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1. Introduction

The Centre for Global Gender Studies (CGGS) was officially established at the University of Göteborg in 2004. The Centre has the following overall objectives:

- supporting an interdisciplinary approach to studies of gender in a global perspective;
- establishing a creative environment for gender researchers and students studying global issues;
- making visible Swedish competence in the field and support further capacity building;
- creating a network of gender researchers within the global development field;
- creating a think tank to be consulted by organisations and journalists in need of expert knowledge in this field;
- developing and strengthening contacts with researchers in the South, through research cooperation, guest researchers, and guest lecturers.

The first international workshop, on the theme *Globalisation, Power and Agency*, arranged by the former feminist research group was held in 2002. Conceptual presentations on the theme were given by Prof. Naila Kabeer, Dr. Anne-Marie Goetz, Prof. Björn Hettne and Prof. Aant Elzinga.

On the 26th-27th of August 2004, the Centre held a second workshop *Citizenship, Rights and Gender Justice* to explore further some of the aspects raised at the workshop in 2002. This workshop was organised in association with the Kerstin Hesselgren's guest professorship awarded by the Swedish Research Council, held in 2004 by Professor Naila Kabeer at the Department for Peace and Development Research Göteborg University (PADRIGU). This workshop is also a stepping-stone to the coming international conference 'Negotiating Gender Justice' that the Centre will organise on 28th of February to 2nd of March 2005.
During the planning process of these workshops we have used the term “Dream-catcher” to symbolically name these events. Dream-catcher came about as a metaphor of the importance to create space for feminist researchers (national and international) to collectively think through contemporary processes of globalisation and change, without direct pressure to produce a specified outcome. Instead catching possible future visions and feminist dreams of a more equal world through a dialogue are at the core of the workshop. The meaning is to have “Dream-catcher” as a re-occurring event, every second year.

The intention was to use this year’s workshop to provide a space where feminist researchers can reflect on the linkages between struggles over rights and citizenship and the broader goals of gender justice. We wanted the speakers deliberations to discuss connections between citizenship, rights and gender justice in a number of different arenas where feminist struggles take place. Contemporary research alerts us to the fact that women’s active engagement in civil society is not always translated into change within the institutional structures of power, such as legal systems, academia, labour markets, the bureaucracy, etc.

It may be that the struggle for gender justice has been at its most effective in mounting a challenge to institutional structures change when it is taken from the individual to the collective, from the private to the public, from the informal to the formal. By analysing the ‘moments’ when such challenges have been mounted, the actors who came together to mount them and the strategies they used, we hoped to obtain a clearer understanding of what a feminist project for the achievement of gender justice would look like. We welcomed contributions that reflected various ways feminists have sought to promote forms of rights and citizenship that embody and promote gendered notions of justice.

This workshop took place in a context where, despite the strong emphasis on rights in the development discourse, it is by no means clear that a commitment to rights is sufficient to achieving such justice. For instance, the idea of a Beijing +10 conference has been questioned, because of fear that it may open up the hard-won gains of the Platform for Action once again to re-negotiations in a world where conservative forces have become
stronger and more organised. DAWN, a network of southern feminists and an active participant at earlier global and regional meetings, has released an appeal for 'no to negotiations' on precisely these grounds. Here in Sweden, the decision to move gender equality as one of the overarching goals of Swedish development co-operation to one of among eight 'main features' has also given grounds for concern. At the moment there is also a relocation of responsibility for gender issues at Sida, from the department working on overall policy to a theme-oriented department concerned with democracy, social development and human rights. Similar tendencies can be seen in the whole donor community. It is by no means clear that such a move will necessarily address the goal of gender equality, given the complex ways in which gender inequality is manifested.

This made us ask: what the concept of rights offers in the context of development? In the closing panel we invited the keynote speakers to reflect on possibilities, dynamics, and limitations of 'rights-based' strategies to promote gender justice in the context of development.

The idea was to have limited number of participants and to favour qualitative discussions, for the two days to be used efficiently. The emphasis was on interaction and actions of the invited guests. The form was hence flexible and the idea was to use a format where everyone was participating in the same discussion. However, it turned out to be a large interest for the event. In the end, nearly fifty scholars, policymakers and practitioners participated at the workshop. Scholars came from the universities of Umeå, Stockholm, Örebro, Göteborg, Lund and from Malmö Högskola. In 2004 the CGGS has also set up a national network of researchers on gender and development (Gad-net) initiated by Sida/SAREC. Gad-net made it possible to spread information about the workshop.

We were pleased to have policymakers particularly focusing on gender from Sida as well as members of the Feminist Adult Education Centre (Kvinnofolkhögskolan) partaking in the workshop. Various disciplines were also represented, such as Anthropology, Political Science, History, Law, Development Studies, and Women's Studies (see appendix 1). The size of the event therefore turned it into be more like a conference, still with
informal ways of communication. The interest in the workshop confirmed our belief that there is an urgent need for proactive work on a collective level to inform and transform social theories and practices.

We want to give special thanks and appreciation to Victoria Heimersson who assisted us by arranging all the practical details to the workshop, which made it successful and flowing very smoothly. Particular thanks go also to Anna Jeppsson who together with Victoria collected the material and wrote the workshop report. Finally, we want to thank Ane Kirkegaard for giving lots of ideas and inputs regarding the thinking process behind the “dream-catcher”.

The workshop would not have been possible without financial support. Thanks to the Swedish Council of Research for financial support through the Kerstin Hesselgren’s guest professorship; to Sida for funding Muthoni Waneyki’s participation; and to the Faculty of Social Science at Göteborg University for financial support.

Göteborg 29th of October 2004

Monica Erwér
2. Program

Day 1  26th of August 2004
8.30 – 9.00 Registration

9.00 – 9.30 Welcome note
Monica Erwér, CGGS/GU

Session 1: Gender and Development
Chair: Maria Stern

Naila Kabeer, IDS  (9.30 – 10.30)
“The Millennium Development Goals, women’s right and gender justice: a critical re-reading”

Drude Dahlerup, SU  (10.30 – 11.00)
“Gender Quotas in Politics: Empowerment from above or from below?”

Coffee (11.15 - 11.30)

Group discussions  (11.30 – 13.00)

LUNCH (13.00 – 14.00)

Session 2: Agency & Intersectionality
Chair: Maria Stern

Edmé Dominguez, Iberoamerican Institute, GU  (14.00 – 14.30)
“Transnational gender/class networking between the North and the South: overcoming diversity or reproducing dependencies in the construction of a global citizenship?”

Monica Erwér, CGGS/GU  (14.30 – 15.00)
“Challenging a gender paradox: from formal to substantive rights”

Group discussions (15.00-16.00)
Coffee (16.00 -16.30)

Round-table discussion (16.30-18.00)
Chair: Drude Dahlerup

Day 2 27th of August 2004

Session 3: Legal Rights and Struggles
Chair: Ane Kirkegaard

Sari Kouvo, CGGS/GU
"Women’s Human Rights’ or Human Rights for Women - A Legal Perspective"
(10.00-10.30)

Muthoni Wanyeki, Femnet Africa
"Rights based approaches: Strategic implications for GAD work by the African women’s movement"
(10.30-11.00)

Coffee
(11.00 - 11.30)

LUNCH
(12.00-13.00)

Concluding panel: (13.00-15.00)

What can rights offer theory, policy and practice in terms of gender and development? How?

Chair: Naila Kabeer
Participants: Drude Dahlerup, Edmé Dominguez, Muthoni Wanyeki, Sari Kouvo, and Monica Erwér
3. Keynote speakers

In the following section, the keynote speakers at the conference will be presented. Each presentation also includes the abstract from their speech. Centre for Global Gender Studies focuses on interdisciplinary research and are therefore proud to present such distinguished researchers and activists from different disciplines and with focus on different regions of the world. The keynote speakers together cover Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America. Focusing of interdisciplinary research is one on the Centre’s main goals. It is our understanding that the keynote speakers geographic and theoretical span gives new dynamics to the discussions on rights, citizenship and gender justice in a qualitative new way.

We were sad to have to announce that two of the keynote speakers Maitrayee Mukhopadhyay at Royal Tropical Institute in Amsterdam and Alice Urusaro Karekezi at Rwanda National University/PADRIGU not could attain the workshop. The reasons for their absence were completely outside their own control.

The papers presented by the keynote speakers will be published by Sida in a volume of Sida Studies Series coming out in the beginning of 2005.

3.1 Naila Kabeer

Professor at the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), Sussex and also holds the Kerstin Hesselgren’s Guest professorship at the Department for Peace and Development Research (Padrigu) during the full year of 2004 and associated to the Centre for Global Gender Studies (CGGS).

Kabeer is a social economist working on interactions between household behaviour and the wider economy. Her past research included micro determinants of fertility behaviour, industrialisation strategies and their gender implications for labour supply and employment patterns in South and Southeast Asia. Areas of specialisation are gender dimensions of poverty; population and health; poverty and food security; household survival and livelihood strategies. Kabeer has worked with a range of
governments, NGOs and multilateral agencies on practical ways of integrating gender and social analysis in policy and planning. Currently she is working on research relating to poverty, livelihoods and labour markets with a focus on microfinance, social capital and collective action. 
http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/aboutids/fellows.html

3.1.1 The Millennium Development Goals, women's right and gender justice: a critical re-reading

This presentation is in three sections. The first lays out some of the constraints that women face in exercising agency within the private domain, and even more so, within the public domain. While such constraints appear to apply the world over, they take a particular form in societies in which family, kinship and other primordial affiliations continue to govern important spheres of life in both public and private domain, influencing the workings of the purportedly gender-neutral institutions of states, markets and civil society.

The second section investigates what the issue of gender justice might mean in such contexts and how it might be acted upon by those who have most at stake in ensuring that gender justice is part of the foundation on which definitions and practices of citizenship are constructed.

The third section takes up the Millennium Development Goals, particular the goal dealing explicitly with gender equality and women's empowerment, as a way of exploring how policies and politics need to be enacted if the current, highly technicist approaches to the MDGs are to be subverted in favour of more transformative ones.

3.2 Drude Dahlerup
She holds a professorship in Gender and Political Theory at the Department of Political Science, Stockholm University. Between 1987-1998 she was an Associate Professor at the Department of Political Science and Cekvina, Centre for Gender Studies, University of Aarhus. Dahlerup's current research interest is: Women in Politics; Social Movements, especially the Women's Movement; Sex Segregation of the Labour Market; Feminist Theory.
Drude Dahlerup is heading a research project: "Quotas - a Key to Equality? An International Comparison of the Use of Electoral Quotas to obtain Equal Political Citizenship for Women". For a larger audience a book, *From Theory to Practice - The Implementation of Quotas* will be published in cooperation with International IDEA, Stockholm.

http://www.statsvet.su.se/stv_hemsida/statsvetenskap_04/all_personal/all_personal.htm

3.2.1 Gender Quotas in Politics: Empowerment from above or from below?

In my present work, editing the first world-wide book on the recent global trend to introduce electoral gender quotas, I want to rethink the dichotomy of empowerment from above versus empowerment from below. If ‘empowerment’ is defined not as a process, neither as a result, by rather as a tool, one may ask if securing a minimum representation of women in formal political institutions through quota provisions might be a tool for fundamental changes in the position of women. On what conditions do quotas lead to empowerment and when does this measure lead to stigmatization and tokenism?

I make the distinction between the fast track with historical jumps in women’s representation and the incremental track, with gradual and slow changes. It took 70-80 years for Scandinavian women to obtain 30-40% of the seats in parliament. Women in other parts of the world are not willing to wait that long today! The incremental track implies that women gain power in civic society before formal political power (from below?), whereas the fast track implies that women with almost no power bases in civil society and little power in political parties (from above) gain 15-25-35% representation over night like in Costa Rica, Argentina, Uganda, India (Panchayats), Bosnia & Herzegovina, Afghanistan, Rwanda (48, 8%), see our global web site: www.quotaproject.org
3.3 Edmé Dominguez

Edmé is an Associate Professor (docent) in the area of Peace and Development Studies. Her undergraduate studies took place at El Colegio de México, Mexico City and at the Institut d'Etudes Politiques (IEP), Paris she got her PhD degree. In 1997 she became Associate Professor in the area of Peace and Development Research, Göteborg University.

Dominguez is lecturer-seminar coordinator at the Institute of Iberoamerican Studies, University of Gothenburg since 1995 and lecturer in International Politics at the department of Political Science and Economics, University of Linköping since 1999. Since the beginning of the 1990s she has been working on the social implications of NAFTA for Mexico and on gender issues regarding academics, citizenship and International Relations. Her project on women and citizenship in Mexico was financed by SAREC/SIDA during 1998-2001 and her present project is on “Women as transnational actors in the NAFTA” “Globalization from women’s perspective: transnational networking and view of integration among Mexican women regarding NAFTA”.

http://www.hum.gu.se/ibero/forskning/edmeforskning/curriculum.html

3.3.1 Transnational gender/class networking between the North and the South: overcoming diversity or reproducing dependencies in the construction of a global citizenship?

This presentation focuses on women’s networks as empowering local southern organizations regarding workers or indigenous women’s rights. What are the strategies and the lessons from these struggles? Are these experiences contributing to a new discourse of international rights? To a new kind of global citizenship? How is this networking taking place from differential power perspectives? What are the challenges that cultural and political diversity pose the construction of transnational alliances? How is this affecting internal power, class and gender structures within the South? And how are these structures affecting such a networking?
3.4 Muthoni Wanyeki

Wanyeki is a political scientist who works in development communications, gender and human rights. She is currently the Executive Director of the African Women’s Development and Human Rights Network (FEMNET). FEMNET was set up in 1988 to share information, experiences, ideas and strategies among African women's non-governmental organisations through communications, networking, training and advocacy so as to advance women's development, equality and other women's human rights in Africa.

One of FEMNET's advocacy projects focuses on African women's participation in, impact on and benefit from the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers. The project documented the lobbying by the Kenyan women’s movement around the PRSP formulation and conducted research into the reasons behind the failure of that lobbying to impact Kenya’s macro-economic framework. The findings have been turned into a training manual on the gender aspects of fiscal and monetary policy and budgeting that is suitable for delivery to civil society, the media and macroeconomists. www.femnet.or.ke

3.4.1 Rights based approaches: Strategic implications for GAD work by the African women's movement

The presentation will be experiential/practical about the value of the human rights framework to the African women's movement and implications of it for the gender and development approach to analysis and mainstreaming.

The endorsement and or adoption of the Human Rights-Based Approaches (RBA) have allowed human rights language to enter the world of development programming as a welcome and legitimate friend. Much has been debated about the merits and demerits of this development. Sceptical voices are arguing that the development industry has simply taken the high minded concerns of human rights instruments and moulded them to its own purposes and therefore, not much is likely to change in policies and programmes.
3.5 Sari Kouvo

Sari Kouvo, is a researcher and lecturer in international law with a focus on human rights and in gender and law at the Department of Law, University of Gothenburg.

Kouvo’s doctoral dissertation in international law and "women’s law" focuses on the development, content and implementation of the strategy for mainstreaming a gender perspective and for integrating women’s human rights within the United Nations human rights framework. Her doctoral research tries to understand how new ideas about equality between the sexes emerge on the international arena, and how the ideas change when promoted and applied by specific institutions.

Kouvo is also interested in issues regarding how to mainstream gender and equivalent perspectives into education. She participated in the establishment of the Centre for the Study of Human Rights and the Centre for Global Gender Studies at the University of Gothenburg.

Preparations are made for a research project about international, European and Nordic initiatives against different forms of sexual exploitation, especially trafficking in women.

http://www.handelsgu.webhotel.tripnet.se/item.aspx?id=3012

3.5.1 Women's Human Rights' or Human Rights to Women - A Legal Perspective

There seems to be something very empowering with the notion of “rights”. However, while claiming as individuals or occasionally as groups to have rights might be empowering, the empowering effect of rights does wear off in case nothing or very little is delivered by what some already call the “right’s industry” (Twining 1999).

I will in my paper discuss the 1990’s “Women’s Rights are Human Rights” discourse, asking what it has meant for international women’s advocates to phrase their claims in a rights’ language. I will also from a legal perspective try to analyze the international community’s responses to the claims of women’s advocates. Two main arguments are put forth in the paper:
(1) “Right’s talk” might open some doors, not the least those into the heart of the international legal and political system, but “right’s talk” can also close doors.

(2) The last decades “right’s talk” has resulted in much new knowledge and many soft law documents, political platforms and action plans, but the de facto legal advances have been minor.

3.6 Monica Erwér
Lecturer at the Department of Peace and Development Studies, University of Gothenburg and also a researcher at the Centre for Global Gender Studies.

Her area of interest is gender and development theory and gender policy. Central issues of concern are such as political restructuring, relations and negotiations between state and civil society, conceptualisation of power relations and the processes of empowerment, new social movements and social transformation. The region of South Asia, India and in particular the state of Kerala is of special interest.

Last autumn she defended her thesis Challenging the Gender Paradox: Women’s Collective Agency in the Transformation of Kerala Politics. The study is based on extensive fieldwork between 1999 and 2001. Eighty in-depth interviews with the female leadership of collective actors have been conducted. The thesis investigates gender and power theoretically by linking the field of gender and development with the debates within social movement theory. It builds a framework on the concepts of Empowerment, Agency, Political Field, Organisational Structure, Framing Processes, and Women’s Interests and Identities.

Since 1996 Monica Erwér has been networking with researchers at the Institute for Development Studies (IDS), Sussex University. She joined IDS in 2000 as a guest researcher.

http://www.padrigu.gu.se/presentationer/erwer.html
3.6.1 Challenging a Gender Paradox: From Formal to Substantive Rights

This presentation investigates a particular context in South India where women's formal rights and potential to full citizenship are present. The state of Kerala has attained a high gender development index, in terms of education and health. This social development has been achieved through a particular history of strong relationship between a Left-orientated state and an active civil society. However, despite the high gender development index, women's presence and agency in the political domain is nearly absent, what is here perceived as a gender paradox.

Against this background the presentation explores the emergence of a new form of women's collective agency in the civil society, outside the arena of formal politics. It investigates why this network of women's groups came about in the middle of the 1990s. Finally, it discusses how the network politicises the specific issue of violence against women and their strategies for change in terms of challenging the divide between the public and the private. At core of the argument is the importance of women's collective agency to claim rights and make formal rights substantive.
4. Group discussions

We found it important to put an emphasis on getting all the participants involved in discussions. Particularly due to the high level of knowledge and wide base of experiences that the participants held. During the conference, the participants were divided into four groups for discussion. The four themes laid out to be discussed were Gender Justice and Development, Legal Rights and Struggle, Citizenship, Agency and Development, and finally State, Power and Agency. However, we also encouraged flexibility and openness for other issues coming up. In the following, the outcomes of these discussions will be presented. Unfortunately, we were unable to retrieve information from one of the groups, why only three groups will be included.

4.1 Gender justice & development

- What can rights offer theory, policy and practice in terms of gender and development? And how?
- Where should policy originate from: below or above?

The discussion started off by discussing development policies, such as Sida’s, and that of women’s participation. The importance of including women’s assessment of their own situation when donor agencies are making their analysis was put forth. The group discussed as to whether these assessments could be easier to achieve by using focus groups as a start? Starting on an individual level might leave women vulnerable. Donor agencies must be able to support women without endangering their lives. Concerning the question of the status quo, even elite women may not be that willing to challenge structures. India was given as an example, where male land rights are not challenged, even by educated, feminist women.

In addition, the group discussed as to whether this should be seen as culture specific? Sometimes there tend to be an over-stress on cultural differences instead of asking what is human. It tends to be too much
simplification when discussing other cultures, without asking if Sweden is that different. How humiliating is it to be the receiver?

Maybe there is a need to bring together common problems, and common solutions, to see each other as human beings with much in common?

4.1.1 Gap between elites and grass roots
The gap between grass-roots and elites was discussed. In developing countries, the differences between the elites and the poor can be as big as the differences between the North and the South. The group spoke of the need for donor agencies to be aware of power differences – both in recipients, as well as in donor structures.

A problem that was discussed is that the link between exploitation of women in the South and the everyday lives of people living in the North remains hidden. Clothes were taken as an example where cheap clothing in the North has a direct impact on the production process. Working conditions in developing countries are increasingly harsh to guarantee the access to cheap clothing for richer countries, something which is seldom discussed.

4.1.2 Is the empowerment of women disempowering men?
A big part of the discussions focused on men and their shifting roles. Today, women are increasingly taking on the role as breadwinners as men suffer from unemployment. Structural adjustment policies (SAP:s) and the effects of these were put forth as an example where shifting gender roles can be detected. Furthermore, these policies are being shifted every seventh year thus making it difficult to work on a long-term basis.

There was a question as to whether the fast-track strategy could lead to an increase in violence against women? Could it be that the empowerment of women is disempowering men? Maybe we must look for inputs to empower both? In addition, the need to include men in gender politics and gender theory was recognised.
In regard to shifting gender roles, the need to get women out of the private sphere into the public was discussed. Furthermore, there was also a discussion on how this affects the private realm. How politicized is the private sphere? And in relation to the situation in Sweden - when women are out of the home, how do they to stay out? Even when women get access to wage-earning jobs, they still do most of the work in the home, leading to a double workload. How different is this question in the North and in the South?

**How politicized is the private sphere?**

### 4.1.3 What is the role of researchers?

The roles of researchers were discussed in connection to their role as activists - can they be separated from each other? How much responsibility do researchers have for the results of their actions in field work, and what happens when they leave? Again, how do we get to know people as people, not only objects of research? A problem was also put forth - could it be that we have a problem of making an impact due to the fact that emotionally charged researchers might produce biased research?

### 4.1.4 Power and empowerment

The concept of power, and how to share it was discussed. How do we motivate those in power to give it away? Could there only be justice for women if someone in power benefits from it?

"**How do we get people in power to realise what is at stake?**"

The power of the feminist movement (in comparison to the workers movement for example) was discussed. In relation to development it was discussed that feminism has somewhat been included in the political discourse of “the modern”. The financial dependency of developing states makes political pressure from the North an important issue.

During the discussions on donor agencies, some notions were put forth as being important for development strategies:
• Humility
• Ethics
• Recognition of power differences and positioning in the relationship between donor partners.

4.2. Legal rights and struggle

4.2.1 Substantive versus Formal Rights

The group began with discussing the importance to separate whether you talk about formal rights - laws or substantive rights. The group detected two different approaches to legal rights:

1) Formal legal rights that not necessarily leads to empowerment.
2) Legal rights as means for social discourses.

What are rights? - A tool, a disguise, a process rather than a fixed law?

Only formal rights are not enough to ensure that people can use their rights when needed. You might be able to act without formal rights and you can, on the other hand, have formal right and still do not act. You really need both to actually do something.

How to bridge between formal rights and lived realities?

4.2.2 How do you really change things?

The question above got the group into a discussion on Bordieu and the concepts of habitus and doxa, people are sometimes conditioned to be oppressed and therefore stay oppressed – what can break the circle? At the same time, it is wrong to tell others what they should want. The group finally agreed that change happens when someone, usually more powerful, benefits from it. The HIV/AIDS epidemic in Uganda was given as an example of having brought about major changes in customary law, especially regarding land inheritance or division. All of a sudden it no longer seemed like a good idea to only pass land through generations of men. Probably this could be understood as a case whereby individuals had
started acting outside the norm thus promoting change and the state having to enable and implement this change as a means of survival.

4.2.3 Rights as struggle

One of the issues the group discussed was whether or not it is always good to get written laws. Laws are not very open and flexible for process. The sphere of legal rights is often dominated by powerful men and sometimes it can be better not to put things into writing.

Once there is a law the negotiations can come to a dead end.

To continue on the issue of rights as a struggle it is important to identify who is doing the struggle and for whom.

Who ends up claiming ownership over the struggle?

Women, poor women, are at the centre, but are they recognised? They are not the ones who do the writing and documenting, but they were, are, there. Often the struggle for rights is fought by international organisations. The group felt that it is sometimes necessary to gain backbone for your strategy internationally or regionally for it to work at home. But is there a danger in that these international organisations are much more powerful than the people they are supposed to represent? Have we really paid enough attention to these international organisations and are we perhaps repeating history by enabling unequal relationships without recognising the power imbalance? When people get access to power, they are somehow assimilated into the 'system' and those without access remain excluded. This phenomenon can be applied to the North-South dichotomy, where NGO's and universities operating in the South are very influenced by the North. After going through such an education, a person might no longer be 'representative' for his/her 'original' group. The conception of 'Human Rights' can be one such example.

Who is accountable for people’s rights and who is it fighting for it?
4.2.4 How to act: Reality versus research and aid

The group also debated the gulf between the ones who suffer from discrimination and the researchers who writes about them in articles. One group member asked if researchers had the right to be empiricists only, don't they also have the responsibility to ask and try to understand why something happens? To say that this is a matter of racism is not enough, you need to explain why.

In many cases, it can be a good option to support local ideas about justice and rights in producing policy. A problem then is whose and what kind of ideas of justice to support? What are the power-consequences and the long term consequences? What is the bottom-line (e.g. is it really a question about religion or maybe about women's basic rights)? What can you compromise about? What kind of alliances can be accepted in the short term (even if it is partly against your values)?

The group agreed that rights is a very trendy concept in the development discourse at the moment and that SIDA does not always put their emphasis on results but focus much on assisting in creating opportunity to exercise rights in order to escape poverty. The group settled on that struggles for rights need to be contextualised. Furthermore, both states and local organisations need to be given support for a long term approach to be sustainable.

4.3. Citizenship, agency and development

4.3.1 To the question of quotations

The group started to discuss the 'fast-track' as a way for women to participate in politics and organizations.

Is there hope for less of women's adaptation to male structures in the fast track?
The question above is one of the arguments in favour of quotas. The presumption is that if a large number of women enter the organisation at once they are not likely going to adapt to male structures.

Some argued that quotation imply that you consider men and women as different where women are seen as representing a different group, especially in highly diverse societies. Quotas as a mean to attain equality could also be questioned. One of the differences in the view on quotation is whether it should be seen as bottom-up or top-down strategies. The group agreed on that they might be able to give dynamics to each other, instead of being seen as either-or.

Another question you could ask in relation to the different perspectives on quotas what happens when women enter politics via the fast-track. It seems that most of these women belong to the middle-classes. Who do they represent? We must realise that there are differences between women in politics on local and central level, both in class and the resistance they face.

4.3.2 The possibilities of global citizenship

There is a discussion between those who resist globalisation and those who do not see any viable options and think that the women's movement needs to act on a global level. The group recognised that territorial democracy is not sufficient to handle problems, such as pollution, AIDS and so forth. We are all transnational consumers and international owners. This is why international organisations are needed but so are also legal and formal rights, such as CEDAW.

The group was not very positive regarding hopes for global democracy. However, it is significant that social movements, such as the women's movement are able to organise transnationally across borders.
5. Panel discussions

During the conference, two panel discussions were held. In the first discussion, the keynote speakers from the first day formed the panel, and the second panel contained all of the keynote speakers.

5.1 Round table discussion, day 1

In the afternoon, there was a panel discussion to summarize the day. It started by giving each group some minutes to report from their discussions, and to pose questions to the keynote speakers. These questions were then elaborated upon by the panel.

5.1.1 A global citizenship?

Referring to the morning session, discussions had taken place around the concept of a “global citizenship” in the group discussions. Thus, the future of the national state and the possibility if such a global citizenship was elaborated upon. Dominguez argued that it is unrealistic to go back to the old view of the state. There will not be the same kind of accountability and responsibility. What kind of actor could take over these responsibilities? How do you, in practice, create institutions and laws that are broad enough to apply to all states?

A question was posed as to how the state can be strengthened against international organisation? Wanyeki pointed to the fact that there are already global laws, and we are somewhat not far from global governance. How do we go from there? The state is still the negotiator on a global level. Maybe there is a need to work both at a global, and a national level. She further stressed the importance of more women from the south taking part in the reform debate.
Kabeer spoke of the distinction between global governance and global citizenship. In practice, there is a gap between real global governance and a real global citizenship.
• Problems with universal application
• Gulf between being governed and citizenship

5.1.2 Rights as a strategic instrument?

How do we define rights? Dahlerup made some objections to the concept of rights in the morning session which was discussed. She argued that the rights in the legal sense are never enough to achieve gender equality. We have to use more tools than the concept of rights. Rights could also be seen as a liberal discourse, it seems to be the concept of today in a neo-libERAL era. However, she could see the strategic value in the concept of rights.

Kabeer argued that rights are useful since that are a way to challenge the way that social group has been positioned in societies. Further, that the concept means something to people on a grass-root level, it is useful to talk about rights. Looking globally, the right to a decent livelihood and to basic needs could in some circumstances mean that people have access to a job.

Rights as a way to challenge the way social groups have been positioned in societies.

Dahlerup argued that citizenship is often defined in the language of rights. The concept of citizenship as a holistic concept is a new phenomena. It is a paradox that citizenship has become so popular in times when so many people lack citizenship, refugees and others. It seems as if the concept tries to encompass too much.

There was also a discussion on how to use tools such as international treaties. Kabeer spoke of the power that these treaties hold if people are told that their government has signed them. There will be reactions. Someone pointed to the fact that these treaties and articles sometimes
overlap each other, and in some instances contradict each other, making it difficult to act upon them.

5.2 Concluding panel
In the concluding panel we invited the keynote speakers to reflect on possibilities, dynamics, and limitations of ‘rights-based’ strategies to promote gender justice in the context of development.

The panel started by giving all of the keynote speakers some minutes to summarize what, in their view, was important outcomes of the conference and what questions the conference has raised.

Kabeer put forward that most of the discussion being held during the days somehow seemed to relate to the relation between structure and agency, and on tools and instruments for transformation.

5.2.1 Concepts
During the conference, it became apparent how different concepts are being used, such as rights and citizenship. Why such different meanings of concepts? Wanyeki put forth the importance of naming these contradictions in order to be able to use them.

The concept of citizenship, it was argued, could be seen as a dynamic concept, referring to both a status and a practice. But how liberal is the concept of citizenship? The concept has been criticised for being a too individualistic concept. How does the concept relate to peoples experiences as group members? How do you bridge between group rights and individual rights? Furthermore, the concept of citizenship needs to be agency orientated to be substantive.

In the panel, there was a discussion on words, and on what power the usage of words holds. The discussion took place around the concept of dialogue and negotiation, where negotiation was said to be the strategy of the disadvantaged, whereas dialogue is a word for the partner in power.
5.2.2 Change

A lot of the discussions were centred on the process of change, on how change comes about and on what arenas the struggle for gender equality should be conducted.

How does change come about? Does change only come about when someone in power benefit from it? What are the different outcomes when talking about different strategies for change? As an example, what is the most feasible way: to use quotas as means for gender equality, or focus on a more incremental perspective where gender equality is more a question of capacity-building?

- Pre-requisites for change
- Process of change
- Staying with the change, taking the consequences

As means for change, the need of negotiations, instead of confrontation, was put forth. However, the difficulty to negotiate when being the disadvantaged partner was argued.

Whatever strategy is being used, the importance to see the processes of change as open-ended was recognised.

5.2.3 Levels for change

On what arenas should the struggle for gender equality be conducted? Discussing the potential of a “global citizenship” the role of the national state was discussed. In today’s world, it was argued, women need the state. Although recognising different areas for struggle (i.e. international arena), the state was seen as the most promising. It was also seen as the most feasible way to gain backbone for strategies for gender equality internationally, not at least depending on the way that the international political arena is structured (with the United Nations being a case in point).

There is need for a strong feminist movement locally, as well as on national and global level.
Dominguez talked about different strategies for change, where we can distinguish a state strategy, a global strategy and a hybrid strategy (hybrid approach) where the two are joint together.

The different interpretation of the state was also discussed. Looking globally, the state is seen in quite different ways. As an example, Dominguez talked about the construction of the state in Latin America, where the state is seen quite differently as it is traditionally lacking legitimacy.

There is a need to recognise the way that rights and reforms are negotiated, and the national setting in which this takes place. It is important to acknowledge the struggle behind reforms. In earlier struggles, Human Rights were not in focus of party politics. The exclusion of gender rights in struggles has traditionally disadvantaged women.

The problems with generalisation was discussed, concept such as the state and rights need to be put in a specific historical and socio-political context, something that feminists has historically argued.

Strong states, it was argued, is a prerequisite for the delivery of rights. On a state level, it is possible to demand accountability. On an international arena, who can be held accountable? In trade politics there is also a problem with accountability. In that sense, the state was seen as an important counter-weight to transnational companies. Further, it was argued that it is on the state level that we do find political will for change.

Is there a potential danger in focusing too much of the struggle outside the national arena, in the sense that the movement get separated from local struggles?

How can we reinvent the state from a feminist perspective?
5.2.4 Tools for change

Policy could be an important instrument for change. If it is a demand on a local level, policy can change thus the importance of agency to be able to implement rights and put pressure on policy-makers. State machinery and institutions for women (both nationally and internationally) was recognised as being important for being able to enforce policy.

It is significant to bring together theoretical concepts, knowledge production and concrete tools in policy for the possibility of social transformation. So that theory informs tools for change.

Regarding quotas as a tool for transformation some questions was put forth: What do we mean when talking about women's representation? There was a discussion on how we conduct the struggle for gender-equality in politics. What do we expect to happen? Is there only a change in numbers or is there a change of politics when women get in?

Kouvo spoke of how to bring together different mainstreaming discourses (in terms of Human rights). How can multiple mainstreaming be conducted?

5.2.5 Rethinking rights?

Today, to use the concept of rights seems as a strategically good idea. Kabeer took an example from work in Oxfam, where shifting from using the concept of needs to using the concept of rights was proven powerful. At a discursive level, the concept of rights can be used as means for talking about structural change and injustices.

Kabeer also made the point that the right to decent livelihood entailed both negative and positive rights. People need law and order, peace, security and access to justice to be able to carry out their livelihoods and they needed both access to markets and some degree of social protection in the face of market volatility. Rights can be thought of as 'hard' entitlements. She also stressed the importance of the capacity to act as an agent. There is a need to enable people to understand their rights in order to be able to claim them.
Dahlerup differed between *rights as a discourse*, and *rights as practice* (i.e. legal). However recognising the potential power of the concept of rights as a discourse, she argued the importance of not seeing legal rights as the only struggle for gender equality. She also expressed concerns that rights are a top-down strategy. Do you get rights, or take rights?

Why are Human Rights now being privileged over Mainstreaming?

**Finally**

We hope that the workshop/conference gave impetus to researchers to meet each other and that new spheres of interactions were created, and that already established contacts were strengthened. We also hope that it fed into breaking some of the unnecessary boundaries existing between academia, policy and practitioners. Some of the ideas and the networks might in the future even produce new research projects in the field of gender and development.

Many thanks go to the keynotes and all participants for your active engagement and two fine days!
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