Harvey, Jean, John Horne, Parissa Safai, Simon Darnell, and Sébastien Courchesne-O'Neill.
"Women's Movements and Sport." *Sport and Social Movements: From the Local to the Global*.
London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2014. 42–66. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023.
<<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781472544995.ch-003>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023,
12:19 UTC.

Copyright © Jean Harvey, John Horne, Parissa Safai, Simon Darnell & Sébastien Courchesne-O'Neill 2014. You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Women's Movements and Sport

Following the 2012 London Olympic Games, the UN Secretary General's Special Adviser on Sport for Development and Peace, Wilfried Lemke, praised the Games for promoting social change in a number of areas including the fight against gender inequality: 'In particular, the inclusion of female athletes in all delegations, including Saudi Arabia [as well as Qatar and Brunei], will help change mentalities and is a very encouraging step in the fight for gender equality and women's empowerment in and through sport' (UN Daily News 2012). His words echoed Jacque Rogge's comments during the opening ceremony of the Games as well as comments from spectators, journalists (e.g. CNN's reference to the 2012 Games as the 'Women's Games'; Brown 2012) and pundits from around the world, all of who saw the inclusion of female athletes in every national team for the first time ever, women's competition in every event, the introduction of women's boxing as an Olympic discipline, and the first-ever (knowingly) pregnant Olympic competitor as examples of improved gender relations in international sport. Approximately 45 per cent of the nearly 11,000 athletes were women and some countries, most notably the United States, sent more female athletes (269) than male (261) for the first time ever.

Yet, despite the increased participation of women athletes in the Olympics, greater representation of women in the IOC and significant improvements in policy, leadership, advocacy and participation for women in sport outside of the Olympics, gains for sporting women have been uneven globally and still are not fully on par with the participation and leadership opportunities for men in sport (see Donnelly and Donnelly 2013; Lenskyj 2012). The gains that have been achieved are the result of the concerted efforts of women (and their male allies) who have banded together to advance sport for women globally, and this chapter will focus on select milestones of the global women and sport movement. This chapter is not and cannot be an exhaustive and complete review of the global women's movement and the women and sport movement: the scope of that endeavour goes well beyond this book and even what is explored in this chapter is limited by accessibility of information. In other words, the developments explored in this chapter may not (and most likely do not) necessarily represent what is happening 'on the ground' all over the world with regard to the fight for gender equity in sport. The chapter is organized in three sections, the first of which traces the historical evolution of the global women's movement.

The second section of the chapter explores the development of the global women and sport movement. Lastly, the chapter examines the limitations of the women and sport movement around the world with a focus on continuing unresolved tensions within the movement. As will be demonstrated in the chapter, and in keeping with the theoretical framework of this book, the general principles of the global women's (and sport) movement can be identified arguably in the following ways. The collective identity of the global women's (and sport) movement centres on womanhood (although, as will be explored in the final section of this chapter, a notion of universal womanhood as collective identity is highly contested) and the movement operates in opposition to patriarchy. The totality of the women and sport movement, then, is directed towards the fight against sex/gender discrimination and the fight for equity in all areas of social, cultural and political life, including sport.

The complex contours of studying the global women's movement

Much like the other social movements in this book, we recognize that a full and all-encompassing examination of the historical development of the global women's movement falls well beyond the scope of one chapter (even beyond the scope of one book). Our intent here is to describe the historical milestones of the global women's movement and identify, in broad brush strokes, the features that have framed and informed (and which continue to do so) the movement. In so doing, we recognize, *a priori*, the impact and potential consequences of the choices we make in highlighting (or not) certain individuals, groups or factors over others. For example, even our depiction of a global women's movement in the singular (rather than global women's movements) carries risk in downplaying the significant plurality of women's activism and advocacy around the world. Furthermore, while we recognize that the historical development and current social organization of the global women's movement is comprised of complex linkages/interactions between local/regional NGOs and the UN (see Chen 1995), this chapter does not attempt to provide an exhaustive list of such organizations (see Eschle and Maiguashca 2010). That said, the historical milestones identified in this chapter are not arbitrarily selected; numerous women scholars, activists and policy-makers recognize them as pivotal to the global women's movement. Although the historical evolution of the global women's movement can be periodized in a variety of ways, we will explore the movement in two broad phases: in the period of time leading up to and including the UN Decade for Women (1975–85) and the developments following the Nairobi conference up to the present post-Beijing conference period (1985 onwards).

The early years of the global women's movement

For many scholars, the roots of the global women's movement can be traced back to the emergence of the United Nations and the signing of the UN Charter in 1945. This is to suggest not that women were not engaged as activists prior to World War II but, rather, that women's efforts to improve the social, political and economic conditions of their lives tended to be more local or regional/national in scope than global. Examples abound of initiatives undertaken collaboratively by women from different parts of the world (e.g. Alice Milliat's efforts with the IOC is one such sport-specific example) prior to 1945. But, such initiatives would not be as far-reaching and as consequential for the global women's movement as the inscription of women's rights in the UN Charter and, eventually, the development of various bodies within and outside the UN focused on the status of women globally. Although Snyder (2006) goes so far as to call the UN the 'unlikely godmother' of the global women's movement, it is important to avoid equating the global women's movement solely with the UN (cf., Antrobus 2004; Basu 2000). While the UN figures pivotally in the emergence and solidification of the global women's movement, broader sociocultural (e.g. the various waves of feminism), political and economic forces as well as the mobilization of non-governmental women's and feminist networks and organizations from both the Global North and South, as noted above, have played equally important roles.

The issue of women's rights was an agenda item at the inaugural meeting of the UN General Assembly in February 1946. A sub-commission dedicated to the status of women was established and situated under the Commission of Human Rights under the auspices of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). However, many women delegates and representatives felt that this sub-commission was not enough and, by 1947, 'the sub-commission formally became the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW), a fully-fledged Commission dedicated to ensuring women's equality and to promoting women's rights' (UNWomen.org n.d., p. 2). The CSW was to provide recommendations and reports directly to ECOSOC on 'women's rights in political, economic, civil, social and educational fields' and make recommendations 'on urgent problems requiring immediate attention in the field of women's rights' (UNWomen.org n.d., p. 2). From the start, the CSW enjoyed close ties with numerous non-governmental women's organizations and, between the late 1940s and the early 1960s, the Commission focused on promoting women's equal rights through the development of international conventions (e.g. the Universal Declaration of Human Rights), attempts to change discriminatory legislation, increasing knowledge of and research on women's experiences around the world, and the fostering of global awareness of women's issues (UNWomen.org n.d.). By the early 1960s, the Commission's efforts exceedingly focused on the role of women and socio-economic

development as evidence documenting the disproportionate rate of poverty among women especially in, but not limited to, developing countries grew (see Antrobus 2004; Snyder 2006).

Antrobus writes that, much like many other social movements, the 'social and political ferment of the 1960s' represented the start of the women's movement as we know it today:

The anti-imperialist and anti-Vietnam War movements, civil rights struggles, challenges to social and sexual mores and behaviour, and above all the rising of young people, brewed a potent mixture from which emerged many of the social movements of the succeeding decades worldwide. What was specific to the women's movement among these was its call for recognition of the personal as political. (2004, p. 23)

The famous slogan, 'the personal is political', speaks to the feminist politics that have and continue to interweave throughout the global women's movement, but it is very important to distinguish that not all women's movements are feminist movements. Feminist movements, in both ideology and action, focus on challenging patriarchy and transforming gender relations that subordinate women to men. Women do, however, organize as women to confront or promote other aspects of social life. Ferree and Mueller (2007, p. 577) highlight the utility of a broad definition of women's movements – women banding together as women to confront any form of inequity – by suggesting that it allows us to take 'into account that many mobilizations of women as women start out with a non-gender directed goal, such as peace, environment, social justice or anti-racism and gradually acquire explicitly feminist components; other, originally feminist mobilizations, expand their goals to challenge racism, colonialism, and other oppressions'. To narrow women's movements to just those that address gender inequity would be to neglect the fluid and dynamic nature of wide-scale political action. Women do not, however, live in social vacuums. Rather, women live in temporal and spatial contexts that have their own gendered and gendering regimes, therefore 'all women's movements are rooted in gendered structures of oppression and of opportunity' and 'all have some actual or potential relation to feminism, whether this is currently a primary goal for them or not' (Ferree and Mueller 2007, p. 579; see also Gamble 2001; Hall 1996; Hooks 1984; Kemp and Squires 1997; Scraton and Flintoff 2002).

While the exact antecedents of the designation of 1975 as the *International Women's Year* (IWY; since then 8 March has been designated International Women's Day) are not clear, it is recognized by many that the 'UN's receptivity to the idea owed a great deal to the efforts of women's organizations that were part of the CSW as well as to women on the delegations of member countries' (Antrobus 2004, p. 34). The observance of the IWY was intended to remind all that discrimination against women was persistent in the world

and to encourage governments, NGOs, networks and individuals to increase their efforts to promote equal rights for women and recognition of their contributions to socio-economic development.

The Commission called for the organization of an international conference to coincide with the IWY and the *World Conference of the International Women's Year* was held in Mexico City, Mexico, in 1975. Delegates from over 133 governments took part in the UN conference, while over 6000 representatives participated in a parallel non-governmental tribunal (or forum). In total, over 8000 people participated in the joint conferences (70% of whom were women and the majority of whom were with the NGO tribunal), the IWY conference was the first official occasion where women – some familiar with UN and governmental settings and some not – from around the world gathered together to speak of issues specific to their lives and experiences (Antrobus 2004). A major theme at the conference was the fostering of better understanding of the experiences of women from developing and industrialized countries and the debates at the conference tended to focus women's basic concerns (e.g. health, literacy, education, employment, nutrition) as supported by the majority of member governments. The role played by government officials at the IWY, many of whom were men and thus lending support to Morgan's (1996/1984, p. x) assertion that the 'UN is a notorious old boys network', resulted in the notable silence around such issues as violence against women, sexuality and sexual orientation (Antrobus 2004); the silence on such issues would be lifted by the end of the Decade.

The debates occurring in the parallel NGO forum were more far-ranging as there were no restrictions on the topics discussed among participants and few formal presentations structuring the tribunal. Fierce debates over feminism and feminist politics, particularly along North-South lines, characterized the conference: 'women from post-colonial states worried that feminism represented yet another form of cultural imperialism, while Western women felt they were the only feminists' (Basu 1995, p. 18; see also Antrobus 2004). The assumption of the struggles of women around the world and of sameness among women, a global sisterhood (cf. Morgan 1996/1984), spurred the resentment of many from the Third World/Global South, and women participants at the conference and tribunal were deeply divided around what was seen as the ethnocentric and middle-class bias of the West and of Western women (Basu 1995). Despite the deep contestations around feminism that punctuated the IWY (and the Decade), these debates were widely recognized as being vitally needed and the conference represented the first occasion for women from around the world to engage in collective reflection and action that would be eventually sustained through the identification of the UN Decade for Women.

The conference defined a *World Plan of Action for the Implementation of the Objectives of the International Women's Year*, a key feature of which was

the designation of 1975–85 as the *UN Decade for Women: Equality, Development and Peace* (UNWomen.org n.d.). In so doing, a powerful legitimacy was brought to the women's movement and to women's issues internationally. One key indicator of this was the surge in the number of research institutes, women's studies programmes at universities around the world, NGOs and lobby/advocacy groups, national women's commissions and interregional governing and advocacy bodies following the IWY conference and throughout the Decade; simply put, the IWY and the Decade ushered in a period of institution- and network-building as it pertained to the women's movement (Snyder 2006; see also Antrobus 2004). Sen and Grown (1987, p. 15) add: 'The United Nations Decade for the Advancement of Women (1975–85) made many of these experiences possible, prodding virtually every development body – United Nations agencies, national governments, and private organizations – to develop projects and programs that would improve the economic and social position of women'.

Two additional conferences comprised the UN Decade for Women: a mid-decade *World Conference of the UN Decade for Women* in Copenhagen, Denmark, in 1980 and a *World Conference to Review and Appraise the Achievements of the UN Decade for Women* in Nairobi, Kenya, in 1985. Both conferences saw exponential growth in the women's movement, and the mid-decade conference saw the beginning of more critical attention being paid to root causes for women's inequality including unjust economic, social, political and cultural structures (Antrobus 2004, p. 50). This greater critical attention to structural issues on inequality can be attributed to, in part, the role played by an ever-growing number of women's organizations, rather than just by governments, in generating political will and in promoting self-reliance (Antrobus 2004; Chen 1995).

While deep divisions among women based on nationality, race, class, religion, region, language and sexual orientation characterized the 1975 and 1980 conferences, 'better communication between these groups of women at the 1985 Nairobi conference occurred once they abandoned the myth of global sisterhood and acknowledged profound differences in women's lives and in the meanings of feminism nationally' (Basu 1995, p. 3). This was aided in large part by the growing presence and influence of women activists, researchers, political leaders and networks from the Global South (Antrobus 2004; Basu 2000; Sen and Grown 1987; Snyder 2006). The North-South divide did not completely disappear but there was a new sense of confidence from women of the Global South that pushed forward the global women's movement in ways not seen earlier. Third-World women's influence, as individuals, groups and as part of advocacy networks, on the conference and parallel non-governmental forum helped to facilitate even more critical dialogue on the structural roots of disparity in women's lives and the articulation of alternative development strategies (Basu 2000; Chen 1995).

From Nairobi to Beijing and beyond

Despite the tremendous gains achieved by women as part of the UN Decade for Women and the welcomed addition of the *Nairobi Forward-Looking Strategies for the Advancement of Women*, there was growing evidence from researchers and activists that ‘rather than improving, the socio-economic status of the great majority of Third World women has worsened considerably throughout the Decade’ (Sen and Grown 1987, p. 16). The emergence of conservative governments in the United States (under Reagan) and Britain (under Thatcher), the adoption of the Washington Consensus (see Chapter 1), the introduction of structural adjustment policies/policies (which helped the IMF/WB to supplant the UN as the centre of international policy debates) and the disastrous social and human consequences of such initiatives for countries of the Global South combined with continuing and pervasive ‘traditional cultural attitudes and prejudices regarding women’s participation in economic and social life’ (Sen and Grown 1987, p. 16). Women in developing countries were particularly disadvantaged by the politico-economic shift of the 1980s as the structural adjustment policies and programmes (SAPs) that emphasized economic growth depended on women’s unpaid labour as caregivers (i.e. social reproduction) and underpaid (exploited) labour in the marketplace (Tinker 1990; see also Bezanson and Luxton 2006). Despite the clawbacks of the 1980s, the global women’s movement – as represented by the work of the UN, international NGOs and a multitude of the local/regional/transnational networks and alliances – continued to advance forward. While the UN Decade for Women, and events leading up to it, put ‘women’s issues’ on the global map, the developments following the Nairobi conference (1985 and onwards) – in particular, women’s participation in the UN world conferences of the 1990s – succeeded in establishing ‘women’s perspectives on global issues’ (Chen 1995).

By the late eighties, the CSW, as part of a larger shift among women activists and women’s organizations, shifted its attention to locate and promote women’s equal rights as an interlocking and cross-cutting theme in economic development, human rights, political, cultural as well as social policy issues (UNWomen.org, n.d.). The activism of women in the lead up to and at these global conferences was essential for influencing governments to see that ‘*all* issues are women’s issues’ (Morgan 1996/1984, p. x; emphasis in original). The different tack taken to women’s involvement in the world conferences of the 1990s is a testament to the international meetings of the 1975, 1980 and 1985 conferences, the tens of thousands of smaller local and regional meetings of women that grew in and amidst the Decade for Women (many of which were organized at the regional level by women activists from the South, independent of both the UN and national governments, Basu 2000). These developments additionally speak to the increasing sophistication of women

activists, throughout this period of time, as savvy political negotiators and lobbyists/strategists both within and outside of the UN (Chen 1990).

It was amid this energy that the Fourth World Conference on Women was held in Beijing, China, in 1995. The conference itself boasted the largest gathering of government and NGO delegations (6,000 delegates from 189 governments, more than 4,000 accredited NGO representatives, and about 4,000 journalists and media representatives) and the preparatory process in the lead up to the conference was the most extensive it had ever been. The negotiations for the draft *Platform for Action* were contentious given diverging views on women's rights around the world yet, by the end of the conference, women's human rights and equal rights were advanced significantly by the unanimous adoption (by 189 countries) of the *Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action*. As the strongest official statement on women internationally to date, the Declaration: 'set new benchmarks for the advancement of women and the achievement of gender equality . . . , [consolidating] five decades of legal advances aimed at securing the equality of women with men in law and in practice' (UNWomen.org, n.d. p. 16). The women's movement can be said to have become truly global in their appeal to universal principles of human rights (Basu 2000; Rao 1996; Ruppert 2002).

Beyond Beijing, there have no other UN-sponsored world conferences specific to women to date although, on 8 March 2012, the President and Secretary General of the General Assembly jointly proposed convening a fifth UN World Conference on Women in 2015. Within the UN, a series of review and appraisal special sessions were called for by the General Assembly, on the recommendation of the CSW, to bring together governmental representatives and NGOs to assess progress on the Platform worldwide. Convened at the UN headquarters in New York, Beijing +5 was held in 2000, Beijing +10 was held in 2005 and Beijing +15 was held in 2010. These special sessions were consistently the largest ever held at the UN headquarters. Each session assessed the implementation of the Platform's action items at the local and regional level, reaffirmed the *Beijing Declaration and Platform*, and reached consensus on further actions and initiatives to further women's status in all aspects of social, cultural, political and economic life. Furthermore, in 2010, the UN created UN Women, the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (retrieved from <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/daw/index.html>).

These developments attest to the strength of the global women's movement and the vibrant energies of women from all levels of government, inter-government (i.e. UN) and civil society (i.e. local/regional groups, NGOs, networks, etc) working collaboratively together. By Beijing, many saw a smaller divide between women of the Global North and South and greater consensus around issues that reached across North-South lines (Basu 2000; Bunch and Fried 1996). This was due in part to greater awareness of and sensitivity towards

the 'local origins and character of women movements cross-nationally' and the widespread recognition that 'women's movements must be situated within the particular political economies, state policies, and cultural politics of the regions in which they are active' (Basu 2000, p. 68). Such a message was more readily accepted by the mid-1990s in part due to the changing global order, changes in the forms of women's activism internationally, and complicated (at times conflicting) interchanges between local and global feminism (Basu 1995). While the tenets of second-wave, particularly liberal, feminism continue to inform women's groups both within and outside of government, third-wave feminism, including post-colonial feminism, emerged in the late 1990s in response to the assumption of the universal female identity – one grounded in and emphasizing white, upper-middle-class women's experiences (Mills 1998) – ensconced in second-wave feminism. Third-wave feminists pushed for greater understanding of the discursive construction of woman and womanhood, the intersectional realities of women's lives and the need to attend to and mobilize in ways that resist the homogenization of women's experiences (Mohanty 1985; 1997; 2002). Third-World feminists, furthermore, criticize research and advocacy that positions marginalized women (often women of colour) as victims or social dupes arguing that such a position ignores or minimizes women's agency amidst local and global forces (e.g. Mohanty 2003; Narayan 1997; Spivak 1988; 1996; 2003; Sandoval 2000). In other words, we must recognize and embrace the diversity of womanhood as part of the collective fight against patriarchy.

Furthermore, some suggest that the very growth of the transnational women's movement is erasing the local face of women's inequality. While some argue that transnational networks have more far-reaching impact than local initiatives (cf., Moghadam 2000; 2005), others argue that as transnational women's movements have grown, 'commitment to grass roots mobilization and cultural change has diminished' (Basu 2000, p. 69; see also Alvarez 1998). It would be inaccurate to suggest that all local women's movements have been absorbed into global ones or that they only act now to resist global influences:

Rather what prevails is a more complex and varied situation in which local and transnational movements often exist independently of one another and experience similar challenges and dilemmas. Furthermore, while transnational ideas, resources, and organizations have been extremely successful around certain issues in some regions, their success with these issues is more circumscribed elsewhere. (Basu 2000, p. 69–70)

Linked closely to these concerns is the critique that the global women's activism has been co-opted into and diluted (depoliticized) by the international state apparatus as part of larger shift towards gender mainstreaming. By the late 1980s, the CSW's approach to dealing with women's issues was as part of the mainstream rather than as a separate issue, and the word 'gender' was used in

place of 'women'. As Khan (2002, p. 39) argues, however, 'the problem with the notion of 'gender' is that it can mean *both* men and women or *either* man or woman. The specificity of women's oppression disappears' (emphasis in original). While activists and scholars recognize that men are also locked into destructive constructions of masculinity and that long-lasting and sustained social transformation around sex/gender relations cannot happen without transformation of male privilege, the neutralized language of gender and gender equality (i.e. gender mainstreaming) is seen to only deflect attention away from women's oppression and subjugation by men (Khan 2002; Tripp 2006). Criticism of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) focuses squarely on the deflection of attention from women, specifically, and even of gender, more broadly. Whereas the Beijing Declaration and Platform is seen as more far-reaching, the MDGs reduce gender to just one of eight points and commitment to some rights (e.g. reproductive) has been dropped completely (Barton 2004).

An understanding of the historical evolution of the global women's movement is vital to better understanding the global women and sport movement as many of the determinants and embedded issues of the former – the emergence and legitimatization of the global women's movement, as supported by the UN, many (but not all) governments and the burgeoning and increasingly sophisticated NGO network/global civil society; the growing critical attention to both structural and cultural issues (including sport) that impact women's lives around the world; the impact of feminism(s) on the global women's movement including challenges to notions of universal womanhood; shifting relations of relations along North-South and local-global lines; and gender mainstreaming and the fear of the co-optation of the women's movement into government state apparatus – inform and contextualize the development and current status of the latter. In concluding this section of the chapter, how can we characterize the status of the global women's movement and the status of women around the world? We recognize that progress in the betterment of women's lives has been made in a number of sociocultural, politico-economic and legal areas, yet progress remains uneven around the world and girls and women continue to experience profound inequalities and discrimination amplified by their geographical location, economic status, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, age, ability and other factors. Why do such challenges remain? A number of cross-cutting issues limit progress, including women's under-representation (or lack of) in key decision-making bodies at all levels of governance; continued violence (particularly sexual) against girls and women; the continued heavy reliance on girls and women for domestic and caregiving work; and continuing and pervasive social and cultural sex/gender stereotypes that constrain women's opportunities and choices. These issues are exacerbated by the inadequate allocation of financial resources for the effective implementation *and* reinforcement of laws and policies dedicated to gender equality and the

empowerment of women, a situation that is only worsening with the major global economic downturn and uncertainty of the past few years. Political will and leadership is vital for sustaining action around women's right. It is on this note that we turn our attention to better understanding global women and sport movement.

The women and sport 'movement'

The study of the global women and sport 'movement' is not an easy one given its complexity, breadth and depth. In fact, the very way in which we identify this as a 'movement' (i.e. the women and sport movement vs. the women's international sport movement vs. the international women's sport movement vs. women in the global sport movement) represents the first of many challenges in conceptualizing what has occurred around the world over time with regard to women and sport. Distinguishing between these terms (including between women's sport and women and sport) is not an attempt to be pedantic with language but rather sensitive to the ways in which language frames the actions of individuals, processes, organizations and movements. Comprehensive analyses of the topic require us to negotiate the global women's movement(s) generally, and global women's sport (or women and sport) movements specifically. This is further compounded by our need to recognize the complex synergies and distinctions between: (1) movements/networks/organizations that have focused on women's sport (i.e. the focus of this section); (2) political action that uses sportswomen/women's sport as a strategy for broader sociopolitical mobilization in areas of social life other than gender (e.g. Věra Čáslavská's protest, while on the medal podium, of the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia at the 1968 Olympic Games); and (3) women's social movements that use sport as a site of change in broader gender relations (e.g. the London 2012: Justice for Women protest of the allowance of the hijab in competition or the challenge put forward by Egyptian feminists to the ultras in efforts to secure women's rights to unrestricted protest; see Wolff 2012 and Dorsey 2012, respectively).

As Taylor (1999) notes, the emergence and maintenance of a social movement rests on the ability of mistreated groups to develop organizational solidarity; thus, we must attend to the mobilizing processes – that is, the organizing practices and intra-movement dynamics – of these collectivities (cf., Della Porta and Diani 2006). With regard to the women and sport movement, this requires us to pay close attention to the individuals and groups, particularly those in key decision-making positions, involved in international women and sport organizations. This section does not offer an exhaustive mapping (chronological or otherwise) of the movement but, rather, offers an identification of select groups and milestones that have framed the current status of the women and

sport globally. This section draws from Jennifer Hargreaves' extensive work in this area (1999, 2001), Darlene Kluka's unpublished doctoral dissertation, as well as the promising work coming out of the Anita White Foundation at the University of Chichester (see Matthews et al. 2012). Following this description of the mobilizing processes of the women and sport movement, the final section will delve further into the continuing concerns and constraints of the global women and sport movement.

As noted earlier, the 2012 Games mark significant developments for women and sport globally, developments that stand in dramatic contrast to the first modern Olympic Games where no female competitors participated and where, in fact, Pierre de Coubertin, the founder of the modern Games, refused to even consider women's participation in sport, let alone in the Olympics. Repeatedly referring to women athletes as inappropriate, unattractive and wrong, de Coubertin argued that 'a woman's glory rightfully came through the number and quality of children she produced, and that where sports were concerned, her greatest accomplishment was to encourage her sons to excel rather than seek records for herself' (Spears 1972, p. 63). His beliefs on women's incapacity for and in sport were not remarkable given societal attitudes towards women at that historical moment in time but, as Wamsley and Schultz (2000, p. 113) note, 'were significant considering the influence he held on the calculated emergence of international sport'. Yet neither he nor the IOC nor the international sport federations, particularly the International Association for Athletics Federation (IAAF), could completely resist the tide of women's participation in sport broadly and in the Olympics specifically.

The inclusion of women in the Olympic Games came about as a result of the actions of key women sport leaders, most notably France's Alice Milliat, engaged in concerted international political action against gender discrimination in sport. At risk of understating the importance of the suffrage movement for women and women's physical activity opportunities (see Kay 2007; 2008) and neglecting the tremendous developments happening in women's sport in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries within different nations around the world (e.g. see Kidd 1996 or Hall 2002 for discussion of the role of early women's sport organizations in Canada), a brief examination of the rise and eventual decline of Milliat's Women's Olympic Games in the 1920s and 1930s is warranted given that it represents, in many ways, the most cogent example of an early international feminist social movement on women and sport.

In response to the IOC's and IAAF's opposition to women's official inclusion in the Olympic track and field events, Milliat established the *Fédération Sportive Féminine Internationale* (FSFI) in 1921 and, in the following year, organized the first-ever Women's Olympic Games (Kidd 1996). Up to this point in time, women had participated in some Olympic events (e.g. tennis, golf, gymnastics, swimming) but these were informally held at the behest of sympathetic event

organizers and/or sport federations (Kidd 1996). These events never enjoyed official status and, despite the growing numbers of women participating in track and field, women were unequivocally disallowed participation in the most prestigious of Olympic events, track and field. Milliat – an avid rower, professional translator and a committed feminist – perceived an intimate link between women's right to vote and women's participation in sport:

Women's sports of all kinds are handicapped in my country by the lack of playing space. As we have no vote, we can not [sic] make our needs publicly felt, or bring pressure to bear in the right quarters. I always tell my girls that the vote is one of the things they will have to work for if France is to keep its place with other nations in the realm of feminine sport. (as cited in Leigh and Bonin 1977, p. 76).

For Milliat and her contemporaries, suffrage was as vital to bringing about acceptance of and recognition for women's sports as sport was for advancing women's rights in society more broadly. This chapter does not offer a comprehensive examination of first-wave feminism given its focus on the global women's movement, but the importance of first-wave feminism cannot be overlooked as, 'in their buoyant, post-suffrage enthusiasm for new frontiers' (Kidd 1996, p. 113), women fought for their rights to participate in sport as athletes using, in this case, bloomers, track shoes and shot puts as tools of protest rather than marches in the streets or sit-ins (Riegel 1963; Schweinbenz 2000). Schultz (2010, p. 1135) goes so far as to describe the suffragists' incorporation of physical activity into their protestations as 'physical activism, or the articulation of physical activity and political activism'.

Although distasteful to some now, women's sport leaders during the suffrage movement and post-suffrage period often advocated for women's sport separate from that of men's – for 'women's sport run by women' (Kidd 1996). Even though, at times, reproducing the feminine apologetic and problematic discourses of women's supposed physical frailty (Lenskyj 1986), many first-wave feminist sport leaders mobilized to ensure that women gained the right to sport. As Kidd writes sympathetically, '... rather than capitulate to the reigning definitions of 'feminine', they reworked them to include the right to vigorous physical activity under their own leadership' (1996, p. 141; see also Hargreaves 1985). We can critique individuals such as Alice Milliat or organizations such as the FSFI (and their national counterparts) for not questioning and reproducing the centrality of male-dominated sport but we must not allow our current sensibilities to dim their accomplishments – they, within the confines of the (more overt) patriarchal society and male-privileged sport of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, offered an opportunity for women to network together in organizations dedicated to women's sport and helped to legitimate women as serious, able and competitive athletes in (elite and otherwise) sport (Kidd 1996).

The 1922 and 1926 Women's Olympic Games witnessed record-breaking performances by female athletes from all over the world in a variety of events and attracted record numbers of spectators (including the Swedish royal family). The growing presence of Milliat's Women's Olympics and the success of women athletes in track and field could not be overlooked by either the IOC or the IAAF, and negotiations ensued between the FSFI, the IOC and the IAAF around women's inclusion in the Olympics. By the 1928 Olympics, Milliat had secured five events for women in track and field – despite being promised 10 events – a move that 'disgusted' the British Women's Athletics Association and prompted the only feminist boycott of an Olympic Games (Adams 2002, p. 144) – in exchange for renaming the Women's Olympics to the Women's World Games (Kidd 1996; Wamsley and Schultz 2000). However, by 1935, women were still denied a full programme of events in the Olympics and full representation on the IOC despite repeated calls for advancement by Milliat and the FSFI. Through a series of IOC-IAAF political manoeuvrings (see Leigh and Bonin 1977), by 1936, the FSFI ceased to exist as the IAAF took over complete control of women's track and field cementing its position as the international governing body for track and field for men and women as endorsed by the IOC. While the early years of Milliat's and the FSFI's work was sustained by the victories of first-wave feminism, its decline was hastened by the changing global geo-political atmosphere of the late 1930s and early 1940s including a world-wide depression, the growing rise of fascism in Europe and, eventually, World War II (Kidd 1996).

In their concerted and global political action against the IAAF, the IOC and the Olympics, and despite the staunch opposition of such sport leaders as de Coubertin, Milliat and the FSFI did advance international women's sport and we must applaud their efforts in doing so. However, we must also acknowledge that the IOC and IAAF succeeded in 'monitoring, regulating, and controlling significant aspects of women's sport' (Adams 2002, p. 143). In giving women five events in the 1928 Games, the IAAF effectively placated the FSFI and in assuming control of international track and field for all women and men, the IAAF and the IOC conceded that women's sport participation was 'inevitable' but also ensured that it would be 'strictly supervised by qualified individuals, namely men' (Adams 2002, p. 145). The introduction of gender testing or sex verification by the IAAF and the IOC in the late 1960s is but another example of efforts to monitor, control and contain women in sport (see Ritchie 2003 and Wrynn 2004). As Adams (2002, p. 143) notes, 'ultimately, the expansion and development of women's international sport depended on the interest and generosity of men'. A sentiment supported by Leigh and Bonin (1977, p. 83) who write:

Prior to 1936, the IOC and the IAAF had been interested in gaining control of women's athletics only to control them and to slow them down, not to promote

them. By 1936, however, the situation was different. Now that women's sports in general had proven a success and now that women's achievements could be used for ideological and nationalistic purposes, the male federations were eager to include and to promote them.

In a foreshadowing of the current tensions in the global women's sport scene, we must recognize that Milliat's and the FSFI's desire to gain entry into mainstream international sport did not radically re-envision patriarchy or male-dominated sport but rather further entrenched it as the standard by which elite international sport was to be judged. While the Women's Olympics concerned the IAAF and the IOC, it did not genuinely threaten to destabilize the importance of either organization or of the Olympics; in fact, 'the persistent lobbying of [Milliat and] the FSFI attests to perceptions about the growing popularity and indeed the centrality of the Games within international sport' (Wamsley and Schultz 2000, p. 115). Furthermore, as the FSFI disappeared into the folds of the IAAF, we see 'a resisting, challenging, but subordinate group's interests . . . absorbed, re-shaped, and re-cast in a manner which sustains the more powerful or dominant group' (Wamsley and Schultz 2000, p. 116). Many of the themes highlighted above continue to punctuate the current global sport landscape for women as well as the contemporary women and sport movement.

The disappearance of the Women's Olympic Games and the decline of the FSFI represented, on one hand, the formal (albeit still contentious) acceptance of women into the burgeoning 'prolympic system/industry' (Donnelly 1996) as well as, on the other hand, the loss of power and self-determination among women's sports advocacy groups (Wamsley and Schultz 2000). Global events such as the depression and world wars helped to dampen (but not extinguish!) women's gains in sport participation and leadership, and it was not until the emergence of second-wave feminism in the mid-twentieth century that we see renewed vigorous activity in advocacy for women's sport.

Developments within the UN buoyed some of the activity in women's sport, and mention of the *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women* (CEDAW) is warranted, given its importance to the women's movement, broadly, and to women and sport specifically. Although the UN General Assembly noted in 1963 that despite the progress made in achieving equal rights for women, 'in various fields there still remains, in fact if not in law, considerable discrimination against women' (as cited in UNWomen.org, n.d., p. 7), CEDAW (as a legally binding document) was not developed or adopted by the Assembly until 1979. That said, it is important to note that CEDAW was ratified in 1981, therefore entering into force faster than any previous human rights convention (Short History of CEDAW Convention, n.d.). The Convention was the first international tool to define discrimination against women and the various articles with the document brought together,

in legally binding form, internationally accepted principles on the rights of women. Given the focus of our book on sport, it must be noted here is that the convention explicitly speaks against the discrimination of women in sport:

Parties shall take all appropriate measures to eliminate discrimination against women in order to ensure to them equal rights with men in the field of education and in particular to ensure, on a basis of equality of men and women: The same Opportunities to participate actively in sports and physical education. (CEDAW, Part III, Article 10(g)).

Parties shall take all appropriate measures to eliminate discrimination against women in other areas of economic and social life in order to ensure, on a basis of equality of men and women, the same rights, in particular: The right to participate in recreational activities, sports and all aspects of cultural life. (Part III, Article 13 (c)) Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/text/econvention.htm>

In recognizing the wide-scale political opportunity structures – the soil in which the global women's movement has grown – the convention's mention of the rights of women to sport, both within and outside the institution of education, weighs significantly.

Within different countries around the world, women sport leaders (and their male allies) pushed for more participation and leadership opportunities in every level of sport – for example, in the United States, the push for and passing of the landmark legislation of Title IX in 1972 that bans sex discrimination in educational institutions whether in academics or in athletics and the establishment of the Women's Sport Foundation (WSF-US) in 1974 as a leading research and advocacy organization. In Canada, in this same period of time, we see the first-ever National Conference on Women and Sport (1974) out of which emerged the creation of Sport Canada's Women's Program (1974) and, eventually, the establishment of the Canadian Association for the Advancement of Women and Sport (CAAWS) in 1981 (see Comeau and Church 2010). In the United Kingdom and continental Europe, similar organizations bloomed – in the United Kingdom, the Women's Sports Foundation (WSF-UK) was established in 1984 and the Working Group for European Women and Sport (EWS) network was established in 1989 (a full standing body of the European Sports Conference by 1993). Again, at the risk of neglecting the important actions, rich histories and unique circumstances surrounding women sport leaders and organizations within different countries around the world (e.g. see Pelak 2005), let us emphasize here that women (chiefly White, Western/Eurocentric, able-bodied) were mobilizing to gain more from a system that continued to profoundly privilege men; they were not rejecting the system outright. Women did gain territory, yet not evenly or in all areas of sport. As Kidd (1996, p. 144) writes: 'girls and women gradually won new opportunities to participate, but with second-wave feminism's rejection of 'separate spheres', those women who aspired

to positions of leadership lost ground. Many of the once-separate women's programs . . . were brought under male leadership, and men got most of the jobs created by the expansion in female participation'. The continued underrepresentation of women in positions of leadership in international sport governing bodies remains a central problem in the women and sport movement as will be addressed in the last section of this chapter.

Worldwide, in 1949, the founding of the International Association of Physical Education and Sport for Women and Girls (IAPESGW) founded in 1949 represented the first-established (i.e. constitutionalized) international (and initially all-female membership) organization dedicated to the promotion of physical education and sport for girls and women. According to Hargreaves (1999), although the IAPESGW had a global dimension to it, in accordance with the vision of the IAPESGW's founding mother Dorothy Ainsworth, the group 'held a distinctly middle-class, elitist and very white Western educational and cultural hegemonic stance' (p. 462). Hargreaves (1999, p. 463) adds:

There was no authentic representation of women from different social groups and cultural backgrounds: IAPESGW members from both the developed and the developing worlds were from elite class and educational backgrounds, the strong links with Empire remained dominant, and the association remained proudly "non-political," avoiding issues of power and difference.

Western cultural and physical education discourse was privileged as universal within the IAPESGW and, by 1992, dissatisfaction with IAPESGW's narrow focus motivated a few members to separate from and establish the Women's International Sports Coalition (WISC) that eventually became part of, in 1993, WomenSport International (WSI) (Hargreaves 2001).

The vision for the WISC and eventually for WSI was far more global than that for IAPESGW and far more interventionist (Brackenridge 1995). Launched in 1994, at the International Conference on 'Women and Sport: the Challenge of Change' in Brighton, the WSI boasted a more global membership as well as a stronger research-based advocacy role in other major international (sport and otherwise) organizations (e.g. the IOC, the United Nations). A notable WSI accomplishment has been the development and publication of the *Women 2000 and Beyond: Women, Gender Equality and Sport* report for the UN in support of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (United Nations 2007) – an extension of the group's representation at the 1995 Fourth World Conference on Women. While WSI has focused on a number of physical activity and health initiatives, concern has been raised that much of its work is directed at elite, competitive international sport or, in other words, institutionalized, highly competitive and commodified Westernized forms of sport (Hargreaves 1999). Despite a declaration of sensitivity for the experiences of women from other cultures, critics such as Hargreaves (1999)

point out that: 'the types of sport and the forms of competition are not in question' (p. 465). She adds:

The emphasis given to certain activities rather than others is to do with relationships and discourses of power. Women from the developed world are in dominant positions in the WSI and theirs are the most powerful and authoritative voices [that] have done little to challenge the global imperatives [that] are reducing the richness of indigenous games and cultures. (p. 465).

Neither the IAPESGW nor the WSI has been oblivious to their (social, cultural, political and geographic) privilege and the urge to 'go global' (not to be confused with whether they have been *able* to effectively 'go global') has underpinned their efforts including the first-ever international conference on women and sport, entitled *Women, Sport and the Challenge of Change* held in Brighton, England, in 1994 (organized by the British Sports Council and supported by the IOC). Drawing on his exhaustive archival work, Matthews comments that 'there were genuine attempts by WSI but . . . [seemingly] . . . not the right connections and networks in other areas of the world that wanted to advance women and sport. This affected their reach. They were going to other countries but there was no one (. . . in positions of power) who could affect change quickly enough' (personal communication, 6 November 2012). That said, nearly 300 delegates from over 80 countries attended the conference, the specific aim of which was to challenge the continued marginalization of females from all levels of sporting and physical activity and address 'the issue of how to accelerate the process of change that would redress the imbalances women face in their participation and involvement in sport' (<http://www.iwg-gti.org/conference-legacies/brighton-1994/>). The conference was very important in bringing together many different women's groups (sport groups and otherwise), each of whom were attempting to advance women's participation and leadership in sport in different ways (Hargreaves 2001). As Pike and Matthews (2012) note, the Brighton Conference brought together these groups to help assume a new collective.

The Brighton Conference had three major outcomes: the decision to hold a second conference in 1998; the creation of the International Working Group on Women and Sport (IWG) to monitor progress in international women's sport; and the *Brighton Declaration on Women and Sport*. The *Brighton Declaration* (including the 1994–1998 *International Strategy on Women and Sport*), adopted by over 320 organizations throughout the world and still influencing major sporting and non-sporting organizations as well as national governments to this day, affirms equity and equality for women in society and sport with its 'overriding aim . . . to develop a sporting culture that enables and values the full involvement of women in every aspect of sport' (*Brighton Declaration*, 1994). The declaration, and the action items based on the declaration's principles and identified in the 1994–1998 *International Strategy on Women and Sport*,

became a powerful tool for organizations in their struggles for women's rights in sport (Kluka 2008). Lobbied by the IWG and other groups, groups buoyed by the Declaration, to set targets for increased participation opportunities for female athletes in the Olympics and increased female membership on national Olympic committees and international federations, the IOC responded by: establishing its own Women and Sport Commission in 1995; adding more women's events to the IOC programme; amending the Olympic Charter to include the promotion of women's sport, adding more women to the IOC including, most notably, the appointment of Anita deFrantz to the position of IOC Vice President in 1997 (Matthews et al. 2012; White 1997). The conference and its outputs got women's issues onto the international sport agenda and did go a long way in influencing sport leaders occupying powerful positions in sport.

As noted above, additional conferences have been held since the Brighton Conference. Subsequent world conferences on women and sport have occurred in Namibia, Canada, Japan and Australia and, in 2014, the world conference returns to Europe (South America is the only continent not to stage a world conference yet). In Table 3.1, a brief summary of the themes and outcomes of each conference is provided, the information of which has been drawn from the IWG website (iwg-gri.org) and Matthews with Pike and White (2012).

The table highlights only the major outputs of each world conference but it must be noted that each conference marked significant advancements for women and sport. Each conference facilitated the gathering together of women's sport leaders and witnessed new initiatives, joint efforts and increased networking between local, national and international groups. We must not minimize the importance of conferences for women's collective political mobilization and, in fact, should recognize the ways in which 'the conference' has become a specific type of movement activity, a type of tool for protest. As Ferree and Mueller (2007, pp. 594–5) note:

Conferences are a resource for building networks around the globe among contemporary women's movements. As events, not merely sites where something else happens, conferences punctuate and focus organizing that has become less episodic and more regularized, giving a concrete form to an otherwise dispersed network. Although conferences are events in the same way that a strike, a demonstration or an urban insurrection is, they have been less readily recognized as important by social movement researchers, perhaps because women have relied on them as a mobilizing tool disproportionately than men.

Despite remarkable gains in some areas, many of the issues raised at the Brighton Conference are still being debated today, issues such as the under-representation of women in leadership and decision-making roles and in NOCs and IFs; the uneven provision of facilities, services and programmes for women's sport around the world; lack of access to sport and physical activity (including

Table 3.1 IWG women and sport world conferences 1994–2014

Date	Location	Conference title/Theme	Major outcomes
1994	Brighton, England	Women, Sport and the Challenge of Change	<i>The Brighton Declaration on Women and Sport</i> 1994–1998 International Strategy on Women and Sport Creation of International Working Group on Women and Sport (IWG)
1998	Windhoek, Namibia	Reaching Out for Change	<i>Windhoek Call to Action</i> (focused on translating the principles of gender equity raised in the Brighton Declaration into practice and connecting with the global women's movement in particular with respect to health, education and employment)
2002	Montreal, Canada	Investing in Change	<i>Montreal Tool Kit</i> (a reference manual containing resources and tools to help individuals and groups advance their efforts around gender equality in sport)
2006	Kumamoto, Japan	Participating in Change	<i>The Kumamoto Commitment to Collaboration</i>
2010	Sydney, Australia	Play, Think, Change	<i>The Sydney Scoreboard</i> (an online tracking tool designed to increase women's representation on sport governing bodies globally by highlighting progress; http://www.sydneyscoreboard.com/)
2014	Helsinki, Finland	Lead the Change, Be the Change	TBD

Source: Adapted from International Working Group on Women and Sport (<http://www.iwg-gti.org/> [accessed 19 December 2012]).

physical education) opportunities for girls and women in both developed and developing countries; the continued sexualization and trivialization of female athletes in the media; as well as the need for greater education and training (Donnelly and Donnelly 2013; Hartmann-Tews and Pfister 2003; Pfister 2010). The IAPESGW, WSI and IWG, as well as numerous regional and national organizations and groups (Matthews, personal communication, 6 November 2012), continue their respective efforts in challenging these issues, and the 2014 World Conference will constitute the next collective step forward in this struggle. However, even as the Brighton Declaration nears its twentieth anniversary, tensions continue to run within the women and sport movement, and four such tensions will be explored in the final section of this chapter.

Unresolved tensions between the global women's movement and sport

Such tremendous accomplishments make it difficult to criticize the work of the individuals and different organizations (the WSI, IWG, etc.), the Brighton Conference or the Declaration itself. However, we must recognize the limitations of these milestones particularly since these continue to impact international women's sport movement to this day. With regard to the sociocultural conditions that have constrained or facilitated the women and sport movement, we must recognize the pervasiveness of patriarchy both within and outside of the institution of sport. Simply put, the structural and cultural conditions within which sport has been and is located continue to advantage men (Hargreaves 1994). It is safe to say that while some women currently enjoy more and better opportunities for participation and leadership in sport than in previous generations, as highlighted at the beginning of this chapter, not all women do so and sport remains an area of social life dominated 'by men' and 'for men' (Donnelly and Donnelly 2013; Hargreaves 2001; Lenskyj 2012; Sabo and Veliz 2012). Sport remains a contested terrain for women and whether the qualitative experience of sport for women has improved compared with earlier generations remains a more tenuous question depending upon women's social, political and geographic location. Kidd (1996, p. 144) writes: '... girls and women struggle to develop identities of healthy womanhood in a cultural practice largely controlled by males and steeped in discourses of masculinity. In the absence of the sort of vigorous feminist debate about alternatives ... there is little to challenge the naturalization of the male model. That so many women succeed does not discount the enormous contradictions they experience'. While some attest to the increased rates of participation among women in sport and greater number of women in leadership and coaching roles as signs of the democratization of sport, others question how truly transformative these changes are and can be given that the current hegemonic model of sport has

been neither refashioned nor re-envisioned and remains decidedly a model of sport that privileges men, domination and risk (Donnelly 1993).

The Brighton Conference did afford women working for female sport in countries around the world the opportunity to connect, network and share, and the Declaration did become a focal point around which people could rally. Yet, as the Declaration is not a legal document (rather a position statement), we must question its teeth. Yes, the IOC has responded favourably to the concerted action coming out of the women and sport movement (aided by pressure from the global women's movement and different nations) and as represented by the Declaration yet, beyond the Olympics, it is still the case that many around the world are still unaware of the Declaration. Furthermore, given its lack of legality and enforceability, it may be the case that some groups and countries have signed the declaration with little to no intention of carrying out any action to legitimately address gender discrimination in sport. As Hargreaves (1999, p. 466) notes: 'It is impossible to judge how far-reaching the effects of the Brighton Conference have been because endorsing it in order to be politically correct does not mean, necessarily, that the will is there, or the resources are available, to implement practical changes in line with philosophy' (see also Kluka 2008).

Another unresolved tension concerns the identified targets (for lack of a better way of putting it) for change within the movement. All the major initiatives that have emerged from the work of the international women's sports organizations are directed at international sport leaders and governing bodies, such as the IOC, rather than to individuals or groups at the grassroots level – people at the receiving end of policy who 'if given the chance, might have a great deal to say about them' (Hargreaves 1999, p. 468). Yes, the IOC is (and has been) hugely influential in international sport but the connection between it and the struggles and desires of women at the grassroots level is not always clear. We must also recognize that genuine and sustained change often occurs incrementally over time (cf., Della Porta and Diani 2006) and that such change in sport requires intervention (almost simultaneously) at both the highest (e.g. IOC) and lowest (e.g. grassroots) levels (see also Travers 2008). That said, even though change has occurred in the IOC – both in terms of women's participation in sport and women in leadership positions on the committee – the IOC remains a hugely privileged and self-perpetuating, undemocratic body, and its members, male and female, remain part of an elite club. The women who are now part of the IOC machinery as participants and leaders, although exceptional and transformative in their own right, are not necessarily representative of the majority and, perhaps more importantly, are being absorbed into the existing male-privileged and male-privileging elite sport, rather than genuinely threatening those discourses and structures of power (Hargreaves 2000). Therefore, when contemplating initiatives like the Sydney Scoreboard – the online tool designed to track and highlight women's

representation on decision-making sport bodies around the world that was the legacy item of the fifth World Conference on Women and Sport – we need to ask the question: do we really want to democratize sport governing bodies along gender lines if the institution of sport within which these groups are located remains patriarchal? Furthermore, we must question the type and impact of change being promoted by the contemporary global women's movement – how transformative is it and can it be, given that it is not completely rejecting hegemonic sport (see also Chapter 4).

Similar criticism is directed towards the leadership/memberships of the international women's sport movements themselves. The IWG, the group that monitors change and 'progress' in women's sport (of which IAPESGW and WSI are members), is a free-floating (i.e. not bound to any specific government or larger, more established NGO such as the UN) self-selected group comprised of individuals already embedded within and active in existing sport governance systems and/or possessing strong links with state apparatuses: in other words, elite women with elite connections (Hargreaves 2001). The ties to government, on one hand, have offered the group a certain degree of legitimacy as well as access to state funds and support but, on the other hand, it has also limited the group's autonomy and weakened its potential radicalism (Hargreaves 2001). Some are sharply critical of this – Hargreaves (1999, p. 467) writes, '... the reality is that [the IWG] is an undemocratic body, not an organization, it has no base, no specific mission except to monitor development, and it smacks somewhat of an "elite girls" network'. But, such severe criticism runs the risk of overlooking some of the extremely positive social change in sport stimulated by the efforts of powerful women utilizing their power (Matthews, personal communication, 6 November 2012).

The challenges (and opportunities) of emergent and interactive collective identity are central to the study of the women and sport movement (cf., Pelak 2002) – how does the movement make sense of the questions: 'who are we' and 'who do we represent'? Hargreaves argues that, while women are engaged in collective political action 'as a strategy to expand sporting opportunities for girls and women across the globe' (Pelak 2006, p. 374), the reach and scope of this international movement is limited because its membership has consisted of predominantly White, Western, middle-class women joined by 'neo-colonial elites' (Hargreaves 2001, p. 215). Despite the movement's supposed self-awareness of its privilege, its stated recognition of the global and perceived sensitivity to experiences, beliefs and desires of non-white, non-Western, it remains – so far – relatively rooted in Western ideologies of sport and homogenized womanhood (Hayhurst 2011; Heywood 2007). Clearly, better understandings are required of the politics of collective identity in the movement – which, in turn, presupposes a better understanding of the political opportunity structures that frames the contexts in which identity emerges – and post-colonial feminism can assist us in this endeavour. Post-colonial feminism

can assist us in unpacking the re/production and privileging of white, Western, upper-middle-class womanhood in sport and, just as importantly, helps us to resist those beliefs and strategies that try to 'save' non-white, non-Western (subaltern) women athletes from their 'marginalization' by 'speaking for' them and acting on 'their behalf' (Mohanty 1985; Spivak 1988). As Pike and Matthews (2012) note, post-colonial feminism must inform our understanding of 'how the diverse groups and individuals who attended the Brighton Conference interpreted and applied the conference proceedings, including the principles outlined in the Brighton Declaration, to their own country's context or situation'. Furthermore, additional analysis of whether the women and sport movement has acknowledged and reinterpreted any adaptations to initial policy may coincide with post-colonial feminist arguments for more attention to be paid to non-Western groups, including the limited academic focus on Latin America. Simply put, we must question whether (and how) the global women's sport movement is really global.

In questioning the 'global-ness' of the movement, one additional site of tension arises and that is the relationship (or lack) of the women and sport movement to other global social movements. The Windhoek Conference and *Call to Action* make explicit the connections between women's sports and other areas of social life such as health, education and work, but it is unclear how deeply this has been taken up within the movement. That is, while women's sports organizations foreground women's access to sport participation and leadership opportunities, it is not clear how they engage with women's struggles in other areas, some of which are related to sport – for example, women sweatshop labourers in sport clothing and shoe industries (see Enloe 1995; see also Chapter 2 in this volume). In a deeply problematic way, we must recognize that increases in women's participation in sport also represent the continued exploitation of women workers in sport-related industries in developing countries around the world.

While sport is often under-recognized (at times, unrecognized) in the broader global women's movement (e.g. see Antrobus 2004; Kuumba 2001), one could argue that other social movements and the causes they fight against, such as labour rights, are neglected in the women and sport movement. One reason why this occurs rests with the ways in which the women and sport movement has been framed. To suggest that women's sport movement is only a woman's issue or that the anti-sweatshop movement is only a labour issue denies the structural interconnections between the systems of oppression that these social movements are attempting to confront (Ferree and Roth 1998; see also Travers 2008). Social movements are interconnected and the issues taken up by social movement organizations are multidimensional and as 'cross-cutting as the systems of domination that give rise to them' (Ferree and Roth 1996, p. 643). This chapter has attempted to better understand the dynamics of the women and sport movement on its own but, admittedly, a more nuanced examination

requires us to employ an approach that takes into account multiple and intersecting forms of oppression and how they are addressed through social movements that ‘interact, compete, cooperate or attempt to ignore each other’ (Ferree and Roth 1996, p. 628). As noted earlier, we purposefully kept the focus of this chapter on social movements that have centred on women’s sport but recognize that richer discussions of these phenomena require more in-depth examination of political action that use sportswomen/women’s sport as a strategy for broader sociopolitical mobilization in areas of social life other than gender and women’s social movements that use sport as a site of change in broader gender relations. In doing so, we begin to draw better attention to the (existing and emerging) coalitions of individuals and groups (and the coalition politics that circulate in between and around them) who work to frame issues and struggles inclusively (see also Chapter 2’s exploration of the Play Fair campaign as a concrete example of coalition activism in action). For such coalitions, ‘diversity remains and solidarity is temporary, specific and strategic: current cooperation in pursuit of a common good’ (Ferree and Roth 1996, p. 643).