lacking that capacity are simply further economically marginalized or disenfranchised. Another argued that 'the Chilean State has begun to work only with social pathologies'. Like many other neoliberal Latin American governments, it has recodified policies toward women by treating the structural and cultural consequences of unequal gender power relations and market-induced exclusion as though they were 'extreme situations'. Violence against women is thus seen as a pathological condition rather than as an expression of women's subordination; and while women heads-of-household have always existed, their 'situation' is now framed as a social ailment that must be cured to achieve 'modernization'.

Most feminists I talked with in Santiago were acutely aware of the problematic motives driving the burgeoning local capacitación market, but many also noted that diminishing funding from private donors and bilateral and multilateral agencies has pushed NGOs to increase their supply of training programs and other sub-contracted services. Indeed, the Chilean government's much-touted economic success story has led many donors to redirect funds away from local NGOs towards others in 'needier' societies in the South or East. And those agencies that still work in Chile now often channel funds for gender programs into SERNAM, which in turn contracts NGO services, while reserving some (relatively limited) funds to distribute to NGOs and researchers through grant competitions. Verónica Schild maintains that '[o]ften, NGOs are put in the position of having to compete with SERNAM for funding... As a result of... changing priorities of foreign and domestic funding, most women's NGOs, and indeed most local or community-based NGOs, are either scrambling to survive or disappearing altogether. Those that remain are increasingly dependent on government-funded programs to survive' (Schild 1998: 105). Barrig estimated that State funds today account for between 10 and 25 percent of the operating budgets of many Chilean feminist NGOs (1997a: 12).

In the case of Colombia, Barrig found that 'depending on the size and mission of the institution, as well as its technical profile, 40–50 percent of the budget of NGOs comes from State sources' (1997b: 10). In Brazil, this trend is as yet less accentuated. As of 1993, only 3.2 percent of feminist NGO monies came from Brazilian government sources (Lebon 1998: 267). But there, too, sub-contracting may be on the rise: diminishing international funding has also led many Brazilian feminist NGOs to pursue contracts with state and municipal governments. And at the federal level, the Cardoso administration's social adjustment program, Comunidade Solidária, has proclaimed a desire to work in partnership with NGOs to improve social services and provide job training for the poor.

While in cases such as that of Chile, donors' shifting regional priorities have pushed NGOs toward greater reliance on State contracts and consultancies, donors also have had a strong hand in the recent turn toward more technical, less movement-oriented kinds of activities in many countries in the region. My fieldwork (and my experience at the Ford Foundation) suggested that funding for projects centred on 'concentración' has become more difficult or where the NGO world has changed its priorities over time: The 60s and the green revolution, the 70s of oil, the 90s of economic reforms, and now, in the 90s, what prevails? (Reich 1995, cited in Lebon 1998: 276). They are well beyond the scope of the present part of the donor community confirms the impact and quantifiable project results. In national and even transnational 'policies inadvertently and sometimes reluctantly) and internal dynamics of many NGOs.

I am not trying to suggest that the with feminist NGOs sub-contracting the of government programs or abiding by measurable impacts or results - especially personal livelihoods are increasingly at populism that often pervades social movement radical egalitarian ideals to proclaim it into the audience to play specialized roles within. However, I am suggesting that the threat to de-hybris the heretofore-dominant feminist NGOs. And as I argued above, that up to now has formed the mainstay of contest pathologized versions of neoliberal perspective, advocate for alternative and promote gendered social justice into the

A GROWING CHASM BETWEEN THE TWO MOVEMENTS-ACTIVIST FACES OF FEMINISM

The competitive local and global gender shifting exigencies of international cooperation are difficult for Latin American feminist NGOs between movement-oriented, contestation-technical-advisory relationship to donor programs for 'at-risk' women or evaluating with a gender perspective still brings contact with the poor and working-class once their core constituencies. But the changing. Professionalized feminist groups present in Santiago's poblaciones or satellite training courses or conduct surv...
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found that 'depending on the size and its technical profile, 40–50 percent of the sources' (1997b: 10). In Brazil, this trend is , only 3.2 percent of feminist NGO monies sources (Lebon 1998: 267). But there, too, x: diminishing international funding has NGOs to pursue contracts with state and federal level, the Cardoso administration's sindade Solidária, has proclaimed a desire to improve social services and provide job

Chile, donors' shifting regional priorities xe reliance on State contracts and con- a strong hand in the recent turn toward nted kinds of activities in many countries my experience at the Ford Foundation)
suggested that funding for projects centered on feminist mobilization and 'concientización' has become more difficult to secure. The global donor community or what the NGO world dubs 'international cooperation' has changed its priorities over time: The 60s were the decade of development and the green revolution, the 70s one of solidarity. The 80s was the partnership decade, and now, in the 90s, what prevails is professionalism, impact, results' (Reich 1995, cited in Lebon 1998: 276). The factors behind this reorientation are well beyond the scope of the present essay. But again my experience as part of the donor community confirms this heightened emphasis on visible impact and quantifiable project results. In insisting on measurable outcomes and national or even transnational 'policy relevance', donors (however inadvertently and sometimes reluctantly) have helped reorient the activities and internal dynamics of many NGOs.

I am not trying to suggest that there's something intrinsically wrong with feminist NGOs sub-contracting their services as experts or executors of government programs or abiding by donors' exigencies to demonstrate measurable impacts or results - especially when organizational survival and personal livelihoods are increasingly at stake. Nor am I endorsing the facile populism that often pervades social movement discourse, which invokes radical egalitarian ideals to proclaim it immoral and anti-democratic for some actors to play specialized roles within heterogeneous movement fields. However, I am suggesting that the above-outlined trends increasingly threaten to de-hybridize the heretofore-dual identity of most Latin American feminist NGOs. And as I argued above, it is precisely that hybrid identity that up to now has formed the mainstay of feminist NGOs' critical ability to contest pathologized versions of neoliberal State policies 'with a gender perspective', advocate for alternative understandings of women's rights, and promote gendered social justice into the 21st century.

A GROWING CHASM BETWEEN THE TECHNICAL–PROFESSIONAL AND MOVEMENT–ACTIVIST FACES OF FEMINIST NGOS?

The competitive local and global gender projects markets, coupled with the shifting exigencies of international cooperation, may make it increasingly difficult for Latin American feminist NGOs to maintain the delicate balance between movement-oriented, contestatory activities and their expanding technical-advisory relationship to donors, States and IGOS. Executing State programs for 'at-risk' women or evaluating the effects of fashionable 'policies with a gender perspective' still brings many feminist NGOs into regular contact with the poor and working-class women's organizations that were once their core constituencies. But the nature of those linkages seems to be changing. Professionalized feminist groups are now perhaps more typically present in Santiago's poblaciones or São Paulo's favelas to administer short-term training courses or conduct surveys to assess the poverty levels of
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female-headed households. And as many interviewees noted, this has worked to distance feminist NGO activist-professionals from ‘las mujeres’. The movement side of NGO identity is being challenged by their contractual relationships to States and donors who expect visible, short-term results on gender projects. Such exigencies may undermine NGOs’ ability to pursue more process-oriented forms of feminist cultural-political intervention – such as consciousness-raising, popular education or other strategies aimed at transforming those gender power relations manifest in the realms of public discourse, culture and daily life – forms of gendered injustice that defy gender-planning quick fixes.

The technical-professional face of NGOs simultaneously has been foregrounded by shifting donor and IGO expectations and State sub-contracting. While the policy-relevant knowledge produced by NGOs sometimes has enabled feminists to mount credible challenges to pathologized gender policies, there is growing concern within the feminist field that the critical voice of the States’ privileged interlocutors on gender policy may be increasingly muted. Comparative studies suggest that ‘the ability of NGOs to articulate approaches, ideas, language, and values that run counter to official orthodoxies ... may be compromised’ and their willingness to speak out on issues that are unpopular with governments will be diluted by their growing dependence on official aid’ (Edwards and Hulme 1996: 7). Sabine Lang’s compelling analysis of the political effects of the NGOization of feminism in Germany, where the State has become the major source of funding for many feminist organizations, similarly suggests that increased reliance on State funding may lead NGOs to lose their critical edge: ‘If NGOs don’t want only to engage in social repair work, but actually want to change structural features of a certain political agenda, how successful can they be when they are dependent on exactly the structures that need to be transformed?’ (1997: 112–113).

Many feminists I interviewed maintained, moreover, that irrespective of their technical competence, NGOs that refuse to play by the rules of the game or whose discourses and practices run counter to the official orthodoxies of the day may be losing out in the gender projects market and are often silenced or marginalized from the public debate. Others further noted that, despite official claims to the contrary, less-than-technical criteria are too often employed by governments when sub-contracting services or hiring NGOs as gender experts: ‘the relationship with the State has been privatized’. When feminist NGOs are critical of the government, they are, predictably, less likely to get contracts or grants, which some claim results in a tendency toward ‘self-censorship beyond even that which the State requires of you’.35 Resource allocations and contracts are thus skewed towards those deemed to be politically trustworthy. Those resources, in turn, provide some NGOs with greater access to national and global policy microphones than others. Moreover, as Schild argues in the case of Chile, ‘vital information [about State contracts or funding for women’s projects] circulates in a network that is highly stratified and that has expanded to and other agencies, at the same time marginalizing the grass roots. These “popular” women’s NGOs are to survive’ (1998: 106–107).

Many feminists I talked with, including very NGOs most regularly summoned for its project or policy assessments, or capacitating growing bias in favor of particular types of activities. Some were critical of the increased NGOs’ while ‘the rest are not even consulted of NGOs would seem to confirm the bias of the field: ‘the popularity of certain forms of N funding, quiescent’ with donors [and, I would] widening rift between well-resourced social mobilization agencies’ (Hulme and I is increasingly in evidence in the contentious movement field.

BUSTING THE NGO BOOM? MANEUVERI GENDERED POLICY AGENDA AND REAR PROFESSIONAL DIMENSIONS OF FEMINIS

The most vehement critiques of feminist NGO a recent, relatively small, but highly vocal American feminist field who claim that women’s movement and ‘sold out’ to the During the most recent of the regionwide Feminist meetings or Encuentros, the seven Chile, in November 1996, Chilean autonomistas brought their scathing critique of ‘professi of debate within the regionwide feminist fi At the Cartagena meeting, the autonomistative and functional complements of patri gender technocracy’.39 Accusing NGOs of State,40 they denied the women they pejor institutionalists) membership in the feminism as NGOs, that is, as institutions ... are co We believe there may be feminist women little by little the institutionalized and te them.41 Others affirmed that these insti belong to the system and sustain it, an political instrument.42 This is kind of Manichean logic is beli the diversity of practices and the hybrid it
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identity is being challenged by their donors who expect visible, short-term agencies may undermine NGOs’ ability to of feminist cultural–political intervention popular education or other strategies aimed relations manifest in the realms of public forms of gendered injustice that defy of NGOs simultaneously has been foreseen) expectations and State sub-contracting. age produced by NGOs sometimes has ible challenges to pathologized gender within the feminist field that the ed interlocutors on gender policy may be, ies suggest that ‘the ability of NGOs to ge, and values that run counter to official ed’ and their willingness ‘to speak out on comments will be diluted by their growing rds and Hulme 1996: 7). Sabine Lang’s effects of the NGOization of feminism in one the major source of funding for many suggests that increased reliance on State critical edge: ‘If NGOs don’t want only to actually want to change structural features successful can they be when they are es that need to be transformed?’ (1997: 
ainstained, moreover, that irrespective of that refuse to play by the rules of the game run counter to the official orthodoxies he gender projects market and are often public debate. Others further noted that, rary, less-than-technical criteria are too when sub-contracting services or hiring nship with the State has been privatized’. he government, they are, predictably, less which some claim results in a tendency n that which the State requires of you’ are thus skewed towards those deemed to sources, in turn, provide some NGOs with global policy microphones than others. se of Chile, ‘vital information [about State projects] circulates in a network that is highly stratified and that has expanded to women in government ministries and other agencies, at the same time marginalizing others who are closer to the grass roots. These “popular” women’s NGOs are quite literally struggling to survive’ (1998: 106–107).

Many feminists I talked with, including activist-professionals from the very NGOs most regularly summoned for State or IGO gender consultancies, project or policy assessments, or capacitación, seemed acutely aware of this growing bias in favor of particular types of feminist organizations and activities. Some were critical of the increased ‘valorization of institutionalized NGOs’ while ‘the rest are not even consulted’. Recent scholarly analyses of NGOs would seem to confirm the bias perceived by many in the feminist field: ‘the popularity of certain forms of NGOs (large, able to absorb donor funding, quiescent) with donors [and, I would add, local States] may lead to a widening rift between well-resourced service providers and poorly-funded social mobilization agencies’ (Hulme and Edwards 1997b: 281). Such a rift is increasingly in evidence in the contemporary Latin American feminist movement field.

BUSTING THE NGO BOOM? MANEUVERING WITHIN THE NEW GENDERED POLICY AGENDA AND REARTICULATING THE ACTIVIST AND PROFESSIONAL DIMENSIONS OF FEMINIST NGOs

The most vehement critics of feminist NGOs are the feministas autónomas—a recent, relatively small, but highly vocal political current within the Latin American feminist field who claim that NGOs have ‘institutionalized’ the women’s movement and ‘sold out’ to the forces of ‘neoliberal patriarchy’. During the most recent of the regionwide Latin American and Caribbean Feminist meetings or Encuentros, the seventh since 1981, held in Cartagena, Chile, in November 1996, Chilean autónomas who organized the gathering brought their scathing critique of ‘professionalized feminism’ into the center of debate within the regionwide feminist field.

At the Cartagena meeting, the autónomas proclaimed NGOs to be ‘decorative and functional complements of patriarchal policies’ who constitute a ‘gender technocracy’. Accusing NGOs of having ‘indecent relations with the State’, they denied the women they pejoratively dub ‘las institucionales’ (the institutionalists) membership in the feminist fold: ‘we do not think that NGOs as NGOs, that is, as institutions . . . are constitutive parts of the movement. We believe there may be feminist women working in these institutions but little by little the institutionalized and technocratic tendencies will destroy them.’ Others affirmed ‘that these institutions are not neutral, that they belong to the system and sustain it, and that money thereby becomes a political instrument.’

This is kind of Manichean logic is belied by the heterogeneity of origins, the diversity of practices and the hybrid identity that still characterizes many
feminist NGOs, most of whose members are quite self-consciously grappling with some of the very contradictions so vehemently condemned by the autónomas. Indeed, many women the autónomas identified with ‘institutionalized feminism’ expressed concern that ‘the women’s movement’s agenda is becoming indistinguishable from that of the government.’ Others even echoed their radical critics’ claim that some feminist institutions were ‘being functional as NGOs; it’s not good or bad, it’s just a reality. But we must ask ourselves, functional to an agenda constructed by whom?’

Most expressed an urgent need to reassess their current practices as feminists, to rearticulate the two faces of NGOs’ heretofore dual identity. Still, many were distressed that the weight of the New Gender Policy Agenda was forcing NGOs to privilege technical-advocacy activities and to neglect other dimensions of ‘movement work’ so central to feminist visions of social transformation shared by most NGOers and others in the feminist field.

I would submit, by way of conclusion, that feminist NGOs are hardly doomed to become a part of what some critics have dubbed the ‘anti-politics machine’ of development (Ferguson 1994) or the ‘community face of neoliberalism’ (Petras 1997). Blanket assessments of feminist NGOs as handmaidens of neoliberal planetary patriarchy, as the autónomas would have it, fail to capture the ambiguities and variations in both the local implementation of the New Gender Policy Agenda and in and among NGOs themselves.

Such variations would surely influence just how much room may be available for NGOs to maneuver within the confines of the restructured late modern, post-transition, and post-Beijing terrain of local and global gender politics. The extent to which NGOs’ contractual relationship to the State constrains their critical capacity, for instance, is likely to vary in different global and local political conjunctures and according to the specific characteristics of local States. Barrig’s findings (1997) suggest that Colombian NGOs’ autonomy seems to have been significantly less compromised, despite a growing dependence on State funding, in large part due to the Colombian State’s own lack of institutionalization and consequent lack of disciplinary or regulatory capacities. The highly institutionalized, legalistic, and rigorously disciplinary contemporary Chilean State, by contrast, may more narrowly constrain NGOs’ ability to advocate for more feminist gender policies and sustain a dual identity while doing business with the government.

To enhance their room for maneuver (or jogo de cintura, as the Brazilians might put it – loosely translated as ‘swing of the hips’), however, feminists would have to devise collective strategies to resist the de-hybridization of NGOs and enable them perhaps to serve as more genuine intermediaries for larger civil society constituencies. To attain both goals, NGOs would have to reaffirm their commitment to widely consulting other actors in the feminist field when they themselves are tapped for policy assessments or project administration by governments and IGOS. Beyond the token policy seminar, this might entail NGO involvement in the establishment or revitalization of ongoing public forums open to the full range of actors in the feminist movement field and their democratic allies. I interviewed expressed an urgent need for which feminists of all stripes could regular ‘politics with a gender perspective’, den regard their State-contracted and donor-reinvented more transgressive public interest the policy realm and thereby help revital. Towards the end of the 1990s, some local fees and Tristan in Lima, had begun investing new such spaces.

In navigating the inevitably muddy w politics, many NGO activist-professionals s retain a dual identity while doing business ‘proyectos puntuales’ (punctual or specific) is imperative for feminists to continually contractual and political relationship with rigid, ‘principled’ positions a priori. Succe ‘cintura’, however, would be more feasible gendered citizenship claims and count on society within and without the feminist f alone’ in local and global gender project suggested, would require enhanced horiz larger feminist field and to popular women
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ad IGOs. Beyond the token policy seminar,
ent in the establishment or revitalization
to the full range of actors in the feminist
movement field and their democratic allies in civil society. Most feminists
I interviewed expressed an urgent need for more regularized public spaces in
which feminists of all stripes could regularly debate and critique prevailing
'policies with a gender perspective', demand accountability from NGOs'
regarding their State-contracted and donor-funded projects, and perhaps even
(re)invent more transgressive public interventions that would move beyond
the policy realm and thereby help revitalize the movement face of NGOs.
Towards the end of the 1990s, some local feminist NGOs, like the Centro Flora
Tristan in Lima, had begun investing renewed energies in revitalizing just
such spaces.
In navigating the inevitably muddy waters of neoliberal State gender
politics, many NGO activist-professionals suggested that it is still possible to
retain a dual identity while doing business with particular governments on
'proyectos puntuales' (punctual or specific projects). But many insisted that it
is imperative for feminists to continually evaluate and interrogate their
contractual and political relationship with official arenas rather than adopt
rigid, 'principled' positions a priori. Successfully negotiating such 'jogos de
cintura', however, would be more feasible if NGOs can invoke collective
gendered citizenship claims and count on the support of other sectors of civil
society within and without the feminist field than when they try to 'go it
alone' in local and global gender projects markets. This, many women
suggested, would require enhanced horizontal NGO accountability to the
larger feminist field and to popular women's movement constituencies.
Many also expressed a pressing need for NGOs to devise ways of
negotiating collectively with States and donors, not just about resources and
time-lines for projects, but also to secure longer-term programmatic lines
of action and set more movement-oriented project priorities. Funding agencies
and government bureaucrat's alike too often simply 'expect contracted outputs
to be achieved and are less interested in a learning process. ... Time and
space for reflection may be reduced ...' (Edwards and Hulme 1996: 7). As
public advocates for women's citizenship, feminist NGOs rightfully might also
insist that donors and State officials allow them the political space to more
thoroughly and meaningfully involve broader sectors of movement and civil
society constituencies in their technical evaluations of gender policies and
programs, allowing them more time for consultation, genuine interlocution,
and critical reflection than impact- or results-driven project timetables
typically permit. Such measures might help draw a clearer political line
between feminist NGOs established to pursue the public interest and private
consulting enterprises or individuals who market their policy expertise,
thereby enabling NGOs to serve as more effective intermediaries of the
societal constituencies which governments claim they want NGOs to
represent.
Finally, those of us in the North who consider ourselves part of the
so-called 'global women's movement' could take IGOs, Northern States and
donors to task on their professed intention to promote a 'thriving civil society'
that would foster gender equity and expand democratization in Latin America. If as my findings and other critical studies suggest, donors have had a strong hand in skewing the feminist movement field toward more technical-professional endeavors, then they might surely tilt the scales at least a bit more in the other direction. Those of us who are social scientists and area specialists could summon our own 'technical expertise' to argue that increased NGO involvement in social service delivery, project execution, and policy assessment does not exhaust their potential contributions to 'strengthening civil society'. Establishing funding criteria that would strengthen rather than obstruct Latin American feminist NGOs' historically hybrid political identities and enhance their ability to be more genuine intermediaries would surely be a step in the right direction.
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Notes

1 An earlier version of this paper was prepared for presentation as the Fourth Annual Schomburg-Moreno Lecture, sponsored by the Latin American Studies Program, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, MA, 2 March 1998. I also was extremely fortunate to be able to debate some of the findings and ideas presented here with Latin American feminist activists and scholars — many of whom I'd interviewed for my study — in workshops at the Universidad de Chile in Santiago (April 1998), the Universidad Nacional de Colombia (May 1998), and the Universidade de São Paulo (August 1998). I am grateful for their invaluable feedback and challenging critiques which helped me refine the present argument. I also wish to thank Claudia de Lima Costa, Maruja Barrig, Vera Soares, Magdalena León, Marcela Rios Tobar, Elizabeth Friedman, Gwendolyn Mink, Natalie Lebon, Peter Houtzinger, and Isbell Gruhn for their incisive comments on earlier versions of this text, and the two anonymous reviewers for lJFP for their helpful suggestions for revision. All errors of fact or interpretation are, of course, my own.

2 I use the term institutionalization in the Weberian sense to denote the rationalization and routinization of an organization's procedures and norms.


4 Ferree and Martin similarly argue that formal feminist organizations or organizations in the US 'are an amalgam, a blend of institutionalized and social movement practices' (1995: 7–8). For a compelling analysis of the hybrid character

of feminist NGOs and the most comprehensive feminist NGOs to date, see Lebon (1998).


6 Research in Chile, Peru, and Colombia during of a commissioned study supported by a grant and Southern Cone Office in Santiago de Augusto Varas for their helpful insights and politics and Mireya Díaz and Loló Villamizar in Santiago, Santa Fé de Bogotá, Santiago gratitude to my collaborator on this project Barrig, is immeasurable. Maruja generously of archival materials on Peruvian, Chilean, and on everything from the weather in Cali to ri maximized the insights I was able to glean from various sites. Marcela Rios, Elizabeth Guerre and Magdalena León and Jennifer Newton both orienting me to the field and making intellectually and culturally enriching. Claudia de Lima thanks for providing 'spatial' and intellectual for me in Florianópolis, Brazil, while I intern on this project. With the support of the UCSC further interviews with feminists in the Brazil and Porto Alegre between July and September grateful to the feminist movement activists and interviews or otherwise gave graciously of their time

7 The ideas contained in this essay, of course reflect those of the Ford Foundation.

8 In her analysis of contemporary feminisms in movements operate within political fields and particular distributions of power. She thought of as a structured, unequal, and social which organizations are embedded and which constantly respond (1999: 5, emphasis in (see Alvarez 1998, 1997b), movements the sense: they construct alternative publics politics and cultural-political meanings and in relation to which people who identify in a wide range of social and political space identities and practices.

9 Ferree and Martin (1995a, 1995b) make a sit of institutionalized feminist organizations in

10 In a survey of 97 Mexican women's NGOs of participants have B.A. degrees (licenciatura studies, and 12% have high school degrees' Brazil and Colombia — Black feminists have
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feminist NGOs to date, see Lebon (1998).
6 Research in Chile, Peru, and Colombia during July and August 1997 formed part
of a commissioned study supported by a grant from the Ford Foundation – Andean
and Southern Cone Office in Santiago de Chile. I thank Bonnie Shepard and
Augusto Varas for their helpful insights and suggestions about local feminist
politics and Mireya Díaz and Loló Villamizar for their invaluable logistical support
in Santiago, Santa Fé de Bogotá, Santiago de Cali, and Medellín. My debt of
gratitude to my collaborator on this project, Peruvian feminist scholar, Maruja
Barrig, is immeasurable. Maruja generously shared her extensive contacts with and
archival materials on Peruvian, Chilean, and Colombian feminists and advised me
on everything from the weather in Cali to research and interview strategies that
maximized the insights I was able to glean from my brief research trips to these
various sites. Marcela Rios, Elizabeth Guerrero, and Ruben González in Santiago
and Magdalena León and Jennifer Newton in Bogotá deserve special thanks for
both orienting me to the field and making my fieldwork experience both person-
ally and culturally enriching. Claudia de Lima Costa similarly deserves particular
thanks for providing ‘spiritual’ and intellectual support and a welcoming home base
for me in Florianópolis, Brazil, while I intermittently scrabbled about the continent
on this project. With the support of the UCSC Social Sciences Division, I conducted
further interviews with feminists in the Brazilian cities of Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo,
and Porto Alegre between July and September of 1998. I am, as always, deeply
grateful to the feminist movement activists and NGO professionals who conceded
interviews or otherwise gave graciously of their time to this project.
7 The ideas contained in this essay, of course, are my own and do not necessarily
reflect those of the Ford Foundation.
8 In her analysis of contemporary feminisms in India, Raka Ray argues that women's
movements operate within political fields shaped by distinctive political cultures
and particular distributions of power. She maintains that ‘a political field can be
thought of as a structured, unequal, and socially constructed environment within
which organizations are embedded and to which organizations and activists
constantly respond’ (1999: 6, emphasis in the original). In my own conception
(see Alvarez 1998, 1997b), movements themselves constitute fields in a similar
sense: they construct alternative publics in which particular ‘ways of doing
politics’ and cultural-political meanings are fashioned and continually contested
and in relation to which people who identify with the movement and are situated
in a wide range of social and political spaces constantly renegotiate their political
identities and practices.
9 Ferree and Martin (1995a, 1995b) make a similar point regarding the contributions
of institutionalized feminist organizations to the US women's movement.
10 In a survey of 97 Mexican women's NGOs, María Luisa Tarrés found that '81%
participants have B.A. degrees (licenciatura), 4% have master's or doctoral
studies, and 12% have high school degrees' (1997: 28). In some countries – such as
Brazil and Colombia – Black feminists have increasingly formed NGOs as well.
11 Interview 35, Lima, Peru, 19 August, 1997. Not all NGO professionals interviewed, however, shared in this hybrid identity. Some understood NGOs as providing 'a critical voice of a technical and professional character that contributes to the movement'. Interview 10, Santiago de Chile, 10 July, 1997.

12 I thank Maruja Barrig for suggesting that I emphasize and elaborate upon local variations in rates and degrees of NG0ization in distinct national feminist fields.


16 Interview 45, Santa Fé de Bogotá, Colombia, 22 August, 1997.

17 Interview 4, Santiago de Chile, 8 July, 1997.

18 Interview 17, Santiago de Chile, 11 July 1997.


21 Interviews BR 98-6 and 7, São Paulo, Brazil, 1 September 1998; Interview BR 98-8, 3 September, 1998.


23 Interview 34, Lima, Peru, 16 August, 1997.

24 Interview 1, Santiago de Chile, 8 July, 1997.


28 Interview 20, Santiago de Chile, 14 July 1997.


33 During one of our several working sessions in Lima in August of 1997, Maruja Barrig attributed the first part of this formulation to a Chilean feminist NGO researcher; I owe the latter insight regarding the recodification of gender policies to Maruja.


35 Interview 34, Lima, Peru, 16 August, 1997.

36 Interview 13, Santiago de Chile, 10 July, 1997.

37 Interviews 33, 5, 26 and 32, Santiago de Chile, July 1997.

38 Long-brewing tensions surrounding the growing NGOization and institutionalization of feminisms in the region came to a head during the VII Encuentro.
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The regional Encuentros had always served as ‘historical markers, highlighting
the strategic, organizational, and theoretical debates that have characterized the
political trajectory of contemporary Latin American feminisms’ (Sternbach et al.
1992: 208). And this one proved to be a veritable watershed, giving rise to three
distinctive, and seemingly antagonistic, political currents or tendencies within
the Latin American feminist field: the feministas autónomas, those pejoratively
dubbed the ‘feministas institucionales’ by their autónoma foes, and a third
grouping (encompassing the vast majority of Encuentro participants) who
provocatively referred to themselves as ‘Ni Las Unas, Ni Las Otras’ (‘neither one
nor the other’). On the debates triggered by the Encuentro, see special issues of
Cotidiano Mujer (Uruguay), nos. 22 (May 1996) and 23 (March 1997); Enfoque
Feminista (Brasil), No. 10, Ano VI (May 1997); Brujas (Argentina), 16, 24 (March
1997); and Feminindia (Argentina), 10, 19 (June 1997) and Oela Mauléón (1998).

39 Speech delivered at the VII Latin American and Caribbean Feminist Encuentro,
Cartagena, Chile, November 1996.

40 In her presentation on the dynamics of the VII Encuentro on a panel on ‘Feminist
NGOs and Global Civil Society: Critical Perspectives’, at the 1997 Congress of the
Latin American Studies Association, Guadalajara, Mexico, April 19–21, feminist
historian, Marysa Navarro, aptly captured in this interpretive phrase the often
vituperative nature of the autónomas’ critique of NGOs.

41 Speech delivered at the VII Latin American and Caribbean Feminist Encuentro,
Cartagena, Chile, November 1996.

42 Speech delivered at the VII Latin American and Caribbean Feminist Encuentro,
Cartagena, Chile, November 1996.

43 Interview 37, Santa Fe de Bogotá, 20 August, 1997.
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