CENTRE FOR
Social Impact and
Philanthropy

# CSIP Working Paper 2022

## Feminist is as Feminist Funds: Debates and Practices in Feminist Funding in India

**September, 2022**

Taranga Sriraman[1]

Centre for Social Impact and Philanthropy, Ashoka University

[1]Taranga Sriraman is a feminist practitioner with 17 years of full-time work experience in advocacy, programmatic and organisation-building work in the areas of gender-based violence, state systems, education, and sexuality. She has an M.A. in Social Work and has worked at the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, in NGOs in different States, and in the Government of India's Mahila Samakhya programme.

https://csip.ashoka.edu.in/

Ashoka University, Rajiv Gandhi Education City
Sonepat, Haryana - 131029

# Feminist is as Feminist Funds: Debates and Practices in Feminist Funding in India

**Taranga Sriraman**

September, 2022

## ABSTRACT

Two centuries of non-profit work for women's welfare and rights, gender equality, and gender justice in India include work done by charitable institutions, social reform initiatives, and feminist organising. Working in this sector in India for almost two decades, the researcher has observed: (a) shifts in both state and non-state funding for gender-related work; (b) feminist mobilisation around varied concepts of mutual aid, gender budgeting, and feminist funding; and (c) substantial growth in the amount of feminist work and organisations. However, the past decade has also seen: (a) disinvestment by the state in key welfare areas; (b) mandating domestic capitalists' funding of welfare work via corporate social responsibility (CSR); and (c) restriction on foreign funding and greater regulation of voluntary associations. In this context, funding from high-net-worth individuals (HNIs) and CSR become the only major options for most non-profit organisations. However, in India, there are many feminist critiques of capitalism and debates within feminist movements on accessing private capital sources of funding. One of the main questions raised by feminist practitioners in the non-profit sector is: what can be done to retain autonomy while functioning in the very unequal world we seek to transform? Thus, this exploratory research on feminist funding and the funding of feminist work in the non-profit sector in India, looks at: (a) the experiences of feminist practitioners in mobilising resources and (b) possible ways forward for both feminist funding organisations and philanthropists who want to support gender justice and empowerment work.

Key words: Feminist Funding, Feminism, Resource Mobilisation, Movements

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Referees – Prof. Neelam Sukhramani, Dr. Trupti Jhaveri Panchal, Ms. Nishi Mehrotra; Ashoka University – Ms. Ratna Menon, CSIP Research team, CSIP Director, Ms. Ingrid Srinath; 2022 Cohort Fellows – Bhakti, Mufsin, Safoora; Friends and family –Nishkala Sekhar, Ritisha Mishra, Papri and Varna Sri Raman, Dr. Samira Junaid.

This study has been conducted as part of CSIP Research Fellowship 2021–22.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## KEY TAKEAWAYS:

There are excellent frameworks and methodologies already developed by specific feminist networks and organisations that carry out advocacy and capacity building in the area of resource mobilisation for feminist movements. Application of the same on a broader scale would be useful to understand both quantitative and qualitative aspects of the feminist funding ecosystem in India.

Gender lens impact investment is a contested new area of resource mobilisation now in India and it would be useful to explore feminist practitioners' experiences of it. In India, at present, mixed models of funding focused on organisational autonomy appear to be the way forward for feminist work of all kinds and scales. This appears to be an inescapable fact at present for movements-based organisations, in particular. Feminist funding organisations could work with organisations apart from their grantee partners through capacity building efforts in negotiating funding relations and financial planning as feminist organisations.

Many newer and smaller feminist organisations are unaware of all the feminist funding opportunities for which they are eligible and they need to be reached out to through internal strengthening of feminist funders' teams.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1. Objectives:

The idea for this exploratory study emerged from the lived experience of the researcher as a feminist practitioner in the non-profit sector in India, engaging with resource mobilisation and specifically interested in feminist funding. A review of literature also shows that there are in India, as well as globally: (a) feminist critiques of capitalism; (b) debates within feminist movements on harnessing private capital funding; and (c) very specific resource mobilisation-related experiences of feminist practitioners and organisations in the non-profit sector, including, and in particular, feminist funding practices and models.

The objectives of this study, therefore, are to understand the following from the experience of Indian feminist practitioners as grant seekers, organisers, resource mobilisers:

(i) feminist debates and critiques of accessing private capital funds and capitalism itself;
(ii) feminist practitioners' navigation of these debates in the actual practice of resource mobilisation;
(iii) significance and practice of feminist funding in the context of these debates;
(iv) lessons that can be distilled for feminist funding organisations and for philanthropists who are keen to support gender justice and empowerment work.

## 1.2 Conceptual framework and methodology:

Given the origin of the idea for this study, it uses feminist standpoint theory (Tandon and Aayush 2019) that emphasises the importance of the researcher reflecting on their own location in the researched universe and an articulation of how the former affects analyses. As socialist feminist theorisations specifically have been used to analyse the study findings, critiques of both patriarchy and capitalism are central to this paper.

Participant-observer methodology and narrative analysis are used to situate all the actors, their experiences, and discourses within a story of feminist funding in India. The researcher as participant-observer is describing specifically the narratives of feminist discourses and interviews with feminist practitioners in this paper. This study is entirely qualitative.

## 1.3 Chapterisation:

This working paper covers the universe of the study (concepts, theoretical frameworks) in section 2, and presents findings and analyses (sections 3 and 4) as follows:

(a) what feminist funding looks like in India in terms of landscape (organisations, advocacy, discourses) and reasons for this (history and connections with national and international developments in third sector resource mobilisation, including in feminist funding specifically);

(b) what the experiences of feminist practitioners and movement leaders tell us about the nature of feminist funding in India, organised thematically;

(c) a comparative framework highlighting the significance of feminist funding and aspects that distinguish it from other forms or models of funding in the third sector in India;

(d) recommendations and considerations on the way forward for feminist funding in India.

# 2. UNIVERSE OF THE STUDY

## 2.1 The broad context and research problem:

(i) **The third sector** is the diverse conglomeration of organisations working for social welfare and development, without a profit motive; it is not the direct administrative machinery of state governance. A section of this sector focuses on socio-political movement-building and rights-based mobilisation of people. All these organisations rely on resources that are provided as funds or as labour and materials at no financial cost to the recipient. This includes all feminist organising and advocacy — especially gender justice work in the non-profit sector. In India, this is either autonomous[2] and mutual aid-based (movements-based collectives) or registered and funded (non-governmental organisations/NGOs, Trusts, etc.). Sector-mapping exercises show that resourcing of the third sector has been impacted by a reduction/retraction of governmental funding (both domestic and international: bilateral, multilateral) and the growth of CSR, high-net-worth individual (HNI) funding; corporatisation of the sector; competition in retail fundraising by the advent of international NGOs (INGOs); and a growing mistrust of NGOs in the changing regulatory environment (Hartnell 2019). **Feminist funding is a specific, slowly growing area of this ecosystem.** The need for it has been established definitively by feminist organisations such as South Asia Women Foundation India (Satija, Purkayastha, Rajan 2021)and Gender at Work India.[3]

(ii) Feminist movements are varied in their analyses and praxis, but are unified in their identification of patriarchy as a framework of socio-economic organisation perpetuating gender-based inequality.[4] In India, most feminist organising, including in the non-profit sector, has been centred on questions of women's poverty in conjunction with questions of structural violence, access and socio-political rights (Ramachandran and Jandhyala 2012). Thus, several feminist analyses emerging from India have been critical of capitalism, and often explicitly socialist (Gandhi and Shah 1992). As Dietrich (2003) and Hensman (2011) note, Indian socialist feminists do critique and move beyond Engelsian and Marxist understandings to address how capitalism and patriarchy are intertwined in their impact on women and other marginalised, impoverished groups. Nevertheless, they also reiterate the importance of building specifically on the Marxist definition of capitalism as the mode of production and globally dominant political economy that is reliant on private ownership of means of production; the private accumulation of surplus value/endless aim of profits in production; and an internationalised financial system (Heinrich 2004). **Thus, the debates on harnessing private capital as funding for feminist work emerge and remain unresolved.**

[2]Autonomous women's groups' is the specific commonly used term in the Indian feminist movements' documentation of its own history, for the collectives that emerged in the late 1970s and '80s. They defined themselves as autonomous as opposed to funded by any entity external to the collective itself. Ref. Jagori. 2004. Living Feminisms. Jagori: a journey of 20 years

[3]This study picks up where the Gender at Work study on Gender and Philanthropy (CSIP Research Fellowship 2021 working paper) concludes, that is, it takes the argument/case made for feminist funding models as a given and unpacks what feminist funding looks like in India and what more it could be.

[4]Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 2018. Feminist Political Philosophy. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminism-political/

(iii) Feminists do recognise that capitalism — accompanied by the liberal democratic form of nation state — is an improvement on preceding systems such as feudal society, in terms of opportunities and rights for women (Johnson 1996). However, gender justice and gender inequality still prevail and, therefore, remain focus areas for both non-profit work and philanthropy, as per evidence generated by both state and civil society actors across the world. For example, three of the United Nations' 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and 80 of over 230 SDG indicators, explicitly mention gender inequality and/or gender justice as targets and concerns listed by member nation-states.[5] It is also these nation-states that legitimise a capitalist mode of production in individual and globalised political-economies, through their regulation of the financial system.[6] Thus, Indian feminists have also documented their own very complex landscape of engagements (Gandhi and Shah 1992; Kannabiran 2005; Ramachandran and Jandhyala 2012; Bhaiya and Kathuria 2018, amongst others) with **the state** — some critiquing it as patriarchal and capitalist, others reclaiming it as a democratic institution through formal collaboration.

(iv) There are many socialist feminist critiques of charity, calling for a return to mutual aid[7] instead. At the same time, many feminists also call for the adoption of philanthropic funding models as the most practical/realistic subversion of the same unequal, unjust distribution of resources in terms of ownership, that is, capitalist patriarchy (FRIDA 2022). For feminist practitioners in the non-profit sector, the question of resource mobilisation is closely connected with that of autonomy in praxis — in what we can say, study and advocate, as programme implementers, funders, and co-travellers in movement spaces.

**This context is complex: feminist civil society reconciles and diverges within itself, as well as with the state and private capital, on different issues, at different points of time, in both tenuous adversarial and impactful ways. Understanding feminist funding in India in this context, as a very specific aspect of resource mobilisation and philanthropy for social impact, is the broad research problem here.**

## 2.2 Data sources, sampling, limitations:

(i) Secondary sources were reviewed, including documentation by practitioners and social scientists, and organisations' disclosures in the public domain (reports and statutory compliance documents). Feminist practitioners were interviewed. Online programmes regarding specific aspects of feminist funding were attended. Snowball sampling emerged through the researcher's own knowledge of feminist spaces and suggestions from potential research participants.

[5] https://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic-social/gender/documents/Gender%2080SDG%20Indicator%20Framework_2019.pdf
[6] Demonetisation dtd. 08.11.2016 in India, is an example of this sheer power and politics of currency as regulated by the state and driving economic opportunity for privately owned capital over growth for the working classes.
[7] Mutual aid has been defined by socialists such as Galeano (Barsamian 2004) as 'solidarity, and not charity', and by Kropotkin (1902) as a fact of evolution and, hence, cooperation for a common goal, respectively.

(ii) This paper is built around narratives of the experiences of: (a) leaders/discourse shapers of feminist movements (those who have led collectives and organisations in formal/recognised capacities, and have visibility and influence in the resource mobilisation discourse in the sub-sector); (b) personnel of feminist funding organisations; and (c) personnel of organisations/individuals who have sought and/or received feminist funding. During data collection, it became difficult to distinguish between these categories as most participants have been in more than one of these roles. Persons interviewed as grant seekers/grantee practitioners are referred to as GP, leaders and discourse shapers as DS, and feminist funding organisation personnel as FF; multiple codes are used for those who have more than one kind of experience.

(iii) Fifteen persons were interviewed in-depth, using a semi-structured interview guide (Appendix 1). Quotes and data from said interviews are combined with literature review in writing each section of this paper.

(iv) The small number of people interviewed (due to researcher's long term illness, and potential participants' hesitancy and time constraints) and the exploratory nature of the study are acknowledged as limitations.

# 3. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

## 3.1 What is feminist funding?

Documents termed as declarations/statements of feminist funding principles issued by coalitions and networks as an outcome of consultations,[8] and the vision-mission statements of feminist funding organisations answer this question. Highlights and analyses of the same, linked with interview narratives, follow:

(i) Feminist funding self-defines as funding by feminists for rights-based movement building work that is feminist in practice and intent. There is a focus on women, queer, and most marginalised communities' leadership in terms of objectives stated in these documents. (These two aspects also correspond with feminist historical definition of feminist movements and organising explored more in subsection 3.2 (i) , wherein self-identification and who leads or shapes the discourse and work is crucial.) The feminist funds' documents are also clear that priority must be given to work focused on dismantling patriarchal, colonial-imperialist, and other intersectional axes of discrimination in terms of systems experienced daily, materially by women, trans, non-binary and queer persons, and other marginalised groups.

(ii) Many of these documents — that are authored by international networks and Global North–based feminist funding organisations — mention that indigenous and BIPOC (Black, Indigenous and People of Colour) communities are the most-marginalised and, hence, a focus of feminist funding efforts; very few mention persons living with disabilities and children as specifically oppressed by patriarchy. Some also mention priority support to 'organisations working with and for the rights of women and girls'.

Socialist feminist organising relies on internationalism as a source of solidarity and inter-learning, global advocacy support (like the Beijing Conference [United Nations 1995] and follow-up advocacy globally and multilaterally for implementation of the UN Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women), and resourcing feminist action materially in the Global South in particular. Hence, the source of definitions of feminist funding stemming from such international networks and Global North organisations in itself is not surprising to any of the participants in this study nor to most writers on this subject.

However, this does not imply that the existing discourse cannot or should not be added to or deepened by feminists from around the globe in contemporary movements' contexts. Contemporary socialist feminist (Azurra, Bhattacharya, and Fraser 2019) and cripfeminist (Kafer 2013) activist-academics have built upon Engels' (1884) propositions to conduct a materialist analysis of contemporary capitalism as ableist and ageist, in the interest of control, perpetuation, and oppression — through the patriarchal family — of an unending supply of labour (Bhattacharya 2017). These considerations appear to be missing in most of the declarations perused. Only a few

[8]Prominent examples include National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy, 2012; documents from Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice (2010), Canadian Women's Foundation, Community Foundations of Canada, Equality Fund n.d.

queer- and child rights-focused feminist practitioners (DS 3 and FF 4) interviewed mentioned age and dis/ability as important to intersectionality in feminist work.

(iii) Similarly, all except one[9] of the few feminist funding organisations based in Asia, do not mention (on their websites or publications) caste and religion-based marginalisation as a focus. However, substantial discourse and practice in Asian regional (especially Indian) feminist organising and scholarship, draw connections between caste and communal majoritarianism in keeping the poorest and most marginalised women, and LGBTQIA++ persons disprivileged in all material aspects (Menon 2012; Agnes and Ghosh 2012). Four of the feminist practitioners (grant-seekers) interviewed said feminist funding should have a clear focus on the rights of oppressed caste groups and religious minorities. What, then, does this mean for the confidence or encouragement of such grant-seekers to apply for feminist funding organisations' support?

(iv) Western feminist funding declarations mention the use of an intersectional feminist lens quite consistently. The influence of this terminology on the statements/documents of feminist funding organisations of the Global South is also notable.

However, adoption of this language does not necessarily match intersectionality as manifested in regional realities. An India-based feminist funding organisation's use of the term 'Adivasi' in the focus areas section of its website, for example, reflects that the very contested area of tribes and indigeneity status in different regions of India has been discounted (perhaps inadvertently) in particular. This excludes feminist funding grant applications from feminist practitioners from a whole range of peoples who have distinguished their experience as Tribal and Vimukta Jati (distinct geographically and historically from the movement and discourse of Adivasi identity) through socio-political mobilisation on the basis of struggles against specific forms indigeneity- and ethnicity-based discrimination.[10]

Some Global South feminist funding organisations mention a focus on rural/remote communities that inhabit geographically remote places, and who have been ignored thus far. This also does not address the very complex realities of caste, tribe, ethnicity, or indigeneity in a country like India, where migration has been a mechanism of oppressive and unequal political-economic relations for centuries. In other words, the emergent question is of how the lens of intersectionality may be translated and applied better locally for practice in the context of South Asia or Asia or any other region, irrespective of where the feminist funding organisation originates from or has its headquarters/registered entity at. This gap was echoed by FF/DS 5 as well: '…what does intersectional mean, who is the most marginalised in a sub-regional context, the few people in that organisation at a regional or international level don't really know…'.

(v) All the declarations and vision-mission statements also prioritise: (a) work in

[9]The only exception is South Asia Women's Foundation India (SAWF-India), which very clearly mentions caste and disability in its vision-mission statement.
[10]These nuances of Tribes, Adivasi and Vimukta Jati identities are explained in The Current Landscape of Philanthropy for Adivasi and Tribal Women at the Grassroots – Nolina Minj, Ruby Hembrom, and Christy Nag (Adivaani, 2021, CSIP Research Fellowship working paper).

partnership; (b) support to collectives; and (c) participatory decision-making at all levels of work in the sector. These are described in terms of grantee organisations' relationships with communities, and decision making within the grantee organisation ('feminist collectives' and 'consultative processes' in narratives).

All of the priorities listed in preceding paragraph are reflective of the distinctive discursive nature of feminist praxis, from the researcher's standpoint as participant-observer in Indian civil society spaces. Two examples stand out in memory: first, Nivedita Menon saying 'there is no single party-line' in response to a question from a man, while speaking at the Negotiating Spaces conference by Majlis in 2012. (The diversity of feminist positions and negotiations with complex intersectional realities of feminist concerns in all kinds of organising and rights-accessing work are summarised in the book of the same name [Agnes and Venkatesh Ghosh 2012].) The second is that of Uma Chakravarty, in a video talk recorded for the CREA Feminist Leadership, Movement Building and Rights Institute 2017, recalling with levity her critique of 'the NGO feminists' in late 1980s and '90s, as those paid to do the work of the women's movement. Crucially, this talk was for a programme of an NGO deeply involved in international advocacy around feminist funding, and directed at participants who were all lifelong professionals in the non-profit sector. Thus, debates around questions of what is feminist organising and what is not, in relation to who funds/resources it and how, have long existed. **This diversity of feminisms and debate as a constant — but not irreparably fissuring — factor in feminist movements' solidarities, historically, is well reflected in the origins of feminist funding also.**

## 3.2 Origins/global background:

(i) Women's rights have been espoused and advanced in varying degrees by numerous movements and individuals as part of their political programmes, across the world (from Plato to the abolitionist and communist movements in the West; from social reformers like Ram Mohan Roy and Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar to the nationalist movement (Kumar 1993), socio-religious community associations and political parties through their women's wings (Kaur 2019) in India). Women have been part of these spaces as well and this is seen to have influenced a steady increment in the entry of upper-class, dominant caste/race/religion and community women into education, professional spaces and, eventually, political spaces. Most contemporary feminists, however, follow the logic advanced by Simone de Beauvoir (1949) in identifying 15th-century philosopher Christine de Pizan as the first feminist: that is, feminist organising is defined and distinguished as women organising and leading women's rights efforts.[11] A range of South Asian and Western scholarship over three decades, regarding the history of this initial by-women, of-women, for-women organising (Kumar 1993; Kaur 2019; Goss 2007) shows that women of different classes and communities engaged in what Sundar (1996) terms work as 'both donors and volunteers', in the manner of socialist definitions of mutual aid reviewed in section 2.1 (iv) of this paper. They mobilised resources for this organising work through: (a) familial, religious, and class community linkages (what would be known today as 'grants' from philanthropists and in-person retail crowdfunding); (b) small-scale self/collectively earned income

[11]Debates amongst feminist historians globally do continue as to whether early women's movements should be termed First Wave feminism or protofeminists instead as they did not explicitly identify as feminist.

(later termed 'self-help' and 'social entrepreneurship'); and (c) expenditure of personal wealth. Abovementioned scholars as well as socialist feminists like Eisenstein (2005) do also point out that queer feminist rights-based organising (amongst other identity-based movements), and women's welfare groups were supported by foundations (private capital) to expand their work, for the establishment and achievement of liberal feminist agendas centred around specific rights (education, family planning, health, property, employment) of access and participation in modern nation-states (democratic, industrialised, capitalist, or mixed model economies) during the mid- to late 1900s. Goss, Sundar, Gandhi and Shah, Eisenstein and Dietrich (op. cit.), amongst others, also point out that while these hard-won rights increased the political and economic participation of gender and sexuality identity groups oppressed in heteronormative patriarchy (universal adult franchise, for example), the radical and socialist feminist organising around questions of class and structural changes remained in a mutually adversarial relationship with private capital.

(ii) It is in this context of concurrent work by plural feminist movements and discourses, that the Astraea Foundation — the first known feminist fund — was established in the United States of America in the 1970s. It is interesting that this work by on-ground organisers in feminist movements considering material realities of organising and inclusion of working-class people is not acknowledged in formal academia as the context preceding and supporting the theorising work that came later (e.g. Gayle Rubin and Judith Butler published their path breaking queer feminist work only in the 1980s). The academic discourse in India around theorising and conceptualising the concerns of feminists do however rely heavily on the work of on-ground organisers and interventionists in South Asia itself, and the aforementioned invisibilising of movements does not apply as much, perhaps because of overlap between academia and organising work as discussed in section 3.1 (v) of this paper.

(iii) The growth in women's liberation to accumulate private capital beyond inheritances, in industrialised free market society, also saw women's rise as high net-worth individuals (HNIs) with socio-political influence, especially since the mid-2000s. Scholarship in both Western (Goss 2007) and Indian (Sundar 1996) contexts shows that funding and socio-political support from upper-class women was important from the early days of feminist organising. However, there are now more and more women HNIs, giving personally (donations), institutionally (foundations and trusts), and mandatorily (CSR) to various philanthropic causes, including work to reduce gender inequalities.

(iv) Many women's funds and queer feminist movements across the Global North have been resourced (financially, politically/legally) by Global North civil society organisations (CSOs). These women's funds and movements have then harnessed developed economy governments to fund feminist funding networks, towards further establishing regional feminist funding organisations across the globe and sustaining small/grassroots feminist work in the Global South. Some of these CSOs and feminist funding networks espouse secular and libertarian-socialist/social

democratic values in the public domain (like HIVOS)[12] [13], others have had links with faith-based philanthropy (Global Fund for Women)[14]. Like Astraea Foundation, these organisations have been built on feminist principles for gender justice work specifically, from the late 1960s to the late 1980s, by diverse groups of co-founders.[15] This reflects the potential and power of feminist movements and concerns to bring together diverse class, professional, and ethnic/racial backgrounds, enabling on-scale harnessing of state and non-state resources.

(v) Over the past 15 years, women's funds have been established across the Global South, including in Africa, South East Asia, Latin America, West Asia/the Middle-East. Feminist funds have also been set up to address specific needs, such as Open to City and FLOW (Funding Leadership and Opportunities for Women). GP3, GP/DS 5, FF3 and FF/DS 4 — all mentioned the importance of international networks of feminist funding (like Prospera) that help in sustenance and cross-learning through having 'an equal seat at the table'(FF3). It is important to note that while some feminist funding organisations are specifically named as 'women's funds', many others are named as feminist funds in particular.

(vi) India saw the establishment of its first feminist funding organisation with support from the Ford Foundation's initiative to introduce diversity-and-inclusion-specific funding, during 2004–08.[16] Prior to this, mutual aid and volunteerism had been the core principles of autonomous women's groups. Organisations such as Jagori and SANGAT (founded by Kamla Bhasin) and feminist practitioners in multilateral agencies and funding organisations (for example, Suneeta Dhar, Priya Paul, Mallika Dutt, as mentioned by this study's participants) helped support resourcing of feminist work, particularly in education, rural development, and health, on scale. So did certain Global North governments and INGOs, both secular and faith-based (mentioned by GP 3).

## 3.3 Feminist funding operational in India

(i) Only two South Asia-based feminist funding organisations operate in India: the South Asia Women Foundation India and Women's Fund Asia (both having grown out of the South Asia Women's Fund). International feminist funding organisations such as FRIDA Young Feminist Fund, Global Fund for Women, MAMA CASH, American Jewish World Service (explicitly supporting feminist research)[17], and others provide grants to individuals and registered organisations in India, including fellowships for human rights defenders, legal professionals, and so on. Gender justice-focused grants are also made by specific international organisations such as OAK Foundation. Recently, coalition funds through venture capital have been established with similar agendas of addressing gender inequalities on scale (CoImpact Gender Fund, for example).

[12]Available at https://hivos.org/about-hivos/vision-and-values/.
[13] Available at https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hivos#:~:text=Hivos%20was%20founded%20in%201968,the%20Association%20and%20Humanitas%20Weezenkas.
[14]Available at https://www.globalfundforwomen.org/who-we-are/vision-mission/frances-kissling-co-founder/
[15]Available at https://www.astraeafoundation.org/stories/today-honor-founding-mothers/.
[16]Available at https://www.womensfundasia.org/index.php?r=aboutUs/ourHistory.
[17]Available at https://ajws.org/our-impact/measuring-success/research-early-child-marriage/strengthening-feminist-approaches-to-research/

(ii) Duration of grants ranges from six months/short-term, one-time, activity-based, to core funding and programmatic flexible grants for up to three years. These cover research, training, programmatic interventions/service delivery, advocacy, and organisational development. Some CSR entities and many individual HNIs/ family foundations also address gender inequalities, especially in livelihoods and education access. All participants reported applying for grants as and when these thematically match their area of specialised intervention, irrespective of whether the source of funds is explicitly feminist or not. Again, this indicates the overall small sum of resources that are available for gender justice work.[18] As GP1 and GP2 both shared, '…there is so little funding for this kind of work anyway…', indicating their work in survivor-centric feminist interventions in crisis-response.

(iii) Literature reviewed in the preceding section as well as interviews confirmed that the state and multilateral agencies are a major source of funding for feminist work in India, especially through grants-in-aid for Scheme implementation, higher education funding, and partnerships sought by UN agencies, especially UN Women.

(iv) Almost all these state and multilateral agencies themselves rely primarily on private capital funding, given major economic recessions in recent decades. Many function more as facilitating or key intermediary[19] organisations (including state agencies like government ministries that have entered into Public–Private partnerships since the late 2000s). However, feminist funding organisations have their own struggles, innovative practices of resource mobilisation, and processes of support to principled work on issues of gender justice (discussed in detail in following sections of this paper). As FF1 put it, 'We do not want to go in depth into building programmatic capacities of the organisations we support as they are already feminist practitioners with on-ground experience of years…Our focus is to get more and more funding accessible to more such practitioners, from all kinds of state and private capital sources that hold most of the resources in the world.' A perusal of the public domain documents of such feminist funding organisations shows that industrial/business-generated wealth (CSR, family foundations and trusts) as well as Global North governments are the primary source of funds harnessed.[20]

[18]OECD. 2019. 'India's Private Giving: Unpacking Domestic Philanthropy and Corporate Social Responsibility', OECD Development Centre, Paris. Available at https://www.oecd.org/development/philanthropy-centre/researchprojects/.
[19]Miller, Kellea and Jones, Rochelle (for AWID). October 2019. Towards a Feminist Funding Ecosystem.
[20]Ibid.

## 3.4 Developments in Indian feminist discourse around resource mobilisation:

Feminist critiques of capitalism and of the structural analyses and struggles by feminist movements to organise and sustain in terms of resources while existing in a world where capitalism is the dominant mode of production may be summarised in two well-known articulations by Barbara Ehrenreich[21] and Audre Lorde[22]. These essentially point out the rightful call for redistribution and reclamation of resources by working class women, and the need to understand the difference between engaging with capitalist patriarchy for material rights in the present versus working to dismantle both capitalism and patriarchy overall, As an on-ground organiser and activist, however, Micah White[23] bridges these two positions in terms of what it means for those living in and struggling against capitalist patriarchy. Thus, White indicates the complexities of all movements as discursive and praxis spaces in their analysis of how Audre Lorde has been misread in a limited manner. This analysis — of the simultaneity of engagement and struggle — is useful in examining feminist debates around resource mobilisation.

(i) Once the contemporary feminist movement spaces were established during the mid- to late 1900s, then the differing analyses and debates of different feminist tendencies helped feminist discourse move beyond liberal feminist concerns (women's rights and women's welfare and sexism-centric discourses) to an understanding and critique of patriarchy as heteronormative, ableist, ageist, racist/ethno-fascist, classist, communal, and casteist (in the South Asian context especially). Today, in Indian feminist organising, we have autonomous women's groups, queer collectives, working class people's unions, political parties' wings, cooperatives, as well as registered service and charitable organisations. These debates amongst Global South feminists also led to an eventual **revisiting and rearticulation of women's funds as feminist funding initiatives,** thereby ensuring 'at least' (GP/DS 5) the aim to engage in work with and for all communities and identities oppressed in and by patriarchy, and not only cishet women. As GP/DS 5 put it, '...we were not always cognisant of our own biases and consolidation of power in cliques within the movements space also...'.

[21]When someone works for less pay than she can live on — when, for example, she goes hungry so that you can eat more cheaply and conveniently — then she has made a great sacrifice for you, she has made you a gift of some part of her abilities, her health, and her life. The 'working poor,' as they are approvingly termed, are in fact the major philanthropists of our society. They neglect their own children so that the children of others will be cared for; they live in substandard housing so that other homes will be shiny and perfect; they endure privation so that inflation will be low and stock prices high. To be a member of the working poor is to be an anonymous donor, a nameless benefactor, to everyone else' (Ehrenreich 1998)

[22]'... survival is not an academic skill. It is learning how to stand alone, unpopular and sometimes reviled, and how to make common cause with those others identified as outside the structures in order to define and seek a world in which we can all flourish. It is learning how to take our differences and make them strengths. For the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. They may allow us temporarily to beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change. And this fact is only threatening to those women who still define the master's house as their only source of support.' (Lorde 1984).

[23]Available at https://www.activistgraduateschool.org/on-the-masters-tools#:~:text=For%20the%20master's%20tools%20will,their%20only%20source%20of%20support.%E2%80%9D.

(ii) As documented (Kannabiran 2005), the 'personal is political' slogan was and is very real for Indian feminists in bridging the gap between: (a) working to prevent sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) through individual transformation at community/societal level vide education and campaigns, and (b) addressing the needs of survivors in a world where newer forms of violence emerge and reporting increases, alongside sci-tech development, increased economic disparities and the resurgence of traditionalist forces. The gap specifically is in support and resources for primary prevention (awareness, campaigns for social change) and secondary prevention (support services for survivors after violence has occurred). Hence, feminists' engagement with state systems through legal advocacy and demand for **gender mainstreaming — gender budgeting** being part of the same, started in the early 1980s. This led to the establishment of a dedicated Ministry of Women and Child Development in 2005–06, and the constitution of non-lapsing corpuses (the Rashtriya Mahila Kosh, Nirbhaya Fund, etc.) for women's rights interventions in areas as diverse as livelihoods/entrepreneurship and SGBV response.

(iii) With incremental state withdrawal from the model of welfare and services as public goods, there has been a resurgence of advocacy (last seen in the 1980s around CEDAW[24] ratification) from feminist movements, for multilateralism to prevent the collusion of nation states with capitalist entities monopolising the world's resources and contributing to ethnic violence, militarism, and climate change, in particular. This advocacy has led to specific further developments in the Indian context; key examples are the following:

(a) Feminist analyses have highlighted the paradox of the Indian state continuing to report to international cooperative forums on gender budgeting while disinvesting in public goods such as education and health (Jhamb, Mishra, and Sinha 2013). It is apparent how gender-budgeting-centred scholarship contributed to the earliest campaigns for a 'feminist UN Women', as exemplified in the ICRW-led campaign.[25] Recently, the discourse of these campaigns has been revived and amplified by feminist networks to reclaim multilateralism from multistakeholderism in global governance, in the context and continuation of actions against large monopolist private entities' agreements with international government agencies (elaborated upon in detail later in this paper).

(b) Similarly, feminist engagements with state systems through establishing feminist praxis within the state's own gender-mainstreaming programmes,[26] have contributed to the conceptualisation of gender justice (in radical and socialist feminist understandings) as distinct from gender equality (in liberal feminist agendas) (Waris [AWID] 2019). The former focuses on intersectional analyses and reparation for discrimination and disprivilege through collective control of resources, while the latter focuses on quantitative measurement of access and *de jure* rights.

[24]Convention for the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women, instituted and ratified at the United Nations during 1981–83.
[25]Available at https://reliefweb.int/report/world/time-feminist-action-and-implementation-report-card-secretary-general-s-fifth-year.
[26]Mahila Samakhya programme and Special Cells for Women programme, both started in the 1980s, are examples of this.

(c) The gradual edging out of gender justice work (such as that of Mahila Samakhya) within state systems since 2011–12 in favour of gender equality models based on microfinance saw innovative and energetic responses by Indian feminists in the direction of developing new autonomous resource mobilisation models. Notable examples are the work by feminist network organisations like the Association for Women's Rights in Development, also known as AWID (AWID 2019) (Dr Srilatha Batliwala — founder of Mahila Samakhya — is a leading member) and the Huairou Commission (member Dr Sangeetha Purushothaman had documented the best practices of and for Mahila Samakhya earlier, helped harness resource support, as well as had the Best Practices Foundation anchor the rural women's federations transitioning out of the erstwhile programme with multiple partners[27]).

(d) These engagements have led to revivals of efforts to reclaim multilateralism, as we see in the recent open letters by feminist alliances of movements across the world exhorting UN Women to do better, in light of the latter's recent MoU with BlackRock,[28] and their impact in ending the said agreement.[29] There are many movement-based critiques (especially environmentalist and feminist) of multi-stakeholder capitalism (Mahanan and Kumar 2021; Friends of the Earth United States and Transnational Institute 2022); feminist organisations and networks like AWID and the African Women's Development and Communications Network (FEMNET) have also focused this lens on how gender justice work in the Global South is impacted by monopoly capitalist entities; they have also made specific recommendations for multilateral agencies like the UN to end illicit financial flows (Waris, AWID 2019). During a multi-organisation online programme (August 2022) under the international feminist action against UN Women-BlackRock agreement, an AWID representative argued that the questions raised were not only regarding this particular agreement. Instead, the questions are part of a larger attempt to reclaim multilateralism by asking UN agencies to hold these massive corporations to account, to regulate and influence the latter's ecological and economic impact on the world, as originally intended when the UNO was formed, and not to merely partner with the corporations as equals. Additionally, many feminist funding networks and advocacy organisations are also asking Global North governments and their bilateral aid agencies (Mama Cash, AWID, Count me In 2022), as well as international crowdfunding organisations (Misra 2021), to incorporate funding for feminist organising and movements (particularly in/for the Global South) into their policies and campaigns work.

[27] http://www.bestpracticesfoundation.org/current-work.php
[28] https://wedo.org/press-release-over-500-womens-rights-organizations-and-feminists-demand-end-of-un-womens-partnership-with-blackrock-inc/
[29] https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-08-26/un-women-terminates-partnership-with-blackrock-after-criticism

(iv) As shared by GP/DS 5, what continues, however (as reflected in BlackRock Inc.'s statement[30] on the closing of its agreement with UN Women), is monopoly capitalism's effort to combine forces and funds in gender impact/gender lens investing through the pooling of venture capital funds disbursed as grants. Global South feminists have been asking private wealth-based and CSR philanthropy to donate to feminist funding organisations and networks with gender justice support expertise, as opposed to reinventing the wheel by establishing gender-impact focused venture capital-driven funding consortiums[31] [32] .

(v) Feminist funding networks (Global Philanthropy Project. 2020)[33] continue to call upon industrialists and HNIs to combine forces with working class women's movements in combating the impact of an oppressive patriarchy. Women HNIs are not unresponsive to this, and often indicate negotiation and analyses of accumulation of private and personal wealth through their own familial connections. Thus, there has been a growth in their giving to feminist funding organisations and women's funds. A recent example of this is the no-questions-asked donations of substantial sums to feminist funds by McKenzie Scott (wealth accumulated through substantial share in Amazon), recently.[34] Rohini Nilekani (wealth accumulated through substantial share in Infosys) has been quoted repeatedly as saying that the immense accumulation of private capital should not have taken place at all (Hartnell 2017).

The debates about the extent of impact of this support stemming from private accumulation of capital are quite apparent in terms of further engagement that feminist practitioners receiving these funds seek from said women HNIs.[35] Some examples include the statement issued by FRIDA upon receipt of donation from McKenzie Scott (FRIDA 2022), the response by outgoing Executive Director (WFA) to Caroline Hartnell's work (Srivastav, n.d.), and the question asked by GP/DS 5 (a senior Indian feminist practitioner in the sector) during her interview for this study: 'Who are the people advising (...) these powerful women HNIs to take these big bets?.... how do we as representatives of feminist movements centred on building the rightful leadership of poor, working class and most marginalised gender and sexuality groups, access those spaces and positions?'

Such concerns are understood more in the following section.

[30]Op. cit., wedo.org.
[31]d'Almeida, Massan (XOESE, le Fonds pour les Femmes Francophones), Chugh, Anisha and Gaind, Sanjana (Women's Fund Asia), Kiromera, Marine-Celeste (Equality Fund). July 2022. Flipping the funding script: ACTIVATE re-imagines grantmaking with feminist funds (Equality Fund). Available at https://equalityfund.ca/grantmaking/flipping-the-funding-script/.
[32]Op. cit., Towards a Feminist Funding Ecosystem (AWID).
[33]https://equalityfund.ca/who-we-are/
[34]https://philanthropywomen.org/activism/mackenzie-scotts-newest-batch-of-culture-challenging-donations/#:~:text=July%2030%2C%202020-,MacKenzie%20Scott%20and%20the%20%2414.2%20Billion%20Dollar%20Question%20for%20Women,rate%20compared%20to%20most%20philanthropists.
[35]Such as broader based giving to feminist organisations, collaboration in reducing the damaging economic and ecological impact of the companies they share ownership in or influence/direct.

## 3.5 Practices and experiences shared in interviews:

(i) Feminist funding organisations and grant seekers alike feel that having feminists and feminist allies in larger systems and institutions of funding is extremely important for on-ground needs to be met on-scale. GP 3 stated, 'Feminist funding organisations are important for keeping small groups and organisations going, to ensure they survive … For systems changing work, we need feminist allies in the spaces where money is moved, including in the government and the largest funding agencies'. Older participants indicated the importance of specific bureaucrats or individuals in larger bilateral, multilateral, and international funding agencies at crucial periods in the establishment or initial expansion of their core programme or organisation.

(ii) Participants shared that women HNIs in India are beginning to engage with feminist organisations and work on-ground, and this needs to be tapped further, especially through alliance building at macro-levels. GP1 and GP2 both shared their positive experiences with women HNIs as funding partners who took more interest in understanding their process-centred work with violence survivors ('put herself in learning position', 'engaged in discussions with us and then suggested extension of support in a more flexible manner to allow for programmatic changes and grassroots needs'). The researcher as participant-observer also experienced this during talks by and in-person interactions with women HNIs (for example, the SKOLL India and DASRA collaborative programme panel on gender equity and pay gaps held online in March 2022, and donor interactions from the experience of a grant from the DASRA Giving Circle). Many participants of this study said there must be ways for feminist funding organisations to create more opportunities for feminist organisations and women HNIs to interact. DS 2 shared that resource mobilisation coalitions must be built that include feminist organisations that need funds and other resource support. However, they felt that such a coalition for advocacy with HNIs and philanthropic organisations must be hosted by an organisation not seeking grants for the same purpose.

(iii) Concerns were raised by GP/DS 5 and FF/DS 4, regarding the emergence of select feminist organisations as recurring grant-winners. They discussed the invisibilising of grassroots/smaller feminist organisations due to the high visibility of the former's staff and their networks and capacities to successfully negotiate competitive grants-seeking spaces. FF/DS 4 and FF2, however, said this is also due to feminist funding organisations not being staffed with those who understand the sub-sector and feminist movements in their vastness and complexity ('it is easy to say intersectional lens and most-marginalised, but who does that mean in this particular country?...so we end up seeing the usual suspects', 'we don't have enough programmatic knowledge or experience in our team ourselves, to make these decisions we need more of that'; 'these two organisations are so well known that they are often given credit for work of the smaller organisations they have partnered with').

(iv) The larger battle for grant-making organisations has been to influence and advocate for an increasingly private capital–filled ecosystem to fund feminist rights-based work. FF 1 and GP/DS 5 shared that this is why (a) feminist funding organisations across the world have tried to engage more with Global North governments and multilateral agencies, as the state can still be laid claim to as collectively owned by people (unlike private capital-based philanthropic organisations), and (b) both sources of funds need to be worked upon simultaneously.

(v) The gap between regulatory frameworks, corporatised resourcing arrangements, and capacities of movement-based organisations is the major area for bridge-building and this can only be done through substantial changes to procedures and processes such as the following:

a) Accessibility of funding organisation personnel, open direct communication and feedback mechanisms that are discursive/dialogic (not one-way) are crucial to feminist practice. The participatory funding model first demonstrated by FRIDA was lauded by FF 4, GP/DS 4 and FF/DS 5. However, all of them pointed out that there needs to be constant discussions and revisiting of what works and what does not, especially in different cultural contexts. GP 2 shared that a feminist funding organisation offered support to their organisation through leadership development training, but also expected the latter to provide legal and interventions skills training free-of-cost to the former. She said this 'ended the discussions … as it did not feel fair'. FF1 shared that 'it is important and a benchmark that any grantee partner can and does call up directly on the phone and say you have not provided this or done that as urgently as needed…'.

b) Autonomy of the core model of direct work and service provision non-negotiables need to be the touchstone of any funding relationship for a feminist organisation, which on principle draws its learnings and builds programmes from/with the participant community. All the practitioners interviewed echoed this, all the discourse shapers except one and only two feminist funding organisation staff. Two practitioners working in SGBV response felt that whether it is a feminist funder or not, the process-based interventions[36] work with individuals in particular should be treated by funders as an area of expertise and one that is scalable. Very often primary prevention work is more amenable to scale of numerical reach and is given preference over secondary prevention work. This is further detrimental to direct crisis interventions work while feminist practice in this area is rare.

(c) FF1 shared that a component of feminist funding partnerships is the support, flexibility, and ease of processes ensured during the grant utilisation period and not only during the application stage.

[36]A common distinction in feminist work in SGBV response that is focused on empowerment through the interventions process, and not focused only on some predetermined final outcomes.

(vi) All the practitioners interviewed felt that work with state systems has not received due focus from feminist funding organisations and this impacts sustainability. Core funding/flexible institutional funding is not easily available for such organisations from other sources. GP 2 and DS 3 said they understand the fear of co-option by patriarchal state systems and regimes, but that the experience of so many practitioners who have struggled and won material gains for women, children, and LGBTQIA++ people in India proves that this fear is largely unfounded.

(vii) Political regime's regulation and restriction of funding from faith-based and bilateral/international organisations has impacted rights-based organisations that are feminist in themselves, as many of the former did provide the earliest support for women's human rights work with most marginalised communities in most remote and rural areas. As shared by GP 3, the project of nationalist self-reliance does not support the social justice/internationalist values-based work of feminist organisations and women's groups on-ground. This reinforces the case for increased domestic funding to feminist work. FF 1 also shared that difficulties of reaching out to potential applicants and navigating the increasingly restrictive FCRA (Foreign Contribution Regulation Act) regime are major challenges faced by feminist funding organisations. The limitations of legal entity registration and regulation are often juxtaposed against the extreme precarity of being completely unregistered — there is no legal *locus standi*, no crowdfunding viability even — for feminist collectives; sustainability becomes a key issue. GP 3 shared how even autonomous women's groups or collectives are now at a loss as to ways of continuing to work at all, given the absence of resources due to heightened individual precarities in a COVID pandemic–impacted economy.

(viii) There is fear of expansion and corporatisation — as leading to a risk of dilution of ideology/mission-drift — amongst older feminist organisations. As shared by DS 1, this often limits their material capacities to raise resources even where available. This needs to be addressed with care and patience, by feminist funding organisations, feminist movements' leadership and feminists in the larger giving sector. Organisations working on feminist funding may consider building grant seekers' capacities to ask for and expend larger budgets while maintaining the quality of feminist-principled work.

(ix) Feminist funding organisations engage in very specific types of capacity-building/strengthening: by building perspectives on issues, demonstration of good practices in organisational restructuring and processes, strengthening resource mobilisation and advocacy skills (like the AJWS platform on child marriage prevention as shared by GP2). The researcher has experienced that workers/practitioners often need help from funder partners to push for parity within feminist organisations (pay, decision making, representation). Many liberal feminist NGOs are disconnected from labour movements and feminist economist discourses. GP 1 shared that a demonstration of flat structured/non-hierarchical organisation by the feminist funding organisation is a good reminder (to grantee practitioners) to practice the same. FF 4 also pointed out significant differences in the practices of a feminist funding organisation established 'by a cross-class group of feminists' as opposed to that established, and later also led, by more privileged groups of feminists only. The differences mentioned included the diversity of

movements that a specific group of cross-class founders of a Global North–based feminist funding organisation were involved in prior to establishing the said organisation, as opposed to Global South–based women's fund whose founding group comprised senior, privileged, and well-connected professionals from the third sector and business world. According to FF4, a stark difference was how the former organisation looked at feminism and feminist funding programmes as supporting primarily feminist activism and organising from the lens of multiple identities oppressed by heteronormative patriarchy, whereas the latter was clear about placing resources in the hands of women-led organisations and developing women helping professionals to provide services. (While FF4 did also add that both organisations' perspectives and work have grown with the help of inter-learning at international networks of feminist funding organisations, the latter, for example, have also become more corporatised and professionalised with changes in the donor ecosystem). FF/DS 5 and GP/DS 4 shared how a Global South regional feminist fund had internal debates on transparency, on the question of a feminist labour-rights organisation being drawn into applicant pool for a grant sourced from the CSR foundation of an international labour-rights violating corporation. While we may disagree with each other on multiple fronts, collaboration can continue through transparency, and consistently centring choice.

## 3.6 Analysis: What do these experiences and literature tell us

The main questions emerging from the data gathered in this study are:

(i) Is feminist funding required as something distinct?

From the experiences of participants, as well as extant literature, the answer appears to be both yes and no. Yes, feminist funding organisations and networks/coalitions in particular are crucial to: (a) counter the gender-lens/gender impact investment trend that has recently emerged; (b) influence multilateral spaces of nation-states; (c) keep feminist concerns at the forefront of funding decisions. However, for established, visible, and influential feminist organisations, which have secured their resourcing plans while retaining autonomy, this feminist funding is not as necessary. They should extend funding opportunities to the vast feminist organising and practice that has not achieved the same due to socio-geo-political location. **Funding/resource mobilisation, in the third sector — as an experience, process, and ecosystem — becomes as feminist as the capacities and solidarities of feminist movements and practitioners.** The general consensus appears to be that spaces for interactions with anti-capitalist/working class feminist groups need to actively be expanded to include women HNIs.

(ii) What can the larger funding ecosystem and feminist funds learn from each other?

(a) FF/DS 4 shared their amusement at having thought 'but feminist funding was already doing this!' when they attended a regional philanthropists wherein the organisational representatives as well as HNIs were discussing flexible core funding (for organisational development and resilience) as a brand-new discovery. Feminist funds have for years practised the following: asking partner/grantee organisations to help expand the pool of grantees (akin to the participatory funding approach pioneered by FRIDA and now adapted by the Equality Fund as well); funding facilitation/intermediary[37]organisations carrying out capacity-building support as part of grant-making activities (for example, the CREA Institutes on sexuality rights, movement building and feminist leadership preceded the DASRA-HBS, SDM, CSIP programmes by well over a decade); and customised and supported funding partnership processes and rights-based forum building. In 2020, FRIDA[38] developed a Resource Mobilisation Ethics Policy (amongst other policies like RAD/Data safety, etc.) in consultation with grantee organisations, to set transparent criteria of where, from whom, and for what any funds will be received. It would be useful for the larger giving ecosystem entities to engage with this body of work that exists, rather than to reinvent the wheel from scratch, if for no other reason than in the interests of efficiency and productivity.

(b) Some participants indicated that the Indian feminist funding ecosystem may learn from the larger giving ecosystem to attend urgently to Diversity-Equity-Inclusion (DEI) concerns within its own spaces, given the inevitable corporatisation of feminist NGO and non-profit company structures. As GP/DS 5 put it, '…it is an assumption that only those from privileged communities can converse effectively with those who control big money and government … we need to try to break this dominance, in our own leadership and processes'. In the context of a few old and well-known, large NGOs in India, DS 2 said, '…it is a shame that corporate funding organisations had to tell the board to adopt diversity and inclusive practices…'.

[37]Term used by AWID in its documents and publications.
[38]As per organisational annual report 2020 on website www.youngfeministfund.org/annual-reports/.

# 4. RECOMMENDATIONS/WAY FORWARD:

4.1 In India, today, there is barely any space left for association of individuals on even a purely voluntary and unpaid basis without some form of regulation. As a result, many modes of resource mobilisation become inaccessible to specific kinds of feminist work. As learnt from inter-organisational programmes held online regarding the subject of this study, irrespective of feminist debates around funding, many organisations may no longer be able to avoid considering small amounts of for-profit work or a specific funder they may have avoided earlier on ideological grounds.[39] Therefore, feminist funds must initiate and lead advocacy and collective action for grant-seeking organisations' capacities to be strengthened. The latter must be able to assert, equalise, and preserve their core work and principles in all kinds of funding relationships. Feminist funds may consider doing this for feminist organisations irrespective of whether they are current partners.

4.2 Most feminist grant-seekers keenly scrutinise language and demonstrated practice before entering into alliances having legal and long-term implications. So, feminist funding agencies may consider internal work in terms of personnel/staff — on diversity and representation, as well as learning in a structured manner the nuances of intersectionality in identities of feminist groups and individuals and, hence, their concerns. This will change language, visibility, and access to/for the diverse mass of feminist practitioners as grant seekers.

4.3 Women HNIs and DEI-focused funding organisations who genuinely care about social transformation to achieve gender equality and, more importantly, gender justice, need to engage with discourse of feminist practice in the sector. This would be in the interest of concretely high-impact and in-depth work on issues of gender that they may/do want to support in the third sector.

4.4 Individual workers cope with inflation and precarity by engaging in speculative and real profit earning activities. The institutional equivalent of this is what some feminist funding entities internationally,[40] and non-profit organisations domestically have begun to advocate and experiment with (termed autonomous funding by AWID), that is, to generate some income independent of only grants and state funding, in times where access to the former and quantum of the latter have continued to shrink. The journey of each organisation, however, is and would be different in building its own mixed model of funding.

[39]As discussed in International Women's Development Agency's online programme in June 2022, regarding Resourcing autonomous feminist collectives' work.
[40]Op. cit., Equality Fund.

# APPENDIX 1: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW GUIDE

### 1) How did this feminist funding organisation evolve/come into being?

- Main actors/stakeholders, milestones/major developments; supportive factors and challenges from within the South Asian context and from outside it; underlying/organising principles.

### 2) What does this organisation's work look like today?

- How do the ideology/principles guide internal processes and structures, as well as whom to raise from and whom/what to give to? How do your funding sources impact/influence the same, if at all? Which other organisations fund same agendas as that of feminist funding, and does this impact your work in any way? What is the impact/influence (supportive and challenging respectively) of larger context today, for your work (including political economy, other uniquely Indian or South Asian factors like caste, communal majoritarianism etc.)?

### 3) What is the relevance of feminist funding and your organisation, in particular, in India, at present?

- What specific needs of the gender-equality sub-sector of the third sector is met by feminist funding and/or this organisation in particular? How does it meet these specific needs and how/why don't other funders (including other feminist funding organisations) meet these needs appropriately/adequately/differently than feminist funding/this organisation does? Do elaborate, if possible, by type of giving (theme-agnostic and gender-specific funders, multilateral and bilateral agencies, Govt., CSR, HNIs) and other sources of resource mobilisation (volunteerism, crowdfunding, general charitable donations).

### 4) Have feminist funding practices in India changed over the decades/years? If yes, how?

- Changes in resource mobilisation practices — from whom, how, nature of agreements entered into with donors, any other aspect; changes in feminist funding organisations' and grantee organisations' work — thematic areas/issues in focus, organisational structure and processes (including grievance redressal, decision-making, leadership etc.), modes and geographies of implementation, nature of expenditures/budgeting practices, personnel-related/HR practices and policies, legal compliance, political/activist engagement, any other aspect; What do you think or feel about these changes and why?

### 5) What further shifts/changes/developments/directions would you like to see in the practice of feminist funding in India, and also in South Asia/the Global South?

### 6) In conclusion, how would you define/what is a clear way to recognise what is and conversely, what is NOT, feminist funding, in practice?

# APPENDIX 2: REFERENCES


Aggarwal, Aayushi, Arundhati Sridhar, , and Bedotroyee Bhattacharjee. 2021. 'Funding for Gender Equality in India: Applying a Feminist Lens'. CSIP Research Fellowship.

Agnes, Flavia and Shobha Venkatesh Ghosh (Majlis). 2012. Majlis. 'Negotiating Spaces: Legal Domains, Gender Concerns, and Community Constructs'. Oxford University Press

Azurra, Cinzia, Tithi Bhattacharya, and Nancy Fraser. 2019. *Feminism for the 99%: A Manifesto.* Verso.

Bhattacharya, Tithi (ed.). 2017. *Social Reproduction Theory: Remapping Class, Recentering Oppression.* Pluto Press.

d'Almeida, Massan (XOESE, le Fonds pour les Femmes Francophones), Anisha Chugh, and Sanjana Gaind, (Women's Fund Asia), Marine-Celeste Kiromera, (Equality Fund). July 2022. 'Flipping the funding Script: ACTIVATE Re-imagines Grantmaking with Feminist Funds (Equality Fund)'. Available at https://equalityfund.ca/grantmaking/flipping-the-funding-script/.

De Beauvoir, Simone. 1949. *The Second Sex*. Gallimard.

Dietrich, Gabriele. 2003. 'Loss of Socialist Vision and Options before the Women's Movement'., *Economic and Political Weekly*, 25 October: 4547–54.

Ehrenreich, Barbara. 1998. Nickel and Dimed: On (Not) Getting by in America. Metropolitan Books.

Eisentstein, Hester. 2005. 'A Dangerous Liaison? Feminism and Corporate Globalisation'. *Science & Society*, vol. 69, no. 3, The Deep Structure of the Present Moment (Jul., 2005): 487–518.

FRIDA. 2022. 'Money is Political'. Available at https://youngfeministfund.org/money-is-political/#:~:text=We%20recognise%20Mackenzie%20Scott's%20position,to%20organisations%20that%20work%20on.

Friends of the Earth United States and Transnational Institute. March 2022. Cashing in on Crisis: How the World's Largest Investors Fuel and Profit from Climate Change and Border Militarization .

Gandhi, Nandita and Shah, Nandita. 1992. *The Issues at Stake: Theory and Practice in the Contemporary Women's Movement in India.* Kali for Women.

Global Philanthropy Project. 2020. 'Meet The Moment: A Call for Progressive Philanthropic Response to the Anti-Gender Movement'. Available at https://globalphilanthropyproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Meet-the-Moment-2020-English.pdf.

Goss, Kristin A. 2007. 'Foundations of Feminism: How Philanthropic Patrons Shaped Gender Politics'. *Social Science Quarterly,* vol. 88, no. 5, Special Issue on Women in Global Society (December 2007): 1174–191

Hartnell, Caroline. 2017. Philanthropy in India 2017 (Working Paper for PSJP). Available at http://www.psjp.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Philanthropy-in-India-October-2017-1.pdf.

Hartnell, Caroline. 2019. 'Individual Giving in India, Russia, the Arab Region, and Brazil. Philanthropy for Social Justice and Peace'. Available at http://www.psjp.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/Individual-giving-in-India-Russia-the-Arab-region-and-Brazil.pdf.

Heinrich, Michael. 2004. An Introduction to the Three Volumes of Karl Marx's *Capital*, trans. Alexander Locacio. Monthly Review Press.

Hensman, Rohini (Union Research Group, Bombay). 2011. 'Revisiting the Domestic-Labour Debate: An Indian Perspective'. *Historical Materialism*, vol. 19, no. 3: 3–28.

Jagori. 2004. 'Living Feminisms'. Jagori: A Journey of 20 Years.

Jhamb, Bhumika, Yamini Mishra, and Navanita Sinha. 2013. 'The Paradox of Gender Responsive Budgeting'. Economic and Political Weekly, vol. 48, no. 20 (18 May 2013): 35–38. Available http://www.feministpolicyindia.org/documents/resources/The%20paradox%20of%20GRB.pdf.

Johnson, Carol. 1996. 'Does Capitalism Really Need Patriarchy? Some Old Issues Reconsidered'. *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol. 19, no.3: 193–202

Kafer, Alison. 2013. *Feminist, Queer*, *Crip*. Indiana University Press.

Engels, Frederick. October 1884. The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. Hottingen-Zurich.

Kannabiran, Kalpana (ed.). 2005. *The Violence of Normal Times: Essays on Women's Lived Realities.* Women Unlimited and Kali for Women.

Kaur, Jagdeep. 2019. 'Women's Organisations in pre-Independence India'. *International Journal of Applied Research* vol.5, no. 1: 142–45

Kumar, Radha. 1993. *The History of Doing: An Illustrated Account of Movements for Women's Rights and Feminism in India 1800–1990.* Zubaan.

Lorde, Audre. 1984. *The Masters Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House.* Crossing Press.

Mahanan, Mary Ann and Madhuresh Kumar. 2021. *The Great Takeover: Mapping of Multistakeholderism in Global Governance*. People's Working Group on Multistakeholderism.

Mama Cash, AWID and Count Me In. 2022. 'Moving More Money to the Drivers of Change: How Bilateral and Multilateral Funders Can Resource Feminist Movements'.

Minj, Nolina, Ruby Hembrom, and Christy Nag. Adivaani. 2021. The Current Landscape of Philanthropy for Adivasi and Tribal Women at the Grassroots'. CSIP Research Fellowship working paper.

Misra, Geetanjali (2021). 'America's Charitable Problem Extends Far Beyond Giving Tuesday, and The Global South Is Bearing the Consequences'. Published on communitycentricfundraising.org in the capacity of Executive Director of CREA.

Ramachandran, Vimala and Kameshwari Jandhyala, eds. 2012. *Cartographies of Empowerment: The Mahila Samakhya Story*. Zubaan.

Satija, Shivani, Debdatta Purkayastha, and Anuradha Rajan. 2021. 'Staking Our Claim: Resourcing for a Feminist Agenda. Voices from the Ground'.

Srivastav, Tulika. Resourcing Social Justice: understanding philanthropy in India (A response to Caroline Hartnell). Available at http://www.psjp.org/resourcing-social-justice-understanding-philanthropy-in-india/.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 2018. Feminist Political Philosophy. Available at https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminism-political/.

Sundar, Pushpa. 1996. 'Women and Philanthropy in India'. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* vol. 7, no. 4, Women and Philanthropy (December 1996): 412–27.

Tandon, Ambika, and Aayush. 2019. 'Doing Standpoint Theory'. www.genderit.org.

United Nations 1995 (reprinted by UN Women in 2014). 'The Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action'.

Waris, Attiya. AWID. September 2019. 'Illicit Financial Flows: Why We should Claim These Resources for Gender, Economic and Social Justice'.

# APPENDIX 3: LEARNINGS AND ACHIEVEMENT

It has taken effort as a practitioner to understand the requirements of academic writing, which are different from those required while conducting research within the professional social work discipline. The data collection and literature review themselves have been a learning experience as well, in a manner of refreshing my skills. I have learnt a lot of details about the international community of those working on feminist funding and harnessing funds towards feminist movements across the globe. Despite having mobilised resources professionally for a number of years, there was new information for me in all of the discourse I perused.

While this is an entirely qualitative and exploratory study, it has brought together a picture of the landscape of feminist funding in India and all the major factors at play, which may be useful for others trying to understand all the actors and debates in this area within a vast and complex context.