

Post-colonial Feminist International Relations Theory and Sport for Development and Peace

Lyndsay M.C. Hayhurst, Lisa McIntosh Sundstrom,
and Devra Waldman

The recent growth of research in the nascent area of sport for development and peace (SDP) has been marked by its entrance into a variety of sub-disciplines in sport scholarship, including critical sociology (e.g., Darnell, 2012), management and organizational approaches (e.g., Schulenkorf, 2012), policy studies (e.g., Lindsey & Grattan, 2012), feminist studies (Chawansky, 2012), social movement perspectives (e.g., Harvey, Horne, Safai, Darnell, & Courchesne-O'Neill, 2013), peace and conflict scholarship (Wilson, 2012), and theories of children and youth (Jeanes, 2013). While each of these perspectives provides pertinent insights into SDP knowledge and practice, in this chapter, we contend that there is still arguably room left for post-colonial feminist international relations (IR) standpoints. Traditionally, as we discuss below, the field of international relations has focused on relations among states, and has defined power as the military and economic capabilities of states to dominate other states. Dominant liberal and realist IR approaches reified the concept of “states” to be divorced from the people living within various countries and the transnational inequalities of power that affect real people’s lives based on class, gender and post-colonial identities underneath the high politics of state warfare and diplomacy. We argue that newer, post-colonial feminist perspectives challenge

L.M.C. Hayhurst (✉)
York University, Toronto, ON, Canada

L.M. Sundstrom • D. Waldman
University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada

the definition of power and who is affected by power relations, while also responding to issues of global capitalism, international political economy, class and the politics of representation. In particular, we suggest that—though IR viewpoints have recently been utilized in some SDP work (e.g., Black, 2008; Levermore & Beacom, 2009, 2014)—infusing IR with post-colonial feminist perspectives potentially results in: (1) a distinct recognition of knowledge and representation as forms of power, particularly in relation to gender, race, class and the global (geo)politics of development; and (2) prying open spaces for locating multiplicities and hybridities (i.e., by accounting for pluralized and overlapping positionalities deployed through intersecting social categories of race, gender, class, sexuality, etc.) in terms that are relevant to international relations vis-à-vis SDP programmes and policies. Put differently, a post-colonial feminist IR approach to SDP reveals, and foregrounds, the (hyper)masculine tendencies underlying sport and the ways these characteristics are potentially encapsulated, and deployed, through international relations (cf. Ling, 2013).

On the whole, and alongside Ackerly and True (2008, p. 160), in this chapter, we demonstrate how a post-colonial feminist IR approach to SDP is useful for ‘illuminat[ing] postcolonial contexts and multiple local and global intersections of social differentiation and oppression’. In other words, our goal is to show how post-colonial feminist perspectives provide a correction to traditional IR, while also making an important contribution to SDP scholarship. Specifically, we illustrate the value of post-colonial IR feminist perspectives in exploring SDP by discussing two of its central themes—global capitalism, class and post-coloniality; and the power of knowledge and representation. We then apply these themes to examples examining the themes of global capitalism, caste and post-colonialism, while also infusing some of the key insights concerning representation and power generated in post-colonial scholarship to the study of IR through the Goal programme—an initiative run by Standard Chartered Bank in India, China, Jordan, Nigeria and Zambia that uses sport training and financial and life-skills education to try to transform the lives of young women in underserved communities (Goal, 2015).

The remainder of this chapter is structured in two parts. First, we briefly map out the key conceptual tools and theoretical trajectories in IR theory, with the goal of illuminating our ultimate push for utilizing post-colonial feminist IR perspectives, particularly when investigating gender-focused SDP programmes. In the second section, we then use a post-colonial feminist IR perspective to analyze the Goal programme.

Conceptualizing International Relations: Key Tenets and Theoretical Perspectives

In a (somewhat) similar vein to SDP scholarship, the field of international relations has not traditionally taken gender concerns into account. In fact, the dominant perspectives of traditional international relations—realism and liberalism—long failed to consider the impact of international politics on actual people inside state borders, and focused on the ‘high politics’ (Weldes, 2006, p. 178) geopolitical questions of the military and economic power of the state, ‘a domain of hard truths, material realities and irrepressible natural facts’ (Tuathail & Agnew, 1992, p. 193). Newer social constructivist approaches to international relations, as well as newer forms of liberalism, have at least begun to delve into the everyday consequences of international relations, and feminist and post-colonial international relations theory has gone a step further by examining the gender, race and other identity consequences of both high politics actions by states, and the troubling ethical dimensions of the knowledge, power and claims to representation exhibited in the transnational activities of non-state actors such as non-governmental organizations (NGOs), international development agencies and corporations.

Classical realism, expounded famously by Hans Morgenthau (1954, p. 4) in one of the foundational works of the field of international relations, *Politics Among Nations*, asserted that politics is ‘governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature’, and that it is possible to develop a rational theory reflecting those laws. Moreover, he argued that political realism ‘stresses the rational, objective and unemotional’ (Morgenthau, 1954, p. 7). State interest for realists, Morgenthau (1954, p. 4) wrote, is ‘defined in terms of power’ and, employing the typically gendered language of the mid-twentieth century, he defined power as the ‘control of man over man’ (Morgenthau, 1954, p. 11). Prudence, rather than moral principles, is the ‘supreme virtue in politics’, so that political ethics only consider political, rather than moral consequences of states’ actions (Morgenthau, 1954, p. 12). Realist approaches take most of Morgenthau’s assumptions as starting points. Feminist scholar J. Ann Tickner, in a highly influential article, examined Morgenthau’s realist theory from a feminist standpoint and pointed out the masculinized vision of international politics embedded in the assumption of universal and objective laws, the privileging of high politics of statecraft rather than the consequences for human beings, the delineation of sharp lines separating public politics from private moral concerns, and the definition of power as being the power of man over man (rather than a feminist perspective on power deriving from Hannah Arendt as action ‘in concert’ or ‘in connection with others’) (Tickner, 1988).

A more recent version of realist theory in IR, called “structural realism” or “neorealism”, divorced international politics from human action and anything involving the internal dynamics of states even more severely. Kenneth Waltz (1979), who wrote the foundational text expounding neorealism, *Theory of International Politics*, adopted many of classical realism’s tenets, but rejected a reliance on rooting man’s quest for power in human nature. Instead, for neorealists, the condition of anarchy in the international system, in which states exist as sovereign equals with one another, without any overarching governing authority, forces states to take a position of self-reliance and power maximization in order to defend themselves against attack by other states. Thus, Waltz (1979) and other neorealists insist, the structure of the system itself creates the hunger for power and enduring violence in the international system. This leads neorealists to examine states as black boxes with no important internal dynamics or actors. For neorealists, then, to examine the power hierarchies within societies, or the efforts of outside actors to influence actors or events inside states would be anathema to their theory.

Classical liberal theorists, intellectual descendants of philosophers such as Kant and Locke, take a fundamentally more positive view of human nature and traditionally have allowed more elements of human choice of action into their theories (Kant, Kleingeld, Waldron, Doyle, & Wood, 2006; Locke & Macpherson, 1980). Liberals tend to view societies and states as more peaceful and freedom enhancing over time as humans learn from past mistakes and develop institutions to govern themselves democratically in an increasingly interdependent world (Doyle, 1986; Keohane & Nye, 1977; Walt, 1998). In order to counter realist criticism of their ostensibly naïve assumptions about human progress and cooperation, a new version of liberalism, called neo-liberal institutionalism, developed in the 1980s (Axelrod & Hamilton, 1981; Baldwin, 1993; Keohane, 1984; Milner, 1991). Neo-liberal institutionalism accepted some of neorealism’s foundational tenets, including returning to the idea that states are the key actors in IR (and selfish ones at that) and found that cooperation among states is even possible and does occur under these conditions. Still, though, the liberal school of thought in international relations has tended to examine states as the key actors in international relations, and neo-liberal institutionalism took the paradigm back to studying exclusively state behaviour.

While liberals have challenged the realist assumption that the militant quest for power is an immutable fact in international politics, it was not until constructivist and feminist theories of international relations came to fruition that scholars were effectively able to undermine the assumptions that states are the only or primary actors in international relations. Constructivists began

to question again the assumption that states are the only influential actors in international politics. Authors such as Keck and Sikkink (1998) and Risse, Ropp, and Sikkink (1999) argued that transnational advocacy networks, crucially including the activism of non-governmental organizations, play an enormous role in changing behaviours of governments as well as social groups within states through work to change the social norms governing actors' behaviour over time. Barnett and Finnemore (2004) argued that the behaviour of actors within international organizations such as United Nations agencies has profound effects upon the policies of states and the impacts of those policies on people around the world towards whom those organizations target their activities. Constructivist theorists believe, fundamentally, that the way that things are situated together 'makes possible, or even probable, certain kinds of political behavior and effects' (Finnemore & Sikkink, 2001, p. 394). Adherents to this perspective explore the 'social content of the organization—its culture, its legitimacy concerns, dominant norms that govern behavior and shape interests, and the relationship of these to a larger normative and cultural environment' (Barnett & Finnemore, 1999, p. 706). These standpoints are useful for unravelling relations among knowledge, power and agency within a global development context. Still, however, feminist theorists have criticized constructivist theorizing about social change for its lack of attention to the unequal power relations inherent in the persuasion and advocacy efforts of transnational activists (Locher & Prugl, 2001, p. 113).

Feminist international relations theory also grew in the late 1980s–1990s, although it has remained rather marginal in its influence; it has not grown into a grand paradigm of the discipline as constructivism has. Foundational authors such as Ann Tickner, Cynthia Enloe, Christine Sylvester and Jacqui True have been central to the field's development. They differ from mainstream constructivists in their insistence that gender is one of the major organizing principles of all areas of international relations. They have contributed gender analyses of international relations on questions ranging from the more typically human-centric fields of human rights or socio-economic development, to the masculinized ways in which security, warfare, diplomacy and international political economy are constituted in international relations.

One of the key contributions of feminist theorists in IR has been to point to how the masculinized actions of state power holders serve to reinforce patriarchal structures and subjugation of women, particularly in the Global South, and that these actions are necessary in order to continue to reproduce a masculinized international system (Enloe, 1989; Sylvester, 1994b). Others have argued that not only do states act to reproduce traditional gender roles, but corporations and market forces in a globalized economy of consumerism also

forcefully shape gender identities (True, 1999). Still others have maintained that traditional and mainstream statist conceptions of “international security”, divorcing the “public interest” from the “private”, and the needs of humans from the needs of states, lead to a masculinized legitimation of wars that actually decrease human security (Sylvester, 1994a; Tickner, 1992). Post-colonial feminists who have aimed to further redefine the focus of IR have since joined this feminist questioning of masculinized constructions of the state and security.

Post-colonial Feminist IR Perspectives

Post-colonial feminism in particular built upon the initial foundations of feminist IR theory that questioned traditional realist IR’s depiction of the state as a unified actor with no internal social content, and the assumption of “the state interest” as naturally and universally one of military security. In a similar vein to global governance scholarship, which recognizes the increasing scope and intensity of authority held by non-state actors on a global scale (Rosenau, 1999), post-colonialism rejects all-encompassing categories that recognize, for example, the authority of the nation-state—thereby challenging one of the mainstays of IR theory.

In addition to complementing—and expanding—global governance perspectives, post-colonial IR feminist standpoints are also useful for building on social constructivist positions by revealing how power, authority and influence are used in social contexts. While social constructivism is an important approach for investigating the “why” and “how” behind various changes in the global political terrain, such perspectives tend to ignore more diverse, feminist-oriented and ‘non-Western traditions of world-making to see how they *mix* the West to produce our contemporary world’ (Ling, 2002, p. 31). In particular, Chowdhry and Nair (2002) further contend that post-colonial feminist perspectives extend traditional IR theory by upholding: (1) questions of inequality, poverty, powerlessness and social justice in the discipline of IR; and (2) historical processes that contribute to the production of (gendered) global hierarchies. Indeed, the gendered foundations of mainstream IR theory are magnified through post-colonial feminist frameworks, with an eye to issues of representation, resistance and agency—particularly in considering key IR constructs such as “the state” and “sovereignty”.

While feminist IR perspectives may similarly demonstrate the ways that gender has been ignored in broader IR literature, Western feminist voices tend to dominate and homogenize these approaches, with little room for the multiple logics and hybridities (Ackerly & True, 2008). In fact, Ling (2013)

contends that neo-realist approaches to world politics only focus on power and uphold a singular hypermasculinity as a normative value, where feminized, weaker “Others” are often deemed inferior, emotional and ineffective, and where “difference” is a source of alienation. Here, Ling also points to resilient social movements that are taking place “on the ground”—such as strong Indigenous movements (e.g., the Idle No More movement that originated in Canada in December 2012), which cannot be captured by traditional neo-realist perspectives.¹ Post-colonial feminist IR theory, according to Ling (2014), is able to account for these “multiple logics” in world politics—it is, in essence, able to move towards ‘decolonizing the international’ away from singular, hypermasculine models—lending the opportunity to ‘throw off the shackles of colonial politics’ (Ling, 2014, p. 583). To accomplish this, post-colonial IR perspectives suggest that neo-realist approaches tend to, for instance: (1) ignore alternative (non-Western) ways of understanding global politics; (2) fail to address issues of representation; and (3) use a universal language to speak about post-colonial others that positions them as subordinate and invisible (Chowdhry & Nair, 2002). On the whole, then, neo-realist perspectives do not pay attention to how post-coloniality and gender are taken up and implicated in a multitude of “colonizing” practices that structure power relations globally, and resistance to those practices’ (Chowdhry & Nair, 2002, p. 9).

In this chapter, then, we specifically hone in on the ways that post-colonial feminist IR theory responds to issues of global capitalism, international political economy, class and the politics of representation. In doing so, we demonstrate how post-colonial feminist insights are gleaned by uncovering how—for example—Western capitalist hegemony is potentially deployed and sustained through the Goal Programme for young women in the Global South funded by a transnational financial corporation—Standard Chartered. We also examine the ways in which a post-colonial feminist IR perspective reveals how racialized and gendered representations of the “Other” are tacitly used in some of the curriculum posted on the Goal programme’s website. Before applying these ideas further, we now turn to research in contemporary sport scholarship to examine how IR theory has been used to explore SDP.

Contextualizing Sport, SDP and International Relations

Post-colonial feminist IR perspectives have yet to be applied to sport scholarship (exceptions include Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011, 2014; Hayhurst, 2011a, 2011b, 2014); and more broadly, IR theory has been largely ignored in sport

scholarship (with a few notable exceptions, such as Black, 2008; Darnell & Huish, 2015a, 2015b; Giulianotti, 2011; Houlihan, 1994, 1997; Huish, Carter, & Darnell, 2013; Levermore, 2004, 2009; Levermore & Beacom, 2014; Levermore & Budd, 2004; Maguire, 2008). As Black (2008, p. 469) argues, 'sport remains widely neglected in the scholarly fields of International Relations (IR) and Foreign Policy specifically, and Political Science more generally'. More recently, Levermore and Beacom (2014, p. 220) suggest that 'sport remains on the periphery of IR analyses, and academics from non-IR disciplines dominate what has been published to date'.

For the most part, SDP research that has used IR theory has mostly used realist perspectives that tend to focus primarily on the role of the state attempting to maximize power within the international sport system. For example, this work explains and compares the role of Western state(s) in designing and implementing sport development and SDP policies and programmes (e.g., Houlihan, 1997; Houlihan & White, 2002). Here, scholars argue that these studies 'mostly emphasiz[e] state intervention in sport and sports diplomacy to pursue foreign policy objectives, and (at times) the role of NGOs and major international federations in governing sport' (Darnell & Hayhurst, 2011, p. 187).

Other influential work by Levermore and Budd (2004) examines sport in the development of social and economic programmes (including those focused on gender), while more current work by Levermore and Beacom (2014) explores IR theory in relation to SDP in terms of governance, community, capital and identity. With reference to governance, these authors show, for example, how NGOs have increasingly extended into diplomatic roles since '(good) governance depends on nongovernmental input ... NGOs with a sport focus ... do have a role to play, for example, in relation to debates concerning the efficacy of development interventions aimed at contributing to the UN Millennium Development Goals' (Levermore & Beacom, 2014, p. 226).² In considering the links between community development and sport, the authors note the range of international actors involved in deploying SDP programmes focused in community development, such as 'the state, multilateral institutions, multinational companies, sports clubs, sport starts, sport federations, and community-based and non-governmental organizations' (Levermore & Beacom, 2014, p. 228).

While the contributions by Levermore and Budd (2004) and Levermore and Beacom (2009, 2014) have been noteworthy in connecting SDP to IR, there remains a lack of discussion that focuses on: (1) gender relations in SDP global politics; and (2) the post-colonial contexts in which many SDP interventions operate. By taking up a post-colonial feminist IR approach, our goal in this chapter is to highlight the involvement of non-state actors such as SDP NGOs and corporations, viewing these entities as socially constructed "agents",

and considering the agency and culture of the marginalized “Other” in global SDP politics. Below, we use a case study from SDP to argue for more of a focus on gender and social relations in IR, including discussions of intersectionality, (neo-)imperialism as it intersects with gender, race and class; and the production of power in IR (cf., Chowdhry & Nair, 2002). That is, through this example, we investigate how post-colonial feminist IR theory can contribute to a more nuanced understanding of the dynamics of SDP and its relationship to gendered world politics. Specifically, the two tenets of post-colonial feminist international relations theory to be further examined in our case study are: (1) global capitalism, class and post-coloniality; and (2) the power of representation and power relations.

Case Study

The Goal Programme: Post-colonial Relationships, Representation and Global Capitalism

Created by Standard Chartered Bank as part of their corporate social responsibility initiative to invest in local communities to be a ‘powerful force for good’, Goal is an award-winning Sport for Development initiative that uses sport and financial and health education to attempt to improve the lives of adolescent girls living in underserved communities (Goal, 2015). Started in Delhi, India in 2006, the programme has since expanded to China, Nigeria, Zambia and Jordan. The programme targets girls aged 13–19 who reside in urban communities, may or may not have access to education, and/or are living on low family incomes. Typically, girls meet weekly over a ten-month period where they will play sport and participate in activities focused around learning a particular life skill. The curriculum was designed by Standard Chartered in collaboration with the Population Council (an international NGO that conducts biomedical and public health research, <http://www.pop-council.org>), and is freely available online through Standard Chartered’s partnership with Women Win (a global organization focused on aiding girls’ empowerment through sport, <http://womenwin.org>). The curriculum has multiple modules that contain a variety of activities that emphasize four life skills: communication, health and hygiene, human rights, and financial literacy. Under communication, the curriculum is focused on learning effective interpersonal communication skills, strategies for identifying and resisting peer pressure, conflict resolution, understanding gender roles in the home and community, and goal setting. The portion of the curriculum directed to health

focuses on positive body image, understanding body anatomy, skills for personal and household hygiene, sexual health, and prevention of sexually transmitted infections. The module on human rights focuses on understanding human rights, sexual rights, resources that girls can access, and safe discussions about sexual and domestic violence. Finally, the goals of the financial literacy module are to underscore the importance of saving money, budgeting skills, career planning, understanding bank functioning, and consequences of borrowing money.

While Standard Chartered and Women Win are careful to mention that the curriculum/programming can be adapted to suit local contexts (they do not provide specific examples, but note that some activities may be more or less applicable), what is provided online is a standardized curriculum that is meant to be implemented in each location where the Goal programme operates. This becomes especially clear in their ‘Training the Trainers Toolkit’ (the document designed to train those who will be implementing the Goal programme) which emphasizes that—although changes can be made to suit various timelines—the curriculum must be taught in the specific order provided and cover the four modules. Moreover, girls who complete the programme and display exceptional leadership qualities are invited to become Goal Champions. Goal Champions are provided further training to facilitate the Goal programme, the possibility of being granted a micro-finance loan to start up their own business, or the chance of internship opportunities in Standard Chartered (Standard Chartered, 2011).

A post-colonial feminist IR approach is useful when examining the Goal programme to highlight the ways in which post-colonial relationships intersect with issues surrounding global capitalism and politics. Particularly, through Goal, Standard Chartered—as a non-state actor—is buttressing a narrow understanding of “development” that is motivated by the interests of global capitalist ideologies. For example, in documents produced by Standard Chartered, the organization highlights that:

The Indian economy loses an estimated \$32.6 billion every year because girls are taken out of schools at a young age, which affects their progress in later years. Yet we know that women are key drivers of economic development in our markets, and studies show that investment focused directly on women and girls delivers strong returns. (Standard Chartered, 2009, pp. 1–2)

In a more recent report issued by Standard Chartered, they reflect on the potential Goal has to contribute to achieving the Millennium Development Goal of eliminating gender disparity in education through empowering girls in

low-income communities ‘in [their] markets’ and providing financial education training to female entrepreneurs (Standard Chartered, 2014). Not only does Standard Chartered emphasize the economic losses suffered by lack of female access to the marketplace, but the understandings of development prioritized (re)inforce (gendered) hierarchical relationships, as Standard Chartered is positioned both as benevolent provider of development as well as the legitimate organization through which development can take place—with understandings that neo-liberal capitalism is the best venue for social, economic and political fulfillment (Ling, 2002). Furthermore, women are positioned as valuable entrepreneurs that are worthy of investment because of the missed opportunities experienced in the economy—they are individual drivers of economic progress with the ability to provide ‘measurable returns’ on poverty reduction in the future. Following Ling (2002, p. 115), the attention Standard Chartered is directing towards promoting female economic integration is reflective of their interests in sustaining ‘Western capitalist hegemony in the global economy’.

Furthermore, utilizing a post-colonial feminist IR lens is beneficial for considering how issues of power and representation—and the related body projects embedded in the programme along with financial education—may work together to homogeneously discipline women in the Goal programme on a transnational scale. While this should not necessarily be understood as a totalizing regime of corporeality, as there is the potential for slight local variations, the curriculum uses normative biopedagogical knowledge designed by groups in the Global North about what constitutes health, empowerment and hygiene. For example, the module of the curriculum dedicated to health covers topics such as reproductive health, issues around HIV, body image and practices to maintain proper hygiene. In an activity related to hygiene, girls are asked to answer “true or false” to a variety of questions that include: ‘it is not necessary to wash your hands after urinating’, ‘washing with soap and water cleans dirt and germs off your body’, ‘you do not need to wash underwear’, and ‘if you have access to sanitary napkins, you should change them twice a day’ (Goal, 2015). Though this knowledge may appear to be “innocent” and potentially useful for these young women in securing their overall hygiene and wellbeing, it is also reminiscent of a civilizing mission in which the young women targeted through this curriculum in the Global South are potentially constructed and represented as dirty, uneducated, uncivilized and racialized subjects—yet, at the same time, they are still “developable Others”. That is, it is only the girls who are being asked to wash their hands, body and clothing, and maintain household hygiene, with no specific equivalent directed to boys through this programme. Combined with the financial literacy component of the curriculum, the focus of the programme is on “ordering” oneself

both in body and finances, in order to impel women to govern themselves into being both active and socially responsible social entrepreneurs that are prepared to become good (and potentially presentable) employees in the context of growing market economies (Batliwala & Dhanraj, 2007). Here, questions arise around the ways in which the Goal programme (and therefore Women Win and Standard Chartered) are given the authority to speak for and about these girls in terms of their health and bodies, and how power is manifested in this programme through domination and subordination/hegemony and resistance on a global scale.

There are further questions to be raised about the ways in which certain women who have gone through this programme are selected as Goal Champions. As Standard Chartered underscores, it is those who display exceptional leadership qualities throughout the programme that are selected to undergo training to facilitate the programme for other women and/or are provided internship opportunities in their bank. It is significant here that only a select few will be inculcated into this logic of development, and that these women will likely be selected based on their ability to emulate the understandings of development put forth by Standard Chartered. Following Ling (2002), it could be that there is an element of 'mimicry' here in that, at the extreme, Goal Champions would likely be selected because of their adoption of Standard Chartered's understandings of acceptable standards of "being" (in finance and body). This could include beliefs in ideologies of free-market capitalism, individual responsibility, as well as the particular (Westernized) understandings of hygiene, health and human rights channelled in Standard Chartered's curriculum. Such Western neo-liberal understandings may work to further promote the image of easily attainable upward mobility, making more visible those who are able to successfully become empowered neo-liberal citizens. At the same time, it could also make more invisible those who are unable to participate or are not destined to become Goal Champions, due to larger structural barriers and processes (such as issues with access) that make this difficult to achieve. Again, the emphasis is on the individual responsibility of the women in these programmes to follow the path to success, and in selecting a few candidates, Standard Chartered continues to reinforce messages of empowerment as "smart economics" (i.e., a sound investment, as women will work to bring themselves and their families out of poverty while simultaneously boosting the economy by entering the workforce) that continue to promote economic liberalization (Chant, 2012).

Here, we see how the presence of Standard Chartered (a prominent global financial institution), in partnership with Women Win (a notable international NGO working in SDP), is able to produce and disseminate a powerful curriculum that focuses on shifting young women's bodies and minds in very diverse

local contexts (India, China, Nigeria, Zambia and Jordan) with an ultimate goal of creating social entrepreneurs who are prepared and able to participate more actively in the global economy. These influential non-state actors (Goal, Women Win and Standard Chartered) are conceivably able to govern this space without considering a cross-cultural model of understanding that accepts multiplicities and specific local cultural knowledge as to what constitutes “leadership” and “hygiene”. From a post-colonial feminist IR perspective, this normative biopedagogical knowledge is injected into SDP programming and transgresses bordered worlds. We are not suggesting here that the young women and girls that are targeted by the Goal programme passively accept its curriculum and biopedagogical messages without resistance or agency; instead, we seek to complicate and question the homogenizing and potentially neo-colonial tone of the programme by pointing to its facilitation through global capitalism and implicit neo-liberal messaging. We are also concerned about the power of transnational corporate and non-state actors, and their ability to design and disseminate dominant discourses of representation and power about girls’ health and bodies.

Concluding Comments

In this chapter, we have argued for using a post-colonial feminist IR approach to exploring SDP programmes as a theoretical tool for igniting discussions about, and exposing, some of the racialized, classed and gendered silences and invisibilities evident in SDP scholarship and practice. Indeed, and as the discussion of the Goal programme illustrates, research on SDP can significantly strengthen its critical insights by using the post-colonial feminist lens from international relations; likewise, the discipline of international relations and post-colonial feminism within it can benefit from SDP scholars’ analysis of an area of global activity by state and non-state actors alike that has heretofore been largely ignored by IR scholars. While the traditional realist and neo-liberal schools of international relations would balk at the idea that sport for development and peace programmes are relevant to global politics, the emergence of post-colonial feminist theory within the discipline provides a new basis for understanding how these low-politics dynamics in everyday development policy constitute much of the important activity in international relations.

This is not to suggest, however, that post-colonial feminist IR perspectives are an absolute panacea to improving our understandings of SDP programming. Indeed, there are many challenges, contradictions and ambiguities involved in

pursuing this theoretical framework. For example, we recognize that we—as authors of this chapter—are middle-class, white, Western academics writing on the topic of post-colonial feminism, international relations, sport and development. In many ways, we are making arguments and challenging the homogenizing character of, for example, neo-realist approaches to studying SDP, when we might be impelling these same standpoints through our very subject positions. And yet, we hope (with some humility) to use this chapter as a departure point for advancing critical discussions about the utility of a post-colonial feminist IR framework in order to address some of the omissions and marginalizations behind more traditional approaches to sport, international relations and development scholarship (see Hayhurst, MacNeill, & Frisby, 2011).

Future research on SDP might consider using a post-colonial feminist IR lens to open up possibilities for exploring instances of grassroots resistance, agency and localized counter-narratives to “global” SDP interventions. Here, we might consider how the post-colonial concepts such as ‘mimicry’ and ‘hybridity’ (cf., Bhabha, 1994) emerge in destabilizing global power arrangements so prevalent in SDP. This may involve examining distinctive forms of (localized) physical culture, recreation and physical activity as they confront dominant metanarratives of “conventional SDP” (i.e., mainstream and globally popularized sports such as basketball, volleyball and soccer). How, for instance, might these localized forms of physical culture struggle against conventional forms of SDP, and potentially resist and confront the increasing global neo-liberal tone of initiatives such as the Goal programme? Is it possible to create solidarities and alliances across gender, race and class through these localized forms of physical culture, recreation and physical activity? While these questions are only beginning to be explored by SDP scholars (e.g., Forde, Waldman, Hayhurst, & Frisby, 2017), we suggest that the time is ripe to heighten research and practice in sport for development and peace by seeking to better understand how contemporary global politics—through the lens of post-colonial feminism—may help us to “rewrite” the SDP story through a richer analysis that is more sensitive, inclusive and attentive to the intersections between gender, race, class and nation.

Notes

1. Idle No More (INM) is an Indigenous-led social movement that focuses on promoting Indigenous knowledge and anchored in Indigenous self-determination, calling on all people to ‘join in a peaceful revolution, to honour Indigenous sovereignty, and to protect the land and water’ (INM, 2014).

2. In 2000, 189 world leaders gathered to commit to realizing the UN Millennium Development Goals, the central aim being to eradicate poverty and support a “blueprint” for designing and implementing development programmes in countries across the Global South. Currently, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have emerged as the new development framework for the post-MDG agenda (see <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org> for further information).

References

- Ackerly, B., & True, J. (2008). Reflexivity in practice: Power and ethics in feminist research on international relations. *International Studies Review*, 10(4), 693–707.
- Axelrod, R., & Hamilton, W. D. (1981). The evolution of cooperation. *Science*, 211(4489), 1390–1396.
- Baldwin, D. A. (1993). *Neorealism and neoliberalism: The contemporary debate*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Barnett, M. N., & Finnemore, M. (1999). The politics, power, and pathologies of international organizations. *International Organization*, 53(4), 699–732.
- Barnett, M. N., & Finnemore, M. (2004). *Rules for the world: International organizations in global politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Batliwala, S., & Dhanraj, D. (2007). Gender myths that instrumentalize women: A view from the Indian frontline. In A. Cornwall, E. Harrison, & A. Whitehead (Eds.), *Feminisms in development: Contradictions, contestations and challenges* (pp. 21–34). New York: Zed Books.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Black, D. (2008). Dreaming big: The pursuit of “second order” games as a strategic response to globalization. *Sport in Society*, 11(4), 467–480.
- Chant, S. (2012). The disappearing of ‘smart economics’? The world development report 2012 on gender equality: Some concerns about the preparatory process and the prospects for paradigm change. *Global Social Policy*, 12(2), 198–218.
- Chawansky, M. (2012). Good girls play sports: International inspiration and the construction of girlhood. *Feminist Media Studies*, 12(3), 473–476.
- Chowdhry, G., & Nair, S. (2002). *Power, postcolonialism, and international relations*. London: Routledge.
- Darnell, S. C. (2012). *Sport for development and peace: A critical sociology*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Darnell, S. C., & Hayhurst, L. M. C. (2011). Sport for decolonization: Exploring a new praxis of sport for development. *Progress in Development Studies*, 11(3), 193–196.
- Darnell, S. C., & Hayhurst, L. M. C. (2014). De-colonising sport-for-development: Critical insights from post-colonial feminist theory. In N. Schulenkorg & D. Adair (Eds.), *Global sport-for-development: Critical perspectives* (pp. 33–61). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Darnell, S. C., & Huish, R. (2015a). Cuban sport and the challenges of South-South solidarity. In L. M. C. Hayhurst, T. Kay, & M. Chawansky (Eds.), *Beyond sport for development and peace: Transnational perspectives on theory, policy and practice* (pp. 35–46). London: Routledge.
- Darnell, S. C., & Huish, R. (2015b). Cuban sport policy and South-South development cooperation: An overview and analysis of the Escuela Internacional de Educación Física y Deporte. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 7(1), 123–140.
- Doyle, M. W. (1986). Liberalism and world politics. *The American Political Science Review*, 80(4), 1151–1169.
- Enloe, C. (1989). *Bananas, beaches and bases: Making feminist sense of international politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (2001). Taking stock: The constructivist research program in international relations and comparative politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4, 391–416.
- Forde, S., Waldman, D., Hayhurst, L. M. C., & Frisby, W. (2017). Sport, social change and peace. In D. Andrews, M. Silk, & H. Thorpe (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of physical cultural studies* (pp. 568–579). London: Routledge.
- Giulianotti, R. (2011). Sport, transnational peacemaking, and global civil society: Exploring the reflective discourses of “Sport, Development and Peace” project officials. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 35(1), 50–71.
- Goal. (2015). *Goal programme*. Retrieved September 24, 2015, from <http://goalprogramme.org>
- Harvey, J., Horne, J., Safai, P., Darnell, S. C., & Courchesne-O’Neill, S. (2013). *Sport and social movements: From the global to the local*. London: Bloomsbury Academic Press.
- Hayhurst, L. M. C. (2011a). Corporatising sport, gender and development: Postcolonial IR feminisms, transnational private governance and global corporate social engagement. *Third World Quarterly*, 32(3), 531–549.
- Hayhurst, L. M. C. (2011b). *The corporatization of sport, gender and development: Postcolonial IR feminisms, transnational private governance and global corporate social engagement*, Munk School of Global Affairs Working Paper Series 2009–2010. Retrieved September 12, 2012, from http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1942740
- Hayhurst, L. M. C. (2014). Using postcolonial feminism to investigate cultural difference and neoliberalism in sport, gender and development programming in Uganda. In K. Young & C. Okada (Eds.), *Sport, social development and peace* (pp. 45–65). New York: Emerald Press.
- Hayhurst, L. M. C., MacNeill, M., & Frisby, W. (2011). A postcolonial feminist approach to gender, development and Edusport. In B. Houlihan & M. Green (Eds.), *Handbook of sport development* (pp. 353–367). London: Routledge.
- Houlihan, B. (1994). *Sport and international politics*. London: Harvester and Wheatsheaf.

- Houlihan, B. (1997). *Sport, policy and politics: A comparative analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Houlihan, B., & White, A. (2002). *The politics of sports development: Development of sport or development through sport?* London: Routledge.
- Huish, R., Carter, T., & Darnell, S. (2013). The (soft) power of sport: The comprehensive and contradictory strategies of Cuba's sport-based internationalism. *International Journal of Cuban Studies*, 5(1), 26–40.
- Idle No More. (2014). Retrieved July 2, 2015, from <http://www.idlenomore.ca/>
- Jeanes, R. (2013). Educating through sport? Examining HIV/AIDS education and sport-for-development through the perspectives of Zambian young people. *Sport Education and Society*, 18(3), 388–406.
- Kant, I., Kleingeld, P., Waldron, J., Doyle, M. W., & Wood, A. W. (2006). *Toward perpetual peace and other writings on politics, peace, and history*. Hartford: Yale University Press.
- Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Keohane, R. O. (1984). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (1977). *Power and interdependence*. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.
- Levermore, R. (2004). Sport and international relations: Continued neglect? In R. Levermore & A. Budd (Eds.), *Sport and international relations: An emerging relationship* (pp. 16–30). London: Routledge.
- Levermore, R. (2009). Sport-in-international development: Theoretical frameworks. In R. Levermore & A. Beacom (Eds.), *Sport and international development* (pp. 26–54). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Levermore, R., & Beacom, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Sport and international development*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Levermore, R., & Beacom, A. (2014). Sport and international relations re-examined. In J. Maguire (Ed.), *Handbook of the social sciences and sport* (pp. 219–245). Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- Levermore, R., & Budd, A. (Eds.). (2004). *Sport and international relations: An emerging relationship*. London: Routledge.
- Lindsey, I., & Grattan, A. (2012). An 'international movement'? Decentering sport-for-development within Zambian communities. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 4(1), 91–110.
- Ling, L. H. M. (2002). Cultural chauvinism and the liberal international order: "West vs. rest" in Asia's financial crisis. In G. Chowdhry & S. Nair (Eds.), *Power in a postcolonial world: Race, gender and class in international relations* (pp. 115–114). New York: Routledge.
- Ling, L. H. M. (2013). *Session 3 – International relations theory: Views from beyond the west*. Retrieved August 24, 2015, from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6tLMtAYiCSg>

- Ling, L. H. M. (2014). Decolonizing the international: Towards multiple emotion worlds. *International Theory*, 6(3), 579–583.
- Locher, B., & Prugl, E. (2001). Feminism and constructivism: Worlds apart or sharing the middle ground? *International Studies Quarterly*, 45(1), 111–129.
- Locke, J., & Macpherson, C. B. (1980). *Second treatise of government*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Maguire, J. (2008). “Real politic” or “ethically based”: Sport, globalisation, migration and nation-state policies. *Sport in Society*, 11(4), 443–458.
- Milner, H. (1991). The assumption of anarchy in international relations theory: A critique. *Review of International Studies*, 17(1), 67–85.
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1954). *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace*. New York: Knopf.
- Risse, T., Ropp, S. C., & Sikink, K. (1999). *The power of human rights: International norms and domestic change*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenau, J. N. (1999). Toward an ontology of global governance. In M. Hewson & T. J. Sinclair (Eds.), *Approaches to global governance theory* (pp. 287–302). Albany: SUNY Press.
- Schulenkorf, N. (2012). Sustainable community development through sport and events: A conceptual framework for sport-for-development projects. *Sport Management Review*, 15(1), 1–12.
- Standard Chartered. (2009). *Sustainability review 2009: Goal*. Retrieved September 15, 2015, from http://www.standardchartered.com/sustainability-review-09/en/community_investment/goal.html
- Standard Chartered. (2011). *Sustainability review 2011: Goal*. Retrieved July 15, 2015, from <http://reports.standardchartered.com/sr2011/leadingthewayincommunities/communityinvestment/goalprogramme.html?cat=m>
- Standard Chartered. (2014). *Sustainability summary 2014: Driving investment, trade and the creation of wealth across Asia, Africa and the Middle East*. London: Standard Chartered.
- Sylvester, C. (1994a). *Feminist theory and international relations in a postmodern era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sylvester, C. (1994b). Empathetic cooperation: A feminist method for IR. *Millennium Journal of International Studies*, 23(2), 315–334.
- Tickner, J. A. (1988). Hans Morgenthau’s principles of political realism: A feminist reformulation. *Millennium Journal of International Studies*, 17(3), 429–440.
- Tickner, J. A. (1992). *Gender in international relations: Feminist perspectives on achieving global security*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- True, J. (1999). Expanding markets and marketing gender: The integration of the postsocialist Czech Republic. *Review of International Political Economy*, 6(3), 360–389.
- Tuathail, G. Ó., & Agnew, J. (1992). Geopolitics and discourse: Practical geopolitical reasoning in American foreign policy. *Political Geography*, 11(2), 190–204.

- Walt, S. M. (1998). International relations: One world, many theories. *Foreign Policy*, 110, 29–46.
- Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- Weldes, J. (2006). High politics and low data: Globalization discourse and popular culture. In D. Yanow & P. Schwartz-Shea (Eds.), *Interpretation and method: Empirical research methods and the interpretive turn* (pp. 176–186). Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.
- Wilson, B. (2012). *Sport and peace: A sociological perspective*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Lyndsay M. C. Hayhurst is Assistant Professor in the School of Kinesiology and Health Science at York University in Toronto, Canada. Her research interests include sport for development and peace, social justice, health, cultural studies of girlhood, post-colonial feminist theory, global governance, international relations and corporate social responsibility. She is co-editor (with Tess Kay and Megan Chawansky) of *Beyond Sport for Development and Peace*. Her publications have appeared in *Women's Studies International Forum*; *Gender, Place & Culture*; *Third World Quarterly*; and *Sociology of Sport Journal*. She has previously worked for the United Nations Development Programme and Right to Play.

Lisa McIntosh Sundstrom is Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of British Columbia, Canada. Her regional area of expertise is Russia and the former Soviet Union. Her major research interests include democratization, human rights, women's rights, the politics of international democracy assistance and NGO activism. She has published in a number of journals, including *International Organization*, *Human Rights Quarterly*, *Europe-Asia Studies*, and *Global Environmental Politics*. Her book publications include *Funding Civil Society: Foreign Assistance and NGO Development in Russia* (2006) and *Global Commons, Domestic Decisions: The Comparative Politics of Climate Change* (2010).

Devra Waldman is a doctoral student in the School of Kinesiology at the University of British Columbia, Canada. Her research is focused on the intersections of (post-) colonialism, urban studies, international development, transnational corporatism and physical culture. The focus of her dissertation is on the politics and implications of building branded, sport-focused, gated communities in suburbs of major metropolitan areas around India. She has published in *International Review for the Sociology of Sport and Geoforum*, and has chapters appearing in *The Handbook of Sport and Politics* (editors: Bairner, Kelly and Woo Lee) and *The Handbook of Physical Cultural Studies* (editors: Silk, Thorpe and Andrews).