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1. What this paper sets out to do

This paper sets out to (1) examine the nexus between CARE and social movements, using case examples of current programming in different geographic and political contexts, with an aim to review the challenges and lessons as well as opportunities for learning in other contexts where we seek to achieve impact; (2) propose an adapted framework for analysis of NGOs’ support of ‘collectivizing’ ranging from support to individuals, to groups, to woke collectives, to social movements, following the principle of CARE’s commitment not only to gender equality but social justice more broadly, as a core component of overcoming poverty; (3) Review the lessons about possible future actions for NGOs like CARE in supporting social movements as allies, in all stages of movement evolution or contexts.

2. Why focus on social movements in the development agenda?

*History shows that change happens with collective action*

Nearly every advancement in democracy and social justice has come from the struggle of everyday people to make their voices heard through collective action. Today, activists working towards justice within workers’ movements, women’s rights, food justice, climate change, and racial justice movements to name a few, are using non-violent collective action to achieve the changes they seek.

Movements are effective in achieving social change on issues that may seem intractable, through a variety of avenues. The collective drive of social movements has been pivotal in successful passage and implementation of many progressive policies, from issues as varied as reproductive health and services for survivors of violence to climate change.¹,ii Broad social movements have been instrumental advocating for and achieving more inclusive political process to include historically marginalized groups.³,iv In addition to creating changes in laws and policies, social movements have proven to be successful in challenging existing gender norms⁵ and creating and promoting alternative norms, for example, about acceptability of gender based violence and climate change.⁶ Movements have been shown to have an impact on increased corporate receptivity to calls for better corporate policies on social issues, and adoption of corporate social management devices.⁷

*What is a social movement?*

“An organized set of people vested in making a change in their situation pursuing a common political agenda through collective action.”

-Srilatha Battliwala, 2008

*There is overlap on change agendas when NGOs are committed to social justice*

What do development actors stand to gain from this collective push? Often, institutions within the development sector are advocating for the same goals, and realize that public constituencies are implicitly needed to push for broader change. Development actors can’t afford to ignore the strengths of collective action by organized stakeholders including those of social movements if we hope to promote and sustain social justice.

Activists engaged in collective tactics of social movements and NGOs engaged in the development sector are often working to promote and protect the rights of marginalized people globally. In some cases, even if it is not typically acknowledged, NGOs and movement actors rely on each other. At times, activists need the structure of formal NGOs to anchor some of the convening spaces and in order to secure funding and resources to accomplish their aims. NGOs need the energy and people power of activists in order for their
work to take shape on the ground. Yet, the academic and grey literature reveal that there is a typical divide between NGOs and activists who are part of broader social movements, despite natural synergies in goals. It has even been debated that it is impossible for activism to be accomplished in the “civil society industry” or the “non-profit industrial complex.” Scholars of social movements have documented a growing concern that NGOs have gone too far in the accommodation with their funders and with the government bodies which they frequently partner on projects. Activists critique NGOs for working on behalf of—and remaining accountable to -- those with money or power rather than those who are most marginalized. Concurrently, many NGOs distance themselves from movements because of the radical and often politicized nature of their work. Scholars of social movements have called this relationship, one of blurred lines and sporadic nuances, “surreptitious symbiosis.”

Sustainability and Impact
As development actors who have a vested interest in achieving impact along the indicators outlined in the Sustainable Development Goals, we should be obsessed with sustainability and impact. Yet, our current models for achieving impact through technical excellence and scale don’t seem to be working. Despite a concerted global push to ending poverty, we are not even close to achieving income equality; rather, the trend is alarmingly moving in the opposite direction. The gap between income quintiles seem to be increasing.

How we program reflects the narratives we repeat about our own role in a change process. Despite a robust industry-wide discourse in the last 2 years about the SDGs and inclusion of indicators related to gender equality, much of the development paradigms have yet to move away from the traditional charitable role of assisting those who are disadvantaged rather than helping challenge the structures that keep them disadvantaged. The relational dynamic of “us” and them “them” as aid recipient retains a colonialist mindset and rhetoric that centers the power directly with development actors. There has been an upsurge of interest and discourse in women’s economic empowerment that features a narrative of women as important economic engines for societies. This narrative often fails to reflect the patriarchal nature of economic systems that privilege some but not others.

A different model for development actors is needed for sustainability and impact that shifts the center of gravity of development away from plans that center control and power in the hands of donors and INGO frameworks and pivot more explicitly towards grassroots activism and ownership. Further, by focusing our development gaze at individual women as economic heroines, we as development actors have failed to see and support the promise of the collective action by mobilized groups to achieve structural change in the systems that are set up to keep them poor.

Models that target individuals or even individual organizations as our prime beneficiaries misses the historically persuasive argument that we could be supporting them as a collective, and organizing support and collaboration between organizations and between movements to provide impetus and leverage for sustainable change.

Building our own capacity for working with movements is essential for strengthening CARE’s organizational and social justice commitments.
As we analyze our ability to achieve our global impact of our program strategy, CARE must be increasingly attentive to and nuanced about the strategies of collective action, or ‘people power” in achieving social
change. Collective action is not a silver bullet that will solve all the problems of poverty. But we do need to look at our own capacity for collective action and social movements as a critical lever of change.

For CARE, building capacity to work collectively, including our own alliances with social movement actors is urgently needed. Building alliances with social movements can help multiply our ambitious impact goals by drawing on the diverse strengths of diverse leadership, broad base of support, and agile tactics that movements bring. CARE’s work on inclusive governance is a strong foundation to contribute to and build on transformative moments created by social movements to increase citizen participation, fight corruption and promote responsive governance processes.

**Incorporating CARE’s principles and values**

Addressing gender inequality specifically requires a different approach because gender inequality is a social justice issue, not simply a technical challenge. The mechanisms through which it and other social inequalities are addressed must be transformative.

Some questions for CARE to consider:

- What exactly do we mean by collective action and social movements?
- How do groups of marginalized people learn to undertake collective action to change policies or norms?
- What are the steps to reaching a state of awareness or political consciousness of the power dynamics used to systematically disempower and marginalize certain groups of people?
- Do we have evidence that our efforts to ‘mobilize’ communities to strive for improvements in gender equality, or inclusive governance, or resilience is either effective or efficient enough to ensure lasting progress?
- Is our traditional approach for partnering with local NGOs to implement our project activities sufficient, given the global changes we see?
- Do we need to widen our theory of change to include nontraditional approaches and partners for CARE, whether to improve our interventions for improved social cohesion and collective action as building blocks for emerging social movements, or for the skills and capacities of social movements in their struggle for justice?

**Civic space is narrowing**

We cannot overlook the shifting social and political contexts in which we work. Even as the gaps between rich and poor are increasing, the space for civil and social activism is increasingly at risk. An April 2017 report by CIVICUS revealed that only “3% of people live in countries where space for civic activism – or civic space – is truly open.” In other words, 97% of people face “serious threats when organizing, speaking out or taking peaceful action to improve their society”. Social activists globally are rising to meet the challenge and continue to press for social justice. Groups of marginalized people such as Dalits, or pastoralists, or domestic workers, are forming networks and movements to press for change in structures that provide a more level operating environment and equal rights and protections. Such movements are valiantly working to strengthen systems of inclusion and justice in both formal and informal spaces, whether the issue is caste rights, land rights, women’s rights or workers’ rights.

3. **Summary of key findings from literature on NGOs and social movements**

Academic studies on collective action and social movements can be found in diverse fields such as political science, social science, and international development, but much of the current literature on the best
practice and lessons of formal organizations as movement allies can be found in grey literature published by activists themselves, donors, and ally organizations. The short summary noted here is not a reflection of an exhaustive literature review but rather focuses on the key notes that might be most useful to CARE as it sets out to be a better ally to movements at all stages of evolution.

A range of case examples of feminist movements\(^\text{xi}\) shows that although the specific political or economic context greatly influences how movements evolve and function, people have successfully organized even under the most repressive conditions. She also notes that women activists have found ingenious and subversive ways of mobilizing even when the organizing space is limited or absent. Perhaps more pertinent is the finding that even in context where the environment for organizing is open, the opportunity costs for people suffering high levels of poverty makes organizing quite difficult.

In much of the literature on social movements, belonging to a movement means adopting or accepting the collective identity, arising from a common sense of injustice. This can provide a sense of broad solidarity even outside of one’s immediate social circle, and give confidence and efficacy to act. Others claim the relationship of a common collective identity to participating in social movements is not as straightforward\(^\text{xii}\).

Organizations considered as trusted allies with social movements are ones that have a deep understanding of the contexts from which social movements arise, including the nuances of felt intersectionalities. Rather than identifying as a “women’s movement,” women participating in movements around the world have cited their identity as their own ethnic or social groups, or the particular form or exclusion they are facing, such as sex workers, disabled women, and domestic workers. Although feminist analysis is common to many, the identity many have chosen to rally behind is not of women per se but as women workers, or disabled women, or via a geographic or political context such as South Sudan or Palestine. Further, newer feminist movements have questioned the familiar gender binary in any case, making it difficult to organize around the idea of a ‘women’s movement.’

A recent study commissioned by Rhize\(^\text{xiii}\) cites what activists see as key asks of formal organizations. These include: (1) Accompaniment (including long-term relationships, respect of autonomous agenda and decisions, and training/mentoring); (2) Connections to other activists; (3) Amplifying message through media visibility, (4) Flexible resources that offers ‘core support’ (for example, resources needed to accomplish outreach to its base of activists, leadership development, but not necessarily funding per se; and (5) security-related support (physical, digital, and legal).

NGOs and other purported allies to movements make some common mistakes. Some of these mistakes arise in part because historically, development and humanitarian NGOs or donors have a technical focus, without a justice frame of reference, with staff who may not have had a chance to reflect their own biases and assumptions, and who typically view local partners solely as implementing partners, via projects, maintaining strict control over timelines, budgets, and direction. These can be useful to note for organizations aiming to be movement allies.

Many tensions exist over issues of power and control. Activists and movement actors may be reluctant to engage with formal organizations because of this tension. Activists have noted that NGOs and other formal institutions often retain systems that perpetuate paternalistic or instrumentalist ways of interacting with informal groups, exemplified by speaking on behalf of others, not respecting the voice and expertise of activists, and not acknowledging and respecting the vision and direction of the movement. Development NGOs registered as independent entities with the government may be reluctant
to push the government for greater accountability if their own registration status is at risk, so activists may be disproportionately shouldering the burden of political risks or even physical safety risk-taking.

Other mistakes arise because of a technical focus that ignores root causes of injustice. Designing programs that ask activists to focus on technical solutions without resourcing the core business of overcoming injustice weakens activists and social movements. Splintering of resources and collective capacity is a common by-product of development or humanitarian programming, since most programs focus on changes at the individual level rather than structural change, or the strength of the collective. Most NGO programs focus on key target groups of individuals (e.g. “women farmers”) and measure change in those individuals rather than seeing them as a possible collective force for change if they are able to work together. It is also common to focus capacity and resources on more accessible institutions or groups in the capital cities, instead of the broad grassroots base of the groups which are seeking change. Choosing a few local partners for implementation rather than supporting the development of coalitions or alliances perpetuates competition for resources that ultimately does not support collective capacity.

It can be difficult for NGOs and other supportive ally organizations to support informal groups of activists with resources because of their informal status. The temptation to “NGO-ize” activists is a common one, much to the detriment of nascent movement groups. Asking groups of activists to shift from activism to a formal structure in order to become “auditable” will often derail the energy from one of a vision of structural change to one of institutional financial survival. Heavy reporting burdens also can derail activism energy and momentum.

Finally, there is a temptation among large support institutions to focus energy and support for specific dynamic individuals as leaders rather than find ways to support ongoing development of leadership and nurturing a pipeline of emerging leaders.

The literature also highlights where some organizational allies to movements have managed to successfully navigate the relationship and provide meaningful and thoughtful support. Many of these mirror the opposite of some of the mistakes shown above. These will be discussed further in the next section of this paper.

4. Frameworks for Analysis

This paper proposes a movement accompaniment framework using elements of eight themes that emerged in the literature review. The accompaniment framework reflects relevant insights from three frameworks proposed specifically by social movement activists for their own work. These movement frameworks were developed by authors who have provided thoughtful critique to NGOs that typically view partnership through a ‘local implementation’ lens. These are summarized below.

Srilatha Batliwala, a preeminent feminist scholar activist presents a feminist analytical frame of how different types of formal and informal organizations have provided support to feminist social movements. These include: (1) movement-supporting organizations; (2) movement-created organizations; (3) movement allies; and (4) service-providing organizations (such as health, legal, services etc.). Batliwala, like others, notes several obvious tension points between NGOs and movements, specifically related to power as it relates to human and financial resources, influence on decisions, and patterns of
communications. She brings a thoughtful critique of the historical examples of NGOs failing to support feminist movements in a meaningful way, because of their allegiance to donor funding, fear of being “too political,” and their tendency to turn informal movement actors into NGOs so that they can legitimately be recipients of (auditble) donor funding. Note that in Batiwala’s analytical frame, the relationship is one-way, organized to show how movements are supported but not how movements can help advance broader agendas of individuals or organizations.

The Miami Workers’ Center promotes a political analysis from trans movement organizing. This framework of analysis is presented in a paper by Rickke Mananzala and Dean Spade in a 2008 paper entitled “The Nonprofit Industrial Complex and Trans Resisstance.” In this framework, the authors describe the hard work of creating a movement that centralizes leadership and change processes embedded within a democratic, sustainable and accountable infrastructure that reflects the diversity of the movement and the intersections of identity and power within constructs of race, class, gender, and sexuality. This framework cites Four Pillars of Social Justice Infrastructure: (1) Power; (2) Consciousness; (3) Policy; and (4) Services. This framework was designed to help movement activists analyze the intertwined, complementary and essential roles implicit in social justice change work, which are often located in disparate organizations or groups, and thus useful for evaluating which organization is doing what and where collaboration and coordination is required.

The Global Fund for Women, a feminist funding organization to fund grass-roots activists, presents a draft assessment tool using an analytical frame made up of characteristics necessary to build and sustain a strong movement for women’s and girls’ human rights. The goal of the draft Movement Capacity Tool is to facilitate discussion within movements about their stage of movement building, their current strengths and gaps, and as a planning tool both for movements and for GFW as they move to implement their strategic goal of strengthening women’s rights movements. The tool includes seven characteristics essential to a robust feminist movement, shown in the box to the right. While useful to characterizing what makes movements strong this tool does not always provide enough guidance on how formal organizations might play a useful ally role to movements.

Despite the insights derived from these frameworks and critiques, there is no one simple organizing framework that helps us understand how and where INGOs like CARE can thoughtfully provide accompaniment and support to social movements at any particular stage of emergence and given the variety of political contexts in which we work. However, gleaning insights about the role for formal organizations from case examples in the literature, and the case examples shown in this paper, some themes have emerged. Based on the literature and CARE’s experiences, a proposed accompaniment analysis looks at eight themes:

1. Organizing structure and leadership
2. Autonomy and control
3. Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of a Feminist Social Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Strong and sustained grass roots base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Diverse leadership including next generation leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Strong collaboration among social justice groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Shared collective political agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Use of multiple strategies that are reinforcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Strong support infrastructure that includes strong anchor organizations and effective decision-making structures and communication systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Strong collective capacities of human rights defenders and their organizations to ensure their safety and security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Collective capacity include grassroots base
5. Safety and risks
6. Influencing Change: Policy
7. Influencing Change: Norms and behaviors
8. Services and resources

These are well aligned with the priorities shown in the Miami Workers’ Center Pillars, elaborating on some of the issues critical to the Power pillar (see box).

These eight themes can also be shown to fall roughly within the framework of CARE’s Gender Empowerment Framework of Agency, Structure, Relations. The graphic in the box below depicts a modification of an existing analytical framework for CARE, adapted from the one proposed in 2009 from CARE’s examples of supporting women’s organizing. This expands the framework to include collective action at scale, featuring components of agency, structure and relations levels. This modification of the original framework shifts the scale from collective action by a single group to collective action by social movements. In this graphic on the far right, one can see that CARE supports multiple groups that are organizing themselves to demand change on various levels (at district or national level, or even global) and moving to solidify these efforts through collective means or broad partnership influencing platforms. At agency level, this means a specific focus on promoting leadership within the movement. At relationship level this means solidifying social justice allies within and outside the movement and incorporating collective action across groups in tactics for change, including non-traditional partners such as unions. At structural level, it scales up collective action in government institutional policy, national and international law and social norms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Accompaniment Themes, Aligned with Miami Workers’ Center Pillars of Social Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami Workers’ Center Pillars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the proposed Movement Accompaniment Framework, institutions that wish to provide thoughtful support and accompaniment can consider their approaches to their partnership. The following matrix shows examples of ways that activists and movements have cited as useful:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Helpful Ways of Accompanying Collective Action and Movements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizing structure</td>
<td>• Adapt to structural forms as needed for the context: mass assemblies, unions, federations, networks, coalitions or ‘underground’ groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Avoid pressure to formalize or become an NGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Role model and encourage democratic, representative and layered governance and decision-making structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage systems for nurturing diverse and new leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourage/support systems of rotating leadership or term limits in leadership roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Power/ Control</td>
<td>• Respect power and autonomy of movement actors without imposing a specific agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Form relationships as equals, understand the context, value culture of the groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss resources openly make decisions together, transparently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hand over the mike, amplify voice by facilitating spaces where groups speak for themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identity</td>
<td>• Routinely facilitate political consciousness of systems of oppression in all programs regardless of sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitate political consciousness within own institutions, including Scaled tactics for changes in policy and norms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Modified CARE Continuum of Women’s Organizing/Collective Action

Focus on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUALS</th>
<th>GROUPS</th>
<th>STRUCTURAL CHANGE</th>
<th>SOCIAL CHANGE AT SCALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Continuum of Approaches for Collective Action ➔ Social Movement

Autonomous movements, with diverse leadership

Strength of networks, coordination with social justice actors, links with legal and other services

Scaled tactics for changes in policy and norms
looking at systems of colonial past embedded within own institutions (and offer to do this jointly with groups and partners)

### 4. Collective Capacity and Action
- Pay attention to the ‘glue’ that binds people together, facilitate spaces where this can be built (avoid splintering tactics)
- Discuss power dynamics, communication mechanisms, be open to operationalize a regular time for problem solving
- Hire people with deep understanding of nuance of context and realities, who can maintain long-term relationships
- Play a convening role, linking movements with other stakeholders and activists

### 5. Resources
- Creative, long-term, flexible resource support w/o being tied to specific outcomes
- Facilitate non-financial support (training, convening, travel support to events, media linkages) without rigid reporting and audit requirements
- Recognize the time and resource differential of activists partners; find ways to support travel, child care, loss of income when participating in joint events or meetings

### 6. Safety & Risks
- Adopt a partnership approach that is committed to sharing risks equally, be aware of political threats and be proactive about a mitigation strategy
- Raise questions about physical threats to safety, find solutions to offset threats
- Ask questions about unintended consequences
- Build in time and space for personal nurture and self-care, for example, offer space to reflect individually or together, perhaps yoga, meditation, or therapeutic healing options in meetings

### 7. Influencing Change: Policy and law
- Amplifying voice through various channels: media, spaces to influence institutional or government policy, international bodies
- Joint policy analysis
- Joint research efforts

### 8. Influencing Change: Norms
- Joint research and planning on how to shift harmful norms and behavior

---

**5. Findings from CARE’s Case Examples**

In order for an INGO like CARE to actually see the results of their work on social justice, CARE will have to find ways to strategically act as an ally with activists and movements. However, that work has to be done thoughtfully and authentically. These case studies offer a chance to examine where we have accompanied, or allied with, supported or nurtured the collective strength of groups of marginalized groups. Three case examples from CARE’s programming are presented here, examined against the frameworks for analysis cited above, with and some possible lessons for others. These three examples were chosen because they represent ongoing attention and work in regions or sectoral priorities and theories of change, and range
across diverse regions and contexts. There are a wide variety of projects and programs beyond these three case examples where CARE might draw lessons.

A short summary description of the three examples is shown below to situate the reader for the analysis that follows.

### 5.1. Niger: Mata Masu Dubara

At the current time, over half a million poor women in Niger have organized themselves into networks of linked groups with a common platform of solidarity and mutual aid, a common identity as Women on the Move, and a common vision for the future that places women on equal social, economic and political footing with men.

The evolution of the groups from a focus on financial inclusion to social and political inclusion should be of vital interest to CARE. It highlights how CARE’s strategic and long-term support for solidarity and collective action, along with a savings model of economic access to cash among marginalized women can show long-term results. Today the groups are operating in many ways independently of NGOs and government, and are seeking independent tactics and financing to continue to recruit new members and achieve their long-term political and social aims.

This remarkable evolution started as a CARE project in 1991 to enable poor illiterate women to have access to a permanent credit and savings system in order to support and promote their income-generating activities, and their economic autonomy. In most countries this method is now called Village Savings and Loans Associations but in Niger where it started it is still known by its local name “Mata Masu Dubara” or Women on the Move. Over a 25-year iterative process, CARE has supported the evolution of the groups from individual savings and lending activities to its current dimension of 640,000 women in savings groups that are acting collectively via networks and meta-networks called federations. The reach and successes and lessons of this evolution is documented elsewhere. (Synthesis Report of the Formative Research Political Consciousness, Leadership and Collective Action in Mata Masu Dubara, 2017).

The team in Niger is best placed to review their own experiences against the themes of accompaniment framework. However, reading the reports from Niger, some key successes and lessons can be identified. These are summarized below.

#### Summary of lessons based on the accompaniment framework:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Lessons from CARE’s accompaniment in Niger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizing structure</td>
<td>Structures remained self-organized and non-formal. From the beginning, the groups and CARE iterated to find systems that promoted diverse and new leadership. The MMD training curriculum emphasizes rotational leadership. However, given lack of numbers of women with literacy skills, some leader positions remain fixed with one person. Also, MMD is having</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trouble recruiting young women due to patriarchal conditions that restrict young women’s movements and actions outside the home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Power/ Control</td>
<td>CARE encouraged sustainable autonomy for groups. Leaders in CARE Niger emphasized decision-making by the leadership of the networks and federations; CARE has taken a back seat. Will new INGOs supporting federations do the same?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identity</td>
<td>The name of “Women on the Move” has proven a positive draw for women (but not men!). There is a strong personal identification with MMD. CARE facilitated political consciousness especially about gender at network level which some leaders have pointed out is the most important component. There seem to be a strong grass-roots base for poor women in rural and urban areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collective Capacity and Action</td>
<td>There is extensive evidence that networks and federation are promoting cooperative collective tactics across networks and federations, on behalf of girls’ education, women’s political leadership, reproductive health services and women’s work load. Yet there is still a question about how to connect across federations within Niger, and outside of MMD with other allies and stakeholders who are influencing policy and norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Safety &amp; Risks</td>
<td>Some physical threats reported. Has CARE considered supporting the MMD leaders to develop a system for monitoring threats or mitigating threats?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Influencing Change: Policy and law</td>
<td>Networks and federations are active in influencing local policy implementation and especially focused on local budgets. The urban federations are more closely linked to decision-makers at national level but unclear how much rural federations are able to influence beyond their own local administrative zone. It’s also unclear how CARE can best find a way to amplify their voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Influencing Change: Norms</td>
<td>Individual networks using creative tactics but there is currently no formal training or guidance / lessons on how to tackle norms change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Resources</td>
<td>Groups, networks and federations are mostly self-financed. CARE’s support for convening offered without burdensome reporting requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARE Niger’s leadership have thoughtfully reviewed and debated their role in the evolution of the networked capacity of the groups over the years. The most recent research study (cited above) shows that CARE Niger has made significant efforts to listen to the women, to support them where possible, and to be candid with them where they can’t. Initial analysis by the researchers showed some strengths in CARE’s accompaniment in organizational structures, identity, power and control, as well as collective capacity, there was less information available about CARE’s accompaniment role to share or manage risks. There remain some open questions about the future, including whether and how to organize a single platform of a confederation that unites all the groups under one governance umbrella, how to negotiate the increasing desire to influence social and political change while falling under the legal rubric of financial cooperatives, and how to support their aims to nurture and grow younger women’s leadership within MMD structures.
5.2. Latin America Domestic Workers’ Movement

Domestic workers have been organizing themselves in the region to agitate for protective policies and social norms for over 100 years; a regional movement began to take shape with the formation of a regional federation in 1988 with the foundation of Confederación Latinoamericana y del Caribe de Trabajadoras del Hogar (Federation of Domestic Workers of Latin America and the Caribbean or CONLACTRAHO), which now includes 23 organizations in 14 Latin American countries.

CARE’s Latin America regional office of CARE began to support the rights of domestic workers in the late 2000s, and over the last 7 years CARE’s regional team has evolved a model of accompanying and supporting the growing base and ambitious goals of the domestic workers’ movement. CARE’s regional strategy goes beyond institutional capacity building of individual groups in each country.

CARE’s regional team supported the domestic workers movement in a variety of ways: providing direct financial support for operational and representation expenses (equipment, office rent, travel, stipends, etc.); finding consultants within and outside the organization to support with the creation of communications materials; providing methodological and logistical support for meetings, trainings and workshops; and technical assistance for the development of evaluation tools, grant applications and action plans. Beyond tactical support, the regional team in CARE has prioritized and valued the affective, personal, and emotional needs of movement leaders and developed genuine concern and regard for the women with whom they work, feelings which are clearly mutual.

CARE’s regional team also saw the opportunity to use its position as a large NGO to create spaces for decision makers (e.g. government, International Labor Organization, etc.) to engage in dialogue with the domestic workers organizations in order to facilitate connections and lend domestic workers’ issues greater political weight. Alliances were also built with other NGOs, especially through the Mesa Regional de Acompañamiento a las Organizaciones de Trabajadoras Remuneradas del Hogar, which brings together CARE, OXFAM, ONU Mujeres, Centro de Estudios Ecuatorianos, FOS-Socialist Solidarity and Solidaridad Internacional.

In 2011, the International Labor Organization (ILO) adopted the Convention Concerning Decent Work for Domestic Workers (Convention 189), thus setting international standards for domestic workers. Over the ensuing years, national domestic worker organizations throughout Latin America made it a political priority to ensure the ratification of the Convention within their own countries and thus it is a primary organizing lens for CARE as well. Collective action by the domestic workers’ movement and their allies have already achieved significant results: 12 countries in Latin America have ratified C189.
This long-term strategy to find ways to accompany a social movement is not unique in CARE but represents a new way of partnering, pivoting from a more typical sub-contracting relationship with local institutions to one in which we enter the relationship as equal partners, finding creative ways to build the glue between institutions to strengthen the movement as a whole, emphasizing a long-term relationship of support that goes beyond financial contracts. One leader in the movement described CARE’s way of working this way:

“CARE has been more open [than with other NGOs]. It’s not just arrive and ask what the needs are, no, it’s about going beyond that: getting involved, participating, having our backs. I have been very impressed to see CARE working with us, not only with their technical ways of doing things, but learning our culture.”

The team in Latin America is best placed to review their own experiences against the themes of accompaniment framework which they have not had the chance to do, to date. In June of 2017, CARE invited leaders of the domestic workers’ movement to give feedback to CARE staff about their accompaniment role, and from that workshop report, some key successes and lessons can be cited. These are summarized below.

**Summary of lessons based on the accompaniment framework:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme:</th>
<th>Lessons from CARE’s accompaniment in Latin America</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizing structure</td>
<td>CARE supports the organizations as they already exist, and has chosen to try to build the capacity of the regional movement as a whole. But, there are so many diverse organizations, both formal and informal across the region, that CARE has been forced to make choices about which to cooperate with. The federation leaders shared their concerns about this, and knowing that resources are limited, asked for transparency about the decisions. The workshop report also showed a general consensus that more work is needed to develop a new generation of leaders in the domestic workers’ movement, and to support long-term/more experienced leaders in sharing power within their organizations. Can CARE consider taking an even stronger emphasis on supporting leadership development and leadership transition?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Power/Control</td>
<td>CARE has in many ways shown up as an equal partner, evidenced by tone, language, body language of CARE staff who show respect and understanding. Movement partners note that CARE staff listen and have stayed for the long-haul. There have been some occasions where CARE staff have over-stepped their bounds of communication of local leadership, but overall, are paying attention. CARE is willing to wait for decisions by the movement leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identity</td>
<td>By default of a common identity as domestic workers, there is a strong identity consensus among the DW movement, with some calls for additional acknowledgement and attention to minorities within the movement. CARE has facilitated political consciousness via opportunities for analysis of sexual division of labor without limiting results of the analysis to a specific technical problem. CARE has provided broad support including emotional support rather than focus on a specific technical agenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Collective Capacity and Action

One of CARE’s main contributions is to support opportunities to convene and learn and share from each other, as well as opportunities to craft joint advocacy plans together with other stakeholders. Yet, DW leadership has asked CARE to find ways to reinforce this collective capacity more broadly down to the grass roots base.

5. Safety & Risks

To date, there is relatively little discussion of safety and risks from the current protest and other tactics used by DW to achieve change. One broad recommendation from the workshop was for CARE to initiate discussion of how to share risk-taking (including on political advocacy) and mitigate risks where possible.

6. Influencing Change: Policy and law

CARE has to date focused heavily on analysis and shifting national and international laws related to ILO 189. There is less clarity on how to influence implementation of laws once national laws reinforce DW rights.

7. Influencing Change: Norms

CARE is just now beginning to examine a strategy for influencing norms and behaviors, particularly of employers; this area needs more support and effort.

8. Resources

CARE needs to recognize income disparities between CARE and DW activists who function in a voluntary capacity. The leaders requested that CARE consider in the future supporting leaders’ time and work sacrifices to participate in CARE-led activities and supporting educational and professional aspirations beyond domestic work. The DW are seeking a financial solution to their very limited time and budgets compared to aspirational goals. Consider seeking alternative funding models that provide support without excessive audit or reporting requirements.

CARE’s accompaniment role with the domestic workers’ movement showed some areas of strength, as evidenced by the workshop report outlining feedback from the DW movement leaders on CARE’s support of organizational structure, power/control, identity and collective capacity. As with the previous case example, there are concerns about risk sharing and management, from political advocacy at national level to threats to physical safety of the activists in the movement. CARE’s accompaniment of shifting norms by working on behaviors of employers is just beginning; more time and effort is needed. CARE’s role as resource partner has been mixed. The flexible budgets available for the accompaniment role have been very limited, and CARE has focused the scarce flexible resources available on the things difficult to find funding for: facilitating travel, convening meetings, and amplification of the voice of the movement leaders in external forums. It has been difficult to convey the importance of these activities within the broader organization that provides such resources. The leaders of the domestic workers’ movement have also pointed out that CARE needs to analyze and confront its own colonialist systems, structures and biases, and strengthen a more inclusive culture and practice within CARE; pivoting from an “us/them” mentality to just ‘us.’ The movement leaders have pointed out the opportunity costs they accept for working as activists on behalf of all domestic workers (almost all are volunteers working to organize in their spare time, on top of long days working at low pay). They hope to discuss the option of resourcing stipends for child care (or offering child care at events), lost wages, and other costs that movement leaders incur when taking days off or leaving their homes to participate in movement events. They note the structural
inequalities between their own situation and that of CARE staff’s NGO salaries and benefits, working for the same aim but during their work day.

5.3. Ethiopia’s TESFA Project with Adolescent Married Girls

In 2017 CARE undertook an ex-post evaluation of a project that supported married adolescent girls which was implemented from 2010-2013 in the Amhara district of Ethiopia. The ex-post evaluation was conducted because the intervention package was being considered for a scale-up across 7 countries and because multiple visits back to the project site showed sustainability promise: the married girls who had participated reported that they were maintaining their intervention practices of meeting together in solidarity groups long after the project had ended. The evaluation was initiated to document the extent of sustainability of a model that had established solidarity groups for marginalized and isolated girls, including how interconnected the groups were and whether they were initiating collective bargaining, or linking with other groups working on issues of pertinence to women’s issues.

This project was called TESFA – Towards Improved Economic and Sexual Reproductive Health Outcomes for Adolescent Girls and was designed and initiated with over 5,000 ever-married adolescent girls (aged 19 and under) in 2010. Interventions included VSLA and solidarity groups for girls, with curriculum on girls’ agency, choice and voice, as well financial literacy and reproductive health. Additionally, the project focused on community-level norms, via groups of adults who provided critical endorsement of the changes sought by the married girls. The final evaluation findings from TESFA interventions in 2013 showed strong evidence of positive changes in the lives of married adolescent girls, including in improved knowledge and behavior related to sexual and reproductive health, and improvements in financial skills, productive use of savings in household economic decisions, and confidence in economic self-sustainability.

These changes were accompanied by large gains in additional positive changes among young married couples as well as shifts in broader community norms that promise long-term sustainable gains. These include improvements among married couples, including improvements in couple communication, decreased levels of gender-based violence and improved mental health. Married adolescent girls reported that their opinion is taken into account when household decisions are made and improved sense of self-worth, mental health and self-confidence. Some described their intention to return to school, and some married girls began attending school again.

Ethiopia has a high rate of early and forced marriage. Nearly half of out-of-school girls cite marriage and childbearing as their main reasons for not attending school. The cultural expectation and power imbalance between a young girl and her husband hinders married girls from being personally, socially, politically or economically empowered. Making important life decisions, including those related to her sexual and reproductive health are nearly impossible. Access to health care, information, friends, family are all fundamental rights of every person, but rural, ever-married girls face additional barriers that limit the most simple options in these areas, making them perhaps the most excluded, marginalized and vulnerable members of their community.
Beyond improvements for married girls and their couple relationships, the TESFA evaluation showed shifts in community norms and expectations, including greater support networks for married adolescent girls, changes in views on the gender roles and expectations for women in the family and society at large, and the expectations for what age is ‘best’ for marriage.

The ex-post evaluation conducted four years after the completion of the project showed remarkable sustainability of the positive results. Almost all of the girls’ groups contacted have met regularly since the end of the program, without additional contact or support from outside. The positive health, economic and gender equality outcomes seem to be well sustained. This is confirmed by the health extension workers and the government officials. Some of the married girls have returned to school and some have even reached the university level! The researchers felt that the combination of interventions that promoted the empowerment of girls plus the formation of adult support groups to pave the way for changes in gender norms was one of the key factors to success, since the communities really supported the changes in expectations for girls’ mobility, voice, solidarity, and equality of decision-making and sharing of domestic chores and child care with their husbands.

Viewed from the lens of accompaniment of a common change agenda or collective action for social and political inclusion, the example of the TESFA project falls short in many respects. The group members’ vision for the future in promoting a wider set of economic, personal and social options and opportunities for adolescent girls is currently limited by the scope of each individual group; they are not in the process of scaling tactics for change at a broader scale. Furthermore, they remain unconnected with other progressive actors in the country who could be allies for their cause, such as the efforts of the Yellow Movement and others, loosely affiliated informal efforts by urban university students and professionals who are aiming to raise awareness and build a base of participants in establishing greater recognition of sexual harassment, GBV and other gender discrimination issues commonly faced by women in Ethiopia. In order to avoid suspicion and censure, these urban feminist movement actors are established either as informal entities or as for-profit consulting firms. As the latter, they are providing CARE with well-appreciated strategic consultative support in CARE Ethiopia’s long-term strategic plans, but are as yet unconnected laterally to the groups of ‘woke’ women living in rural areas, belonging to CARE-sponsored groups focused on financial inclusion.

Staff in Ethiopia are much better placed to conduct a formal analysis of their own work against the eight themes of accompaniment; they have not yet had a chance to do so. However some key lessons emerged even from the ex-post research report conducted in May and June 2017.

**Summary of lessons in Ethiopia based on the accompaniment framework:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Lessons from CARE’s accompaniment in Ethiopia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Organizing structure</td>
<td>The girls’ groups remained informally structured and functioning autonomously. Leadership turnover was not promoted; leadership has remained fixed, without new leaders emerging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Power/ Control</td>
<td>CARE designed and supported the training with internal peer facilitation and leadership. This encouraged sustainable autonomy for groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identity</td>
<td>CARE facilitated political consciousness especially about gender equality. But there is no sense yet of a sense of collective identity beyond the group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Collective Capacity and Action

CARE leveraged training in solidarity within the group, but groups are unconnected to each other, and the rural girls are unconnected to emerging feminist movement organizing elsewhere, and even the links to adults in the project (SAA Groups) became less regular.

5. Safety & Risks

The curriculum for the groups emphasized overcoming domestic violence and there is some evidence that domestic violence is reduced. Adults may have played a successful role in overcoming community resistance to changed roles for young women. There are larger political risks about organizing in this closed context that need to be thought through.

6. Influencing Change: Policy and law

Influencing policy is not possible in the current context.

7. Influencing Change: Norms

The SAA groups facilitated by CARE provided some impetus for norms to change, and some cushion of acceptability for the new roles that the married girls adopted as economic agents with authority, voice, and mobility. The girls’ groups don’t seem to be engaged in influencing change directly except through their own role modeling. Unclear which tactics the SAA groups are still using four years later.

8. Resources

Resources were embedded in the groups, remaining informal, without burdensome reporting requirements. CARE did not offer to play a convening role with linkages to other groups.

The lessons from this case example point to the challenges of incorporating lessons from accompaniment of movements into a more typical development project in an environment where there was no prospective goal for movement accompaniment, and where typical interventions for influencing policy are not possible and where organizing of any kind is suspect. Yet this retrospective analysis of CARE’s project from 2010-2013 did incorporate interventions for organizing a marginalized and isolated population successfully: the groups of married girls were able to continue meeting even after the project ended and continued their own political analysis of gender discrimination. The adult SAA groups paved the way for norms to change, which may have dampened typical backlash. They even successfully started some new groups for married girls who were not able to participate during the time of CARE’s original project.

CARE promoted the autonomous functioning of the groups and supported development of strong leaders, but without systematizing the emergence and development of new leaders. There is clearly a sense of unity and collective strength as a group, but the groups yet remain unconnected to each other or to other stakeholders in country with a common agenda. Project interventions included a focus specifically on domestic violence, and some girls report domestic violence has reduced. It’s not clear how other physical or political threats are being anticipated or mitigated.

6. Overall Findings

The case examples show three different points along the continuum of approaches featured in the adapted graphic shown below, using CARE’s continuum for collective action. Each of these is context-specific. In Ethiopia, where the project was never intended to facilitate collective action beyond the
solidarity of the group, the interventions fall within the second approach. Niger’s interventions evolved and iterated over a 25-year time frame to land more within approach three, in which groups of woke individuals are acting collectively to influence both norms and policies aligned with a shared political goal, yet their actions are not yet coordinated at a national scale; their influence tactics remain at their own, district level. They want to be connected to other stakeholders with a common agenda but the platform for doing so remains out of reach for the rural women. In Latin America, CARE has also iterated their approaches over time, and have landed now on an explicit regional movement accompaniment role, thus falling in approach four, aiming at social change at scale.

Comparing key areas of success in the case examples across the eight themes of the accompaniment framework, it appears CARE has been relatively more successful in themes of Power and to some extent, Identity and Resources.

A range of lessons emerge from CARE’s role in accompaniment of Collective Capacity and Action. CARE appears to have hired people with deep understanding of the context and realities, who were able to pay attention to the ‘glue’ that binds people together, and to facilitate spaces where a sense of common agenda and mutual aid (if not collective action) was nurtured. In some contexts, CARE has successfully played a convening role, linking movements with each other and with other stakeholders and activists.

There is more of a mixed picture in the themes of Organizing Structure. While CARE has succeeded in negotiating the complexity of working with informally organized groups, there remain outstanding questions about the challenges of systematically nurturing younger leaders.

With regard to Influencing Policy and Norms, CARE has provided more support to the former than to the latter. It remains unclear if CARE’s accompaniment has supported analysis and iteration of collective action tactics (marches, mass protests, dialogue with elected officials, etc.) in order to influence Norms
The theme that has garnered the least attention in each setting is that of safety, risk-sharing and risk-mitigation. This is an issue that resonates with activists and is one where CARE needs to pay closer attention. It includes threats to physical safety by activists who step into roles as leaders and change agents and who are role modeling a different reality that may be threatening to others. It also includes attention to the broader political context of threats to organized civil society by the state. Our movement allies are also asking about CARE’s role as ally in standing with, and amplifying their voice. In some cases CARE has been hesitant, due perhaps to a historical role as neutral humanitarian actor and perhaps due to perceived threats to organizational operations.

Using a color scoring system of green, amber, red, I would give CARE a range of scores across the eight themes of accompaniment but these are best coded and scored by the teams themselves rather than an outside observer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Collective</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Norms</th>
<th>Security/Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Other observations made by staff in the process of documenting these three case examples offer thoughtful insights. Where we see long-term success, there are long-term leadership in the country office who provide a stable vision for finding a space for iterative accompaniment roles. It is worth pointing out that our most trusted partners are those with which we have invested in the long-haul. It takes time, and it takes stable leadership.

In contrast, we still have operating systems designed for an implementation model that replicates our own organization (subcontracting NGOs) rather than facilitating roles and supporting informal groups, activists, and social movements. Practically speaking, we are struggling to find work-arounds for financial and procurement systems that interfere with an accompaniment role. More research needs to be done to document the work-arounds and whether these can be systematized in CARE, for our work with informal groups, activists and social movement stakeholders.

7. Recommendations

1. Leadership and political will are essential for systematizing the resources and actions needed to support collective action and social movements. Despite a decade of effort in moving from needs-based approaches to rights-based approaches, and further analysis of a program approach, CARE’s systems are still set up for the CARE of 20 years ago.
2. Expand the definition and discourse around “partnership,” to include an additional option for “accompaniment.” This shift in mindset and discourse needs to include critical political analysis of CARE’s traditional role in the humanitarian and development space, and to strengthen an anti-oppressive, anti-colonialist culture and practice within CARE. In this shift of discourse and mindset we need to pivot from an ‘us/them’ differentiation to simply ‘us.’
3. As a complex, diverse and decentralized organization, we need to nurture both activists and development professionals within the organization. Both are needed to find a way to facilitate and broker relationships between the powerful and those who are marginalized.
4. Similarly, our operational systems for finance and procurement need some more flexibility under circumstances where we are nurturing informal groups who are working collectively for
social and political change.
5. We need more thinking about red lines and how to balance our advocacy brokering role if we wish to set ourselves as allies to social movements and find a way to amplify the voices of activists.
6. Clearly, we need further thinking about Risk Management/Security for our activists and for our own staff if we move into the accompaniment role.
7. Many of the Regional Impact Growth Strategies are keen to explore opportunities for linking with social movement activists. One suggestion would be to include an analysis of CARE’s capacity to play an accompaniment role using the analysis framework of 8 themes, developed here.
Annex A. Social Movement Frameworks

Srilatha Batliwala

Srilatha Batliwala, the pre-eminent feminist scholar writing about social movements from a feminist movement perspective in a document called *Changing Their World* thoughtfully outlines a broad socio-ecological model of analysis for feminist movement actors. She differentiates formal organizations from movements, and cites four types of organizational relationships with movements and some characteristics of those types of relationships. Note that Batliwala asserts that all types of organizational relationships are needed; she insists that we not rank these, or give too much value or glamour to one type of relationship over another. NGOs like CARE are normally placed in the “allies” category in general. But as we shall see through examination of the case examples, CARE’s diverse experiences with movements can cut across these categories.

Box 1. Batliwala’s four categories of relationships of organizations to social movements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Relationships</th>
<th>Examples of Organizations</th>
<th>What is Provided to Movements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Movement-supporting organizations</td>
<td>SANGRAM, GROOTS</td>
<td>• Provide support for consciousness-raising;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>many women’s rights organizations place</td>
<td>• Mobilizing into an organized constituency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>themselves here</td>
<td>• Capacity building (leadership, advocacy, tactic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategic support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Movement-created organizations</td>
<td>Unions, workers’ federations:</td>
<td>In addition to any of the above, the following unique things:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Set up <em>by movements</em> to foster movement</td>
<td>• Organizing a movements’ constituencies into units and groupings that channel their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>goals to do the things that dispersed</td>
<td>collective power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>leadership cannot]</td>
<td>• Creating an accessible space where constituents can meet to analyze, make decisions and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>take action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Offering a mechanism through which movement members can elect or nominate leaders to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>govern and coordinate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Providing opportunities for movement members to advocate on behalf of the movement with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>external stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Movement allies</td>
<td>NGOs, UN, Academics, political parties</td>
<td>• Provide opportunity-specific collaboration rather than ongoing relational support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Service-providing organizations</td>
<td>Legal or health clinics, day care centers,</td>
<td>• Health, legal, etc. services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A second framework of analysis created by the Miami Workers’ Center is presented in a paper by Rickke
Mananzala and Dean Spade in a 2008 paper entitled “The Nonprofit Industrial Complex and Trans
Resistance.” In this framework, the authors describe the hard work of creating a movement that
centralizes leadership and change processes embedded within a democratic, sustainable and
accountable infrastructure that reflects the diversity of the movement and the intersections of identity
and power within constructs of race, class, gender, and sexuality. In this paper, the authors argue that
neoliberal nonprofits typically reflect colonialist mindsets and explicitly undermine movements by
splitting the delivery of essential, life-saving services from the work of political consciousness raising and
organizing among those who need those services. Similar to Batliwala, they also decry creating a cadre
of professionals who absorb the bulk of funding available for activists and create schisms and
competition for scarce resources. Yet the authors ultimately acknowledge that movements need allied
organizations which can provide needed infrastructure and space for network building, leadership
development, and sustained campaigns for change. The authors cite the tool developed by the Miami
Workers’ Center for understanding the roles of various strategies within social justice work, known as
the Four Pillars of Social Justice Infrastructure. This framework was designed to help movements analyze
the intertwined, complementary and essential roles implicit in social justice change work, which are
often located in disparate organizations or groups, and thus useful for evaluating which organization is
doing what and where collaboration and coordination is required. The work of the four pillars must be
well aligned. The authors are explicit that work of the three pillars of Policy, Consciousness and Services
is to serve the first pillar of Power.

Box 2: Miami Workers’ Center Four Pillars of Social Justice Infrastructure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Consciousness</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Building out membership bases (quality) and strengthening grassroots leadership (quantity). Shifting power to those without access to formal power.</td>
<td>Changing policies and institutions through legislative and political means.</td>
<td>Shifting public opinion and norms, including media.</td>
<td>Providing services that immediately stabilize wellbeing and provide urgent relief to the most oppressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the mid-2000s, CARE adopted an analytical framework for supporting women’s empowerment, called the
Women’s Empowerment Framework. An adaptation of this framework was proposed in 2009 for analyzing
CARE’s support for collective action during CARE’s Strategic Impact Inquiry on Women’s Empowerment. The
analytical framework examined the experiences of CARE’s efforts to organize women using collective action.
The original framework is shown Box 4 below.

Box 3: Continuum of approaches to organizing women using CARE’s GEF components of Agency, Structure, Relations
In the final analysis of the SII in 2009, most projects fell into Approach 1 and 2. The findings revealed that CARE often mobilizes women for CARE’s own project-specific goals. Relatively few of CARE’s program examples embodied the third approach. Few projects supported women’s own agendas. Some exceptions include the examples of CARE’s work with the radicalized garbage pickers in Cuenca, Ecuador, where the original project began with the first approach but rapidly evolved to utilize solidarity and collective action to push for rights of this marginalized group, and the work with sex workers in India. The SII offered further lessons in the programmatic examples utilizing the fourth approach of collective action to achieve structural change. In several examples of such as in Guatemala and India, CARE helped support women build collectives and gain a sense of solidarity and leadership to represent their interests; however, those women’s collectives were side-tracked from their original goals and intents by evolving into NGOs. Their momentum for building a base of support and tactics for attaining justice and social change was lost as they shifted their attention to developing proposals for donor funding and brokering relationships with donors.
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