints by those with power are not addressed in the final policy. The fact that the policy “does not recognize or articulate the very real threat to power holders . . . that (the idea/l) of equality entails” (Record of Consultation) exacerbates these problems. The only place the final policy mentions unequal power relations is when referring to women’s lack of awareness of unequal power relations.

Women’s empowerment is central to achieving gender equality. Through empowerment, women become aware of unequal power relations, gain control over their lives, and acquire a greater voice to overcome inequality in their home, workplace and community. (CIDA 1999, 8, principle ‘d’ emphasis in original)

Rather than identifying unequal power relations as the problem and envisioning ways of tackling this problem, CIDA’s policy identifies women’s lack of awareness of unequal power relations as the problem. This places the blame for women’s inequality squarely on women’s shoulders. Women’s lack of knowledge and understanding of their lives and circumstances is the problem CIDA tackles. Inherent power imbalances, which are the real problem, are left intact.

55 In the final policy, this is principle ‘f’ (CIDA 1999, 8). While very minor changes were made in this principle from the draft to the final, the participant’s suggestion was not one of them.
CIDA erroneously assumes that partnership and dialogue will necessarily result in the dismantling of power imbalances. According to CIDA staff, partnership and dialogue between Third World women and men will ensure the success of development projects and the attainment of gender equality.

So if you want to work on HIV prevention, reproductive health, you probably need to work with both men and women, but separately. You need to bring young men together and talk about their bodies, how it [sic] works, and a little about sex and the transmission of the disease. You need to talk to the girls and women and talk about their right to say no. You need to have those separate and parallel discussions. . . . You have to think about it in terms of partnership and dialogue.
(CIDA staff 1 interview)

One of the policy’s guiding principles echoes this vision. “Gender equality can only be achieved through partnership between women and men”56 (CIDA 1999, ii). One participant in the consultations raised concerns about emphasizing the role of men in women’s empowerment, demonstrating how power imbalances can remain unchallenged even when there is partnership and dialogue. She describes the problem in the following way.

There is great language in the policy around empowerment, increasing women’s voices around their reality, etc. At the same time, in typical gender-speak, the importance of men’s role in the process is stressed. For many of us working at the NGO front-lines, so to speak (delivering gender trainings, working with local gender trainers, etc.), the effect of this kind of language (tied to the $$ [sic] donor countries bring) is often that male voices still take up most of the space in our ongoing conversations/learning about gender. . . . So the funders’ policy (not just CIDA) becomes a great incentive for current NGO power holders, almost always men, to be the prime beneficiaries.
(Record of Consultation)

This participant explained how when men play a role in women’s equality, it often results in men taking the lead and women being pushed aside or excluded. When I raised this concern with one staff member, she articulated her response in the following way. To her, this “probably happens in societies where it would probably happen anyway” (CIDA staff 1 interview). To demonstrate her point, she relayed the following story about a project by a

56 The draft policy also contains this principle (CIDA 1998a, 3, principle d).
"little NGO" (CIDA staff 1 interview). In this particular community, before the NGO arrived, women raised and cared for the goats and when they were sold, the men got the proceeds. In this project, the NGO came in and said they'd have a pig raising project. The pigs would go to the women and this has been my experience in many developing countries and they're really your piggy bank and you sell the pig when you need to pay school fees or someone has to go to the hospital. You feed the pig your scraps and it's your walking piggy bank. So after about 9 months of the project [the men] said, you've got to take the pigs away from the women they're not paying attention to our goats. This woman [the NGO person evaluating the project] said this was an unintended consequence. And I said, you've got to be crazy, if you'd done the slightest bit of analysis you would have known the women would look after the pigs because it was their money and they would let go of attention to the goats because it was the men’s money and they needed their money. And in a poor village there’s only really one ounce of scrap food for the animals and are they going to feed it to the pigs or to the goats? So, I said, you should, in the design, the NGO partnership should have anticipated this and should have sat down in the community, isn't this exciting, with this project we're going to have both pigs and goats and this is going to enrich the entire community and could have put in place some strategy about developing extra feed for the goats or something like that. If you don’t communicate with the men, they’re just going to come and see it purely in terms of my goats aren’t being fed, get rid of the pigs. Whereas if you go in at the beginning of a project and you say this is going to benefit the whole family because the men will have their money and the women will have their emergency bank account, at certain times it’s going to be a little tricky because there isn’t going to be enough scraps, but here’s a plan to deal with that, you could have had a win-win situation for the men and women. What we have found from our experience, if you go in and work only with the women you may exacerbate a problem that will result in backlash and limit the amount of space in which to work. You need to be thoughtful about this, you don’t give all the jobs to the men. You need to understand that women, that separatism is not an option. This is a very difficult line. I think that one of the difficult things about working on gender equality is that it is very contextual.

In this discussion, the staff member draws on GAD feminist propositions that men need to be included in gender projects and analysis. These feminists maintain that if gender analysis only focuses on women, it does not truly address and challenge gender roles. It also fails to be mindful of how gender projects impact women and men in different ways. Understanding men and masculinities, they argue, will help examine the traditional expectations of men and how those are socially constructed just as women’s roles are.
Exploring these gendered constructs and involving both women and men in projects geared toward women provides an opportunity for both men and women to transform.

Her analysis, however, fails to problematise power imbalances on a local or global scale. She focuses, instead, on the importance of engaging men in the dialogue concerning the pigs and goats to gain their support and trust. She does not discuss the lack of food to feed the goats or pigs, or for that matter the women, men, and children in the community. She does not explore what the communities’ needs are and how they can best be met. Rather, relying on GAD principles and ideals, she talks about the need to give women pigs so they can have a “walking piggy bank,” without considering how the minimal scraps available will be sufficient to feed both the goats and the pigs. In her analysis, the problem is the men’s unwillingness to share their resources, not the First World’s unwillingness to share its resources. She does not examine nor discuss the lack of sufficient resources in the first place and why there is such a scarcity of food. Nor does she consider how the added burden of caring for their pigs will affect women’s workloads. She maintains that if the NGO had presented the project to the men in a particular way, the NGO would have been successful in convincing the men of the project’s benefits. It is believed that if this occurred, men would embrace the project and gender equality will be achieved – both women and men will have “walking piggy banks.” However, simply giving women pigs does not ensure equality.

By focusing on the gender inequalities in this way, the broader issues of global inequality are overshadowed and disregarded. CIDA’s policy also simplifies Third World women’s problems. As discussed above, the final policy recognises disparities between women and men, but disregards the historical systemic discrimination women face. The inequities are not placed in the context of power imbalances. In the same way, the policy

---

57 See pages 88-91.
neglects to examine power imbalances on a global level and thus fails to address global inequalities. The blame for Third World women’s inequality is placed squarely on the shoulders of Third World women and men. According to CIDA staff, good gender development practices entail dialogue between Third World women and Third World men.

“You need, they need to be partners in this” (CIDA staff 1 interview), whereas dialogue between CIDA and Third World women is not imperative. CIDA’s policy contains language about sharing and co-operating with Southern partners. CIDA provides experts and helps Third World countries transform their institutions, laws, policies, and even social norms. However, the policy does not contain any language about how Canada can share its wealth or power. Because CIDA’s policymaking process was used as a means rather than an end, CIDA entrenched its hold on power.

The goat and pig project, the critique of it by CIDA staff, and CIDA’s policy all overlook women’s multiple sites of oppression, their needs, and the complexities of their lives. While gender equality is important and is “a major goal on which all feminists can agree, gender discrimination is neither the sole nor perhaps the primary locus of the oppression of Third World women” (Johnson-Odim 1999, 315 emphasis added). Many Third World and anti-racist feminists echo this theme (Antrobus 1995, Barriteau 1995, Nnaemeka 2001, Razack 1999).

Gender Equality: The Panacea

Despite Southern women’s concerns that gender discrimination is not the sole, nor perhaps the most significant source of their oppression, CIDA’s gender policy presumes that gender equality is the panacea for all that ails Third World women. According to the draft policy, gender equality is deemed critical because it is “at the heart of economic and social
progress” (CIDA 1998a, 1-2). CIDA’s Policy on Gender Equality is a tool to “create a better world for all – one in which inequality on any grounds, be it gender, class, race or ethnicity, is finally overcome” (CIDA 1999, ii). Both policies refer to the Beijing Platform for Action which states that “[e]mpowerment of women, and gender equality are prerequisites for achieving political, social, economic, cultural and environmental security among all people” (Beijing Platform for Action: paragraph 41, qtd. in CIDA 1999, 4; CIDA 1998a, 4). CIDA’s failure to understand Third World women’s concerns stems partly from CIDA’s lack of partnership and dialogue with Third World women. This is exacerbated by staff’s lack of familiarity with the writings of Third World feminist theorists. While one staff member expressed passing familiarity with some, the theorists she mentioned focus primarily on gender and economic development measures. These authors rely on principles that are steeped in traditional development practices.

As discussed above, traditional development practices rely on the notion that economic progression, based on eurocentric values, is the avenue for development. CIDA’s policy is not so much a tool by which gender equality can be achieved, as it is a mechanism used by CIDA to manage and control Third World women, thereby sustaining CIDA’s power. The policy relies on one understanding of Third World women’s values and needs, those that comport with CIDA’s own. Staff acknowledged that CIDA’s policy may not always be applicable to Third World women and that they may disregard aspects of CIDA’s policy that are “too Canadian” (CIDA staff 1 interview). Southern women’s dismissal of CIDA’s policy stems from the fact that it is a Canadian policy – it reflects Canadian values and they are not living in Canada. On the other hand, the writings of Third World feminists reflect their reality and discuss what is important for them. CIDA staff implements its policy in the Third World, not in Canada. The problem with staff’s decision either to disregard or not familiarise
themselves with the writings by feminists that seem "too Southern" is that it perpetuates the racialized exercise of power, thus making the comparison unequal. When CIDA staff choose to familiarise themselves only with those Third World feminist writings that resonate with them, they do Third World women a great disservice. Furthermore, by focusing its policy on gender equality while disregarding global inequality, CIDA masks its attempts to maintain its power and control. This decision perpetuates and disguises top-down attitudes and approaches.

In addition to erroneously presuming that the achievement of gender equality will solve Third World women's oppression, CIDA's policy neglects to examine the root causes of gender inequality. Because of this shortcoming, it fails to address its stated intention: to achieve gender equality. Staff raised this concern during the consultation.

All members of a community should have the same responsibilities and benefits of a communal life. In order to be able to say that two things are equal, they have to be identical or quantifiable. However, many elements of the relationship between women and men are not quantifiable. The most fundamental inequality between women and men is in the amount of power they have in decision-making about how things work in a community.58

(Record of Consultation)

Quite a few participants echoed this view. "I see gender inequality/inequity as rooted in patriarchal power relations which structure both institutions and individual consciousness" (Record of Consultation). Accordingly, the policy needs to be "more explicit about power and capture the idea that unequal power relations are the basis of gender inequality" (Record of Consultation).

Current societal structures perpetuate women's inequality. Concerns about simply incorporating women into these structures, without transforming them, were raised as well.

58 This quote is taken from the moderator's summary of CIDA's internal consultation that was posted on the public consultation. I did not have access to CIDA's internal consultation and thus do not know whether the summary reflects the comments of one or more CIDA staff members.
during the consultations. The focus of this discussion was whether CIDA should work
towards mainstreaming gender or transforming societies. One guest panelist best explains
these conflicting approaches.

[T]here also needs to be a more explicit discussion of gender equality as a
transformatory approach. . . . This discussion would need to cover some of the tensions
. . . between gender equality as integration [i.e., mainstreaming] into the current social
nexus or transformation of that nexus. With a rights based approach such as that set out
in the draft policy gender equality must be about transforming society to achieve
equality. But the means by which that transformation are to come about, as
recommended in the draft policy, are all about integration into the current system.
Clearly there is a disjuncture here in the policy as greater integration of women is
unlikely to lead to a transformed society. In other words the means does not fit the end.
(Record of Consultation)

Many participants concurred with this view. One participant working with a non-
governmental organisation in Indonesia explained that she is troubled by CIDA’s emphasis
on mainstreaming. She points out that CIDA,

as a development funder . . . [and] . . . one of the promoters of Canadian foreign policy,
. . . chooses its beneficiaries very carefully, and let’s face it, lately that usually means
governments, large NGO actors and private sector institutions. If we are trying to make
some change in power relations, which I believe is at the heart of gender work, within
policy frameworks such as CIDA’s, I think we have to be very clear that CIDA itself
while on the one hand developing not too bad gender policies (among others) is heavily
invested in not threatening the status quo at the very least.
(Record of Consultation)

Given the nature of CIDA’s beneficiaries, it is unlikely that CIDA can promote the
changes in power relations that are needed to transform societies (Record of Consultation).
CIDA’s policy ensures that power relations will not be transformed. As one participant
argued, the examples of gender equality results (contained in section 5 of the draft policy)
seem “more in-line with liberal, mainstreaming perspectives, glossing over underlying socio-
economic, cultural and political roots of gender inequality” (Record of Consultation). She
articulated concerns with the policy’s failure to recognise the connections between race, class
and gender.
[P]arity with men cannot be assumed to be a desirable goal. Poor women do not want to be equal to poor men; nor do they necessarily want to be 'equal' to the affluent. Instead, women living in poverty frequently assert that their objective is to obtain social justice for themselves, for their families and their communities, for both women and men alike. Southern activists have pointed out, class, racial, social differences must also be transformed if gender equality is to become a reality. (Record of Consultation)

She suggested that CIDA craft the policy with "a vision of equitable 'social development'" as outlined in CIDA policy statements, manuals and assessments (Record of Consultation). This approach would more directly address Southern women's concerns.

Given the overlap between the gender equality policy and these documents, she was surprised by the lack of reference to them in the policy. She argued that transformatory development requires more than a focus on gender inequality. A dialogue about alternative forms of economic and social rights and mechanisms for their creation is necessary to achieve gender equitable development. "Although there is a risk that the focus will be shifted away from women's disadvantage relative to men, I think there is reason to be cautiously optimistic about the potential of a social development framework to raise questions about power differentials across gender, race, and class lines and their origins in economic paradigms" (Record of Consultation). Because the normal functioning of central institutions causes and perpetuates the inequality of some groups, it is necessary to change how institutions function to remedy that inequality. CIDA's draft policy briefly addresses her concerns. "Achieving gender equality will require changes in institutional practices and social relations through which disparities are reinforced and sustained" (CIDA 1998a, 2 Box ii). However, in the final policy, this value is weakened. "Specific measures must be developed to address the policies, laws, procedures, norms, beliefs, practices and attitudes that maintain gender inequality" (CIDA 1999, 9). This phrasing does not address the changes that are needed in institutional practices and social relations to achieve gender equality.
The final policy does not incorporate the criticisms, concerns and articulations made by participants and Third World women's critiques of development. Instead, the policy attempts to advance equality by incorporating women into current societal structures. However, transformation of society requires more than mainstreaming gender or transforming gender relations. In fact, mainstreaming often results in a reinforcement of hierarchies "with very little change in terms of power relations in general, let alone between women and men" (Record of Consultation). In spite of all the concerns raised during the consultations about gender mainstreaming, "[i]f you read the policy for its content and intent, you will see it's very much about mainstreaming" (CIDA staff 1 interview). This is so, even though the word 'mainstreaming' is not actually contained in the policy. The reason given for its exclusion was articulated as follows: "we couldn't find a good translation into French for mainstreaming. . . . we just thought it lent itself to misunderstanding" (CIDA staff 1 interview).

Feminist demands for integration of gender issues have been translated by development agencies into an emphasis on mainstreaming gender within their organisations. Ideally if gender issues are truly mainstreamed, organisations would face a "radical overhaul" (Miller 1998, 150). However, in practice, as feminist issues are co-opted by bureaucracies, they are diffused to meet bureaucratic needs. The result is that rather than transforming the bureaucracy women are incorporated into its current structures. Gender, as an analytical tool, becomes de-politicised. In consequence, the root causes of gender inequality, such as patriarchal power relations, remain unexamined and intact. Power imbalances are perpetuated when unequal power to make decisions is masked in the discourse of partnership and dialogue. Nonetheless, CIDA presents gender equality, through the process of gender mainstreaming, as the panacea to Third World women's oppression.
CIDA’s process and thus, the resulting policy fail to examine women’s multifaceted lives and the intricacies of their oppression. Had CIDA done so, staff would have learned that gender equality policies, while important, are not the sole solution. Just as the tail wags the dog, institutional needs, rather than the suggestions by guest panelists, staff and participants, drove CIDA’s policymaking process and ultimately determined the framework and contents of the policy. Addressing Third World women’s needs and desires requires significantly more nuanced and comprehensive policies than those advanced by CIDA’s gender equality policy.

Summary

CIDA’s policymaking process demonstrates that preserving CIDA’s privilege as a white, First World institution of ruling was perhaps CIDA’s most important goal of all. CIDA changed its policy to gender equality to meet its needs, both ensuring the retention of its status as a leader in the field, and providing mechanisms that can be used to measure project results. These mechanisms incorporate Third World women into development processes and create means of measuring their compliance with and participation in development projects. At the same time, they erase women’s experiences, cut them off from their histories, and label and categorize them in ways that are beyond their control.

CIDA’s commitment to gender equality is superficial. It fails to allocate sufficient resources to gender equality and there is a lack of institutional commitment to gender issues, making the job of gender equality staff at CIDA extremely difficult. However, feminists working within CIDA are not passive participants in nor are they manipulated by the practices of institutions of ruling. Rather, they engage in those practices to sustain their own power. In this instance, they utilized cursory participatory processes, creating an illusion of
inclusion when, in reality, the process was structured to ensure its pre-determined outcome. The substantive issues were decided well before the consultation began. This does not mean that Southern women do not want gender equality, nor does it mean that gender inequality is not a reality in Third World women’s lives. Rather, as Escobar articulates “[i]t means that this reality serves only as a partial basis for another, institutionally constructed reality that is consonant with conceptualizations of the problems of development already put together in Washington, Ottawa, Rome and Third World capitals” (1995, 179). For these reasons, CIDA’s abstract commitment to gender equality does not transmute into real practice.

The policy itself only purports to tackle gender equality on a local level, and even then fails to adequately problematise the issues. By defining the problem in this limited way, gender equality policies constitute women as a coherent group that is characterised by their gender. Third World women are seen as oppressed victims of their patriarchal societies, and gender equality policies provide the mechanism by which to ‘reform’ Third World countries so that their women become liberated. Using the Western model as the standard by which all other societies are judged, development agencies construct themselves as the experts. Gender development experts, namely feminists working in the development apparatus, are then flown in to help educate, liberate and ultimately save Third World women. By functioning in this manner, gender equality policymaking processes and policies are, to use Razack’s words, “inevitably an encounter between the white First World and the racialized Third World” (1999, 89). Women’s histories of systemic discrimination and ingrained power imbalances are overlooked. Third World women’s histories of exploitation and oppression by the First World are dismissed. CIDA’s policy, staff and policymaking process ignore the even larger issues Third World women face, namely globalization and global inequality.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

The feminism of the World Bank is thus opportunistic and serves, first and foremost, the Bank’s own aims. Must we, then, object to the consequences of the Bank’s policies which may very well be positive?
(Bessis 2001, 22)

If CIDA’s process was created and carried out in a way to meet CIDA’s needs, and if the process and policy perpetuate racialized discourse, are they nonetheless valuable? Can any government entity, embedded as it is in institutions of ruling and operating to ensure the perpetuation of its own power, ever effectively construct international gender and development policies that will truly benefit their intended beneficiaries? Could CIDA have adjusted its process to more effectively create a policy that both incorporated the voices and demands of Third World women and that addressed their needs?

CIDA could have moved out of its place of comfort. Staff could have travelled to more destinations, or set up satellite connections where in person visits were unfeasible. The gender equality staff could have had greater commitment to the process and to gender issues from those within the higher echelons of CIDA itself. That commitment could have included financial, technical and moral support. However, none of this occurred. The participatory process was superficial, gender equality is not a priority within CIDA and financial, technical, and moral support are not forthcoming.
This lack of commitment occurs because when feminist issues are incorporated into bureaucracies, they are done so in a superficial, cursory manner that affords the institution the ability to present itself as a leader. However, just like Oz, when the curtain is pulled back the real face of the institution (i.e., CIDA) is exposed. What we then see is an agency that commits insufficient resources and institutional support to an inadequately staffed unit. With such limited resources and lack of institutional commitment to gender issues, the gender equality staff at CIDA is significantly hampered in their work. They cannot click their heels together and work miracles. Just as colonial governments relied upon certain individuals in the colonised lands to sustain its power and authority, international development agencies do the same, relying on feminists working within their institutions to sustain and validate them.

My research supports Third World, anti-racist feminist contentions that while feminists working in development agencies undoubtedly face enormous obstacles and are manipulated by their agencies, they are not simply passive participants in this process. Rather, internal gender advocates also participate in the practices of institutions of ruling to strengthen and sustain their own power.

They do so by creating cursory participatory practices, engaging in racialized discourse and perpetuating power imbalances. By assuming that gender equality is the panacea for all that ails Third World women, CIDA racialized Third World women and imposed its own vision of development upon them. CIDA, along with many other Northern (and Southern) agencies, presents gender equality as the cure to women’s oppression. This cure is purported to work as follows: if only Third World women would swallow the ‘gender equality pill’, they would no longer experience inequality on any front. Racial discrimination, gender oppression and Third World underdevelopment would vanish. The problem with this pill is that it is a placebo. By shifting the focus from the multifaceted issues that Third World
women face to gender inequality, CIDA’s gender equality policy usurps Third World
women’s issues and transforms them into a manageable ‘problem’ that Northern experts can
solve. As Razack explains

Gender inequality replaces First World-Third World relations in this approach, if not
by design then by impact. It is not the conditions of the loans themselves, but how they
affect men and women differently that becomes the focus.
(1999, 95)

This sleight of hand leaves Canadian development policies intact and Third World
women’s histories and present day realities of genocide and exploitation unexamined. This
removes the focus of the analysis from larger power inequalities between the North and
South that deny Third World women (and men) equal opportunities in life. CIDA’s policy
not only fails to tackle the difficult issue of North/South inequalities, but it also perpetuates
this divide because the Canadian government and Canadian citizens benefit from it. Third
World women and men’s options are limited due to global inequalities. Until Northern
governments (and those with power, whether located in the North or the South) examine their
own complicity in the exploitation of Third World peoples, and until global inequalities are
addressed, gender equality policies remain little more than window dressing. They will fail to
transform Third World women’s lives or their countries, and may well entrench power in the
hands of the elite.

For these reasons, gender equality policies are not only not the cure for Third World
women’s oppression they can and often do exacerbate the problem. When the ‘gender
equality pill’ is mixed with other additives such as modernisation development policies and
structural adjustment programmes, Third World women get even sicker. In combination,
these ‘medications’ have interfered with Third World women’s abilities to maintain their
self-sufficiency and to help their communities develop sustainable policies and programmes.
Third World women have been force-fed these pills for too long. Fortunately, they resist, spit
them out and throw them up. In this way, Third World women disrupt the development process and utilise the policies in ways that are beneficial to them. While gender equality policies may eventually help to improve the lives of Third World women so that they are ‘equal’ to Third World men, this equality will continue to be marred by global inequality. As Johnson-Odim points out, seeking “to achieve equal treatment between men and women and equal access and opportunity for women, . . . often amounts to a formula for sharing poverty . . .” (1991, 320).

When CIDA engages in participation as a means, it merely brings more and more relations into bureaucratic processes thereby tightening its power. For this reason, CIDA’s policymaking process did not empower Third World women and did not result in a shift in power. Because CIDA controlled the process and ensured the outcome, it would not have mattered who participated. It was merely a ritualistic exercise that hid attempts by CIDA to keep control, “perpetuated and disguised continued top-down attitudes and approaches” (Nelson and Wright 1998, 11), and strengthened CIDA’s reputation as an innovator and leader in the field.

If CIDA truly wants to empower women, then the way to do so is to engage in participation as an end. This, however, would require CIDA to relinquish power. If one holds power over another, and wants to empower the other, the most direct way to do that is by giving up some of her own power. Hopefully someday the North will tackle these issues in a more holistic way that includes really listening to and hearing what Third World women are saying. To do so, the North would have to be willing to turn its gaze inward and, as I quoted at the very beginning of this paper, engage in “a profound, historical and cultural review of
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59 See page 1, block quote.
the Western project" (Pieterse 1991, 24). Until that happens, Northern gender equality policies will not be the panacea they claim to be.
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Appendix I
Interview Questions for CIDA Staff

1. What is your current position at CIDA?
2. What was your position during the Internet consultations on the Gender and Equality policy?
3. What role did you play in the Canadian International Development Agency’s Gender and Equality 1998 policy reformulation?
4. Did you participate in writing the draft policy for the consultations? If so, in what ways?
5. What resources did CIDA staff consult in helping them write the draft policy for the consultations?
6. Who did CIDA staff consult with in framing the consultation?
7. Did CIDA staff look at testimonials by women living in the countries to which CIDA provides funding? If not, why? If so, which ones and how did CIDA gain access to them?
8. Did CIDA staff read novels or other literature by women living in the countries to which CIDA provides funding? If not, why? If so, which ones?
9. Did CIDA hold consultations in the countries in which it provides funding to provide alternative avenues for marginalized women to participate in the consultation process?
10. What was the decision-making process that led CIDA to believe that its Gender and Equity policy needed to be updated?
11. Did you think that the policy needed to be updated? Why/why not?
12. Why do you think CIDA thought it was necessary to update its policy?
13. How was the need for CIDA to update its policy identified? [Did CIDA staff, partner organizations and/or beneficiaries raise the need for CIDA to update its policy?]
14. What was the decision-making process that led CIDA to have two distinct consultations on the policy, one for the public and one for CIDA staff?
15. Did you participate in the public Internet consultations?
16. Did you participate in CIDA’s internal consultations?
17. What outreach did CIDA do to inform people about the consultations?
18. Do you think more outreach could or should have been done?
19. How did you feel about the level of public participation in the consultations?

20. Do you think the Internet consultations were useful?

21. How was the agenda determined for the Internet consultations?

22. How was it decided what questions would be raised during the consultations?

23. Were there individuals or organizations that wanted to participate but were unable to do so? If so, how many and why were they unable to participate?

24. What efforts, if any did CIDA take to assist with their participation? (E.g., provide computers, assist with Internet access either with money or time, etc.)

25. Were any other avenues for participation available, other than the Internet?

26. If not, did you feel other avenues for participation (other than the Internet) should have been available?

27. If so, how were people informed of these additional options?

28. Did organizations or individuals utilize these other avenues to participate?

29. How many responses did CIDA receive by these other avenues?

30. Are these responses archived and accessible?

31. Are there any internal document(s) that evaluate the Internet consultation process? If so, can I get a copy?

32. Once the Internet consultations were complete, what was the process for finalization of the policy?

33. Did participants have any further opportunity to comment on (give feedback on) the final policy?

34. Why were CIDA’s internal Internet/email discussions not posted to the public Internet consultation listserv?

35. Why were the postings on the Internet consultations not translated into all three languages?

36. One participant expressed concern with language in the draft policy that stressed the importance of men’s role in working towards women’s empowerment and equality. She points out that the effect of emphasizing the importance of including men in this process results in men taking the lead, becoming the trainers and trainees and women being excluded, once again. Do you have any thoughts or feelings about this concern? Do you think the final policy addresses her concerns?
37. Who drafted the draft policy that was used for the consultations?

38. What internal process did the draft policy go through before being accepted as the draft that would be used for the consultations?

39. Who wrote the final policy?

40. What internal process did the final policy go through before being approved as "policy"?

41. Did the final policy change as it went through this process? What were the changes? Were they significant?

42. How long did this process take?

43. Was the final policy approved and accepted for implementation in March of 1999 or March of 2000?

44. How did you choose the guest panelists?

45. Were some of the guest panelists from partnership organisations?

46. Did you pay the guest panelists to participate?

47. Did you pay anyone else to participate?

48. How much did the other CIDA branches (e.g., partnership branch, geographical branches) get involved with the consultation and drafting and finalizing the policy?

49. Did CIDA staff from the other branches help pull in their partners in other countries for participation?

50. What was the budget for the consultations?

51. What is the funding breakdown for the six programming priorities?

52. How does the coding system work? Do you think it accurately reflects the resources actually provided to gender and equality issues?

53. What is your racial or ethnic heritage?

54. What is your religion?

55. How old are you?

56. Please provide any additional comments or thoughts.
Appendix II
Interview Questions for Moderator

1. What role did you play in the Canadian International Development Agency’s Gender and Equality 1998 policy reformulation?

2. Did you participate in your individual capacity or as a representative of an organisation or agency?

3. What is the name of the organisation you worked for during the consultations?

4. Did you participate in writing the draft policy for the consultations? If so, in what ways?

5. In what ways did you help to shape the agenda for the consultations? Did you consult with CIDA staff before and/or during the consultations to assist you with this task?

6. Do you know what resources, if any, CIDA staff consulted in helping them write the draft policy for the consultations?

7. Do you know with whom CIDA staff consulted when framing the consultation?

8. Do you know if CIDA staff looked at testimonials by women living in the countries to which CIDA provides funding? If not, why? If so, which ones and how did CIDA gain access to them?

9. Do you know if CIDA staff read novels or other literature by women living in the countries to which CIDA provides funding? If not, why? If so, which ones?

10. Do you know if CIDA held consultations in the countries in which it provides funding to provide alternative avenues for marginalized women to participate in the consultation process?

11. Did you think that the policy needed to be updated? Why/why not?

12. Why do you think CIDA thought it was necessary to update its policy?

13. Do you know how the need for CIDA to update its policy was identified? [Did CIDA staff, partner organisations and/or beneficiaries raise the need for CIDA to update its policy?]

14. Were you involved in the decision-making process that led CIDA to have two distinct consultations on the policy, one for the public and one for CIDA staff?

15. Do you know why CIDA made that decision?

16. When you provided the moderator’s summary, did you include in those summaries discussions from the internal consultations as well (or did the summaries only include comments from the public consultations)?
17. Did you participate in CIDA’s internal consultations?

18. Do you know what outreach CIDA did to inform people about the consultations?

19. Do you think more outreach could or should have been done?

20. Did you try to inform other individuals, organisations or agencies about the consultations? If so, how?

21. Do you know of people who wanted to participate in the consultations but were unable to do so? If so, how many and why were they unable to participate?

22. When participants had difficulty participating, what did you do to try to assist them with that process?

23. How did you feel about the level of public participation in the consultations?

24. Do you think the Internet consultations were useful?

25. How was the agenda determined for the Internet consultations?

26. How was it decided what questions would be raised during the consultations?

27. How much did you consult with CIDA staff before posting your summaries or asking questions for the participants to consider?

28. Were there individuals or organizations that wanted to participate but were unable to do so? If so, how many and why were they unable to participate?

29. What efforts, if any, did CIDA take to assist with their participation? (e.g., provide computers, assist with internet access either with money or time, etc.)

30. Did you participate in writing the Gender and Equity policy?

31. What did you think about that policy?

32. Do you think it was relevant for women in developing countries? Why/Why not?

33. What did you think about the proposed Draft Gender and Equality policy that was circulated for the Internet consultations?

34. Did you feel that participants could play a role in shaping the agenda? If so, how? If not, why?

35. Do you remember how much CIDA paid your organisation for your services and the additional services your organisation provided?
36. Once the Internet consultations (and any evaluation process) was complete, what, if any, role did you (or your organisation) play in finalizing the policy?

37. What is your racial or ethnic heritage?

38. What is your religion?

39. How old are you?

40. Please provide any additional comments or thoughts.
Appendix III
Interview Questions for Guest Panelists

1. What role did you play in the Canadian International Development Agency’s Gender and Equality 1998 policy reformulation?

2. Where are you located (what country, city)?

3. Did you participate in the Internet consultations?

4. From where did you participate?

5. Did you participate in your individual capacity or as a representative of an organisation or agency?

6. What role did you play in the Canadian International Development Agency’s Gender and Equality 1998 policy reformulation?

7. Did you participate in writing the draft policy for the consultations? If so, in what ways?

8. Did you think that the policy needed to be updated? Why/why not?

9. Why do you think CIDA thought it was necessary to update its policy?

10. How did you learn about the Canadian International Development Agency’s Internet consultation on the Gender and Equality policy?

11. Do you think more outreach could or should have been done?

12. How did you feel about the level of public participation in the consultations?

13. Do you think the Internet consultations were useful?

14. Did you participate in setting the agenda for the consultations?

15. If so, how did that process evolve?

16. Did you participate in drafting CIDA’s Gender and Equity policy?

17. What did you think about that policy?

18. Do you think it was relevant for women in developing countries? Why/Why not?

19. What did you think about the proposed Draft Gender and Equality policy that was circulated for the Internet consultations?
20. Did you feel that participants could play a role in shaping the agenda? If so, how? If not, why?

21. Did you feel you could influence the agenda? Why/Why not?

22. Was it difficult for you to participate in the consultations? Why/Why not?

23. Please describe any challenges you faced in your efforts to participate.

24. How did you access the Internet to participate in the consultations?

25. Did you have to pay to use the Internet?

26. If so, how much?

27. Did the cost of the participating interfere with your participation? If so, in what ways? If not, why?

28. Did you try to inform other individuals, organisations or agencies about the consultations? If so, how?

29. Do you know of people who wanted to participate in the consultations but were unable to do so? If so, how many and why were they unable to participate?

30. Were you asked to read any specific theorists or theoretical papers before participating as a guest panelist? If so, which ones?

31. What is your theoretical grounding? What theorists do you rely on when doing gender and development analysis or theory? What theorists have guided your perspectives on gender and development?

32. What, if any, role did you play in CIDA’s formulation of its final policy after the Internet consultations?

33. One participant expressed concern with language in the draft policy that stressed the importance of men’s role in working towards women’s empowerment and equality. She points out that the effect of emphasizing the importance of including men in this process results in men taking the lead, becoming the trainers and trainees and women being excluded, once again. Do you have any thoughts or feelings about this concern? Do you think the final policy addressed her concerns?

34. Are you a woman or a man?

35. What is your racial or ethnic heritage?

36. What is your religion?

37. How old are you?
Appendix IV
Interview Questions for Bellanet Staff

1. What is your current position at Bellanet?

2. What was your position during the 1998 Internet consultations on CIDA’s Gender and Equality policy?

3. What role did you play in shaping the Internet consultations?

4. How was the relationship between Bellanet and CIDA established?

5. At the time of the consultations, what experience did Bellanet have in conducting Internet consultations?

6. Has Bellanet conducted similar Internet consultations since it conducted CIDA’s?

7. What did Bellanet learn from the experience?

8. What would Bellanet do differently now?

9. Did Bellanet assist CIDA in conducting outreach to help ensure broad participation in the Internet consultations? If so, how?

10. How many people actually participated in the Internet consultations?

11. How many participants were from outside Canada?

12. Where are they from and what are the numbers of participants from each location?

13. Are you aware of any problem people had participating? If so, what were the problems?

14. What efforts did Bellanet take to assist with people’s efforts to participate?

15. Are you aware of any other avenues for participation that were made available to individuals who could not or choose not to participate via the Internet consultations?

16. If so, how were people made aware of these alternative options?

17. Did Bellanet participate in archiving or recording those who participated by other means?

18. How is the Internet consultation archived?

19. Are there any internal document(s) that evaluate the Internet consultation process? If so, can I get a copy?

20. Once the Internet consultations (and any evaluation process) was complete, what, if any, role did Bellanet (you) play in finalization of the policy?
Appendix V
Interview Questions for Participants

1. What role did you play in the Canadian International Development Agency’s Gender and Equality 1998 policy reformulation?

2. Where are you located (what country, city)?

3. Did you participate in the Internet consultations?

4. From where did you participate?

5. Did you participate in your individual capacity or as a representative of an organisation or agency?

6. How did you learn about the Canadian International Development Agency’s Internet consultation on the Gender and Equality policy?

7. Do you think more outreach could or should have been done?

8. How did you feel about the level of public participation in the consultations?

9. Do you think the Internet consultations were useful?

10. Do you feel that your voice was “heard”? If so, how? If not, why?

11. Did you read CIDA’s Gender and Equity policy that had been in place before the consultations?

12. What did you think about that policy?

13. Do you think it was relevant for women in developing countries? Why/Why not?

14. What did you think about the proposed draft Gender and Equality policy that was circulated for the Internet consultations?

15. Did you feel that the agenda had already been set? If so, how? If not, why?

16. Did you feel you could influence the agenda? Why/Why not?

17. Was it difficult for you to participate in the consultations? Why/Why not?

18. Please describe any challenges you faced in your efforts to participate.

19. How did you access the Internet to participate in the consultations?

20. Did you have to pay to use the Internet? If so, how much?
21. Did the cost of the participating interfere with your participation? If so, in what ways? If not, why?

22. Did you try to inform other individuals, organisations or agencies about the consultations? If so, how?

23. Do you know of people who wanted to participate in the consultations but were unable to do so? If so, how many and why were they unable to participate?

24. Are you a woman or a man?

25. What is your racial or ethnic heritage?

26. What is your religion?

27. How old are you?

28. Please provide any additional comments or thoughts.