INTRODUCTION

Is Female to Male as NGO Is to State?

Andria D. Timmer, Christopher Loy,
and Elizabeth Wirtz

What is the relation of the State to nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) and are these relationships gendered? Drawing inspiration from Sherry Ortner's influential contribution to feminist anthropology, "Is Female to Male as Nature Is to Culture?" (1974), this volume asks if a similar analogy could be used to interrogate the relationship between nongovernmental organizations and the State: Is female to male as NGO is to State? That is, are the same power relationships that maintain a male/female dichotomy, despite the blurred boundaries between the two categories, evident in the ambiguous division between NGO and State (Bernal and Grewal 2014)? The contributors to this volume provide case studies of nongovernmental organizations throughout the world to exemplify how the NGO/State dichotomy is one that is maintained, strengthened, and contested through normative understandings of NGOs as feminized and the State as masculine. Through analyses that explore the analogy posed here, the ethnographies demonstrate that the complex NGO/State relationship is one that can be understood as a power relationship; one that is constructed similarly to gendered power relationships. This is not to say that NGOs *are* female and States *are* male; rather, we explore the in-betweenness of male/female, State/NGO and argue that the unbounded categories *are* hegemonically bounded in very similar ways.

Posing the question (*Is* Female to Male as NGO is to the State?) does not presuppose an answer and certainly not that the answer is *yes*. However, asking the question catalyzes several strands of productive analyses to help scholars uncover, rethink, or recognize certain

identifying aspects of NGOs. Putting these two concepts—governance and gender—together in Ortner's structuralist binary opposition allows scholars to reconceptualize a key inquiry within NGO studies: power dynamics inherent to the NGO/State relationship. Exploring Ortner's classic analogy also allows us to uncover the myriad ways in which the "NGO form" (Bernal and Grewal 2014) is feminized, alongside parallel ways in which the State is masculinized (e.g., Heng and Devan 1995; Hofstede 1998; Mackinnon 1989). Asking the question also provides a heuristic for recognizing emerging discoveries within NGO studies, such as what Liisa Malkki (2015) refers to as the "domestic" arts of women's labor. Further, as chapters in this volume demonstrate, highlighting culturally constructed dichotomies such as male/female and State/NGO also allows scholars to deconstruct binaries inherent to these symbolic representations.

Gender and Power

The analogy posed by Ortner is representative of the structuralist analyses employed by many anthropologists of the time (e.g., Douglas 1966; Lévi-Strauss 1969; Sahlins 1981). She asserts that the universal inequality between the sexes is underwritten by a cultural logic that devalues women due to their symbolic association with nature, whereas men are valued due to their (also symbolic) association with culture. Given the gender disparities in political and economic power that continue to exist globally (Inglehart and Norris 2003; Ortiz-Ospina and Roser 2018), seeking a universal explanation is a reasonable endeavor. That said, the simplistic outlying of x versus y belies the complexity of the relationships between the variables. In other words, the essentialisms that anchor Ortner's analogy (female/male, nature/culture) are merely starting points for, not the ultimate conclusion of, her analysis.

Feminist anthropology has made great strides in reformulating concepts of gender since Ortner's original proposition of power and the sexes in a number of fundamental ways. First, the very categories "male" and "female" demonstrate more of a Western cultural model of bodily differences than a reflection of human biological diversity (Fausto-Sterling 2000a, 2000b). Biological sex is recast as a more complex process of determining normative markers of reproductive organs and hormonal levels that belies binary categorization and complicates efforts to categorize human biological sex altogether. Second, gender is no longer

seen as simply the social roles that are applied to and enacted by biologically "sexed" individuals. That is, gender is not simply a social concept that is overlaid onto sex. Rather, gender is recast as a cultural system of meaning that reflects cultural representations of difference. Anthropologists have long noted that many cultures, past and present, have cultural representations of gender that extend far beyond the binary of "man" and "woman" (Brettell and Sargent 2017; Kulik 1998; Nanda 1998). Gender is not only a culturally created social role, but also a process of subject making and identity formation. Third, feminist scholars have decoupled gendered social roles (i.e., "man" and "woman") from a much broader system of gendered attributes—masculine and feminine. Essentially, male, man, and masculinity (and conversely female, woman, femininity), while associated conceptually, need not be enacted in parallel manners. For example, a human assigned "female" sex can have a social role "man" and behave in a combination of masculine and feminine ways. All these categories articulate with one another, yet also demonstrate that gender is a project that is complicated and often contradictory.

Despite the growing understanding in both popular culture and scholarship that gender is nonbinary, the performative aspect of gender still aligns individuals into two discrete categories (West and Zimmerman 1987). As Judith Butler well articulates, individuals do not have bodily autonomy in that "the body has its invariably public dimension, constituted as a social phenomenon in the public sphere, my body is mine and not mine" (2004: 21). That is, bodies are publicly surveilled and inscribed a gendered social meaning. Moreover, the act of "doing gender," engaging in social interactions that reproduce gender differences (Deutsch 2007; West and Zimmerman 1987), is attributed to nonhuman entities as well. As gendered attributes have meaning outside of the human biological body, they are also assigned not only to people but to many other aspects of our natural world, such as animals, birds, insects, environmental elements, colors, sounds, clothing, and buildings. Researchers have found that there is a tendency to ascribe gender to inanimate and animate objects that are objectively genderless (Boroditsy, Schmidt, and Phillips 2003; Grohmann 2009; Wilkie and Bodenhausen 2012). Gendered attributes are associated with intangible concepts as well—deities, symbols, and even institutions and organizations. That is, an institution can be gendered female or male regardless of the biological sex of the members within that institution.

Gender is a complex process in which differences in bodies, behavior, and (in)tangible concepts are assigned meaning in the form of

gendered attributes. But gendered attributes do not simply describe difference. Masculine and feminine are not only situated as different but inherently unequal. Male and female, as iterations of the culture/nature dichotomy, are culturally elaborated through the production of a masculine model that is different from the feminine. The constructions are characterized by a fundamental, universal inequality: not only does woman *not equal* man, but they are situated as fundamentally *unequal*. Ortner's 1974 analysis entails a complexity that seethes under its analogic elegance. Her critique transforms the apparent naturalistic universals into artifacts of cultural and power. As such, her analogy serves as a jumping off point for a more nuanced and provocative analysis of gender and culture.

Our reformulation of Ortner's analogy is offered in the same spirit as her critique: as a heuristic that serves as an entry point for a broader investigation into the cultural work that goes into framing and mediating the relationship between NGOs and States. In the course of this volume, we problematize a static notion of either while maintaining that there is a widely perceived difference between government and NGO functions and endeavors. The ethnographic inquiries presented in this volume expose the complexity and nondichotomous ways of being and living. Humans do not live their lives in binaries, but cultures do produce dichotomous symbols, categories, and schema that influence how we understand ourselves and the world around us (Geertz 1973; Goodenough 1981; Hofstede 1998; Inglehart and Norris 2003; Kroeber 1952; Sharifian 2010). Humans (anthropologists included) identify and understand the unboundedness and complexity of reality through categorical representations. These imaginaries are powerful in that they shape how we approach the world. Our perceptions of reality, mediated by categorization, influence our thoughts and behaviors and, therefore, the construction of our reality.

(Non) Governance

Before we delve further into the explication of the analogy we are using to frame this analysis, it is important to situate NGOs as our subjects of study. Voluntary organizing to confront local issues of, for instance, poverty, illiteracy, environmental degradation, State overreach (or underreach) has long been an attractive site of study for commentators interested in culturally situated responses (Comaroff and Comaroff 1999;

Hann and Dunn 1996; Herbert 2017; Prato 2016; Rutherford 2004). For political scientists interested in civil society as a social phenomenon, these organizations appeared to be vital for the development of robust democratic institutions (e.g., Keane 1998). Yet, as Arjun Appadurai argues, democracy is characterized by a paradox whereby democracy as a mode of governance is profoundly anchored to the Westphalian Nation-State. At the same time, democracy as a set of values only makes sense as a universal, that is, as a mode of governance deployed globally (Appadurai 2001: 42). Given that Western-styled civil society institutions, understood to be an important countervailing force to antidemocratic statist tendencies, were not present in all nations, interested parties in the US sought to find ways to create or strengthen civil society organizations abroad by leveraging existing international aid organizations, like USAID (Hearn 2001; Ottaway and Carothers 2000; van Rooy 2013. The hope was that by creating, some would say "imposing" (see Ferguson 2014), civil society institutions in Africa, Latin America, and Eastern Europe, the people themselves would become empowered to address social problems that Nation-States could not, or would not, address. As Cold War divisions unwound, neoliberal interests, ignoring the centrality of both "voluntary" and "social" in the definition of civil society, began to couple "private property" and "freedom from regulation" to notions of civil society (Fukuyama 2003).

Civil society is often constituted through the establishment of nongovernmental organizations. There is no consensus within the NGO-world or among scholars as to what constitutes a nongovernmental organization. The term and institutional structure, although by no means new at this time, came into vogue in the 1980–90s, a period of time called the "NGO boom" (Agg 2006; Alvarez 1999) or "NGO fever" (Bernal 2017). The rise in nongovernmetalism is often associated with the end of Sovietism and the fall of the Iron Curtain as well as the establishment of neoliberal development models in the 1980s in the Global South. During this time, organizational structures emerged from the civil sector—defined as "the realm of organized social life that is voluntary, self-generating, (largely) self-supporting, autonomous from the State, and bound by legal order" (Diamond 1994: 5)—bearing the designator NGO increased both in number and scope throughout the world. This time also saw a great proliferation in transnational advocacy organizations, which arose due to the emergence of a global public, a civil society. Not insignificantly, as Keck and Sikkink (1998) point out, many of these transnational organizations emerged from historical movements

such as women's suffrage and developed to address global women's rights.

The development of a third sector of civil action in society is idiomatic of the era of transition in the post-Cold War/neoliberal era. During this time, especially in post-Soviet Central and Eastern Europe but also in the Global South, a number of NGOs formed with the specific goal of increasing democratic capacity in potential democracies. They rose in part due to the opening of spaces in which people could act in civic ways outside of the government. In the Soviet world, activities that were the purview of the bureaucratic State before 1989 were privatized and later marketized. This is especially true regarding care for marginalized people. Lynne Haney (2002), for example, explains how the needs of the poor, especially poor women, transferred from the State to private and civic entities throughout Soviet-era and post-Soviet Hungary. Accordingly, the post-Cold War era is characterized by a marked rise in civic, activist, and humanitarian organizations. Outside of the post-Soviet world, NGOs proliferated as a response to what many Western nations saw as the incompetence and corruption of newly formed nations in the postcolonial new world order. NGOs developed to presumably foster democracy and, as such, receive aid from Western governments that had originally been given to other governments but had shifted to fund newly formed NGOs, further undermining and potentially weakening nascent States. International aid to NGOs was seen as a "civilizing" endeavor through which Western values could be introduced and integrated into "third world" communities.

As a result of this specific history, NGOs are associated with democratic ways and being and acting because they are perceived to be grassroots, horizontally structured organizations that seek to benefit an underserved beneficiary group (Ferguson and Gupta 2002). They rose to prominence during a time of the expansion of Western styles of liberal democracy. It is for this reason that much of the early scholarship, what Vannier and Lashaw (2017) call the first generation of NGO studies, lauds their democratic power and ability to "do good" (Anderson 1999; Fisher 1997). Hardt and Negri, for example, identify NGOs as "some of the most powerful pacific weapons of the new world order" (2000: 36). As the field of study has matured and entered the second generation (Vannier and Lashaw 2017), however, researchers have recognized that there is nothing inherently democratic (or good) about NGOs. Rather, they tend to mirror the hierarchies found in the neoliberal States within which they work in that they function through elitism, are unaccount-

able to anybody except to their donor, and are distanced from those they seek to serve. NGO actors uphold themselves as, and may believe themselves to be, prime movers of social change but are in fact handmaidens of neoliberalism (Barnett and Weiss 2008; Donini 2008; Edwards and Hulme 1996; Gunewardena 2008; Harvey 2005; Hulme and Edwards 1997; Kamat 2002; Schuller 2012; Wallace 2009).

The Many Faces of NGOs

As this above discussion highlights, "NGO" describes and encapsulates many different organizational forms. On the one hand, for example, are GONGOs, or government-organized NGOs, which explicitly carry out the ideological and material directives of the State. On the other hand, NGO can also describe activist grassroots organizations that seek to subvert State or corporate power. NGOs can be expansive entities with a global reach, or they can be a neighborhood collaboration. And, of course, there are many intermediate positions between these extremes. Despite the inherent messiness of this site of engagement, Lewis and Schuller (2017) posit that the study of NGOs is important and productive precisely because of the analytical instability of these organizations. Studying NGOs requires us to ask such questions as: (1) How are such disparate entities understood as being the same? (2) What is the salience of the NGO form to the structure of society? And (3) who are the actors in (beneficiaries) and of (benefactors) any NGO work? In this volume, we take up these questions by looking at how the NGO sector of society is understood as a bounded form outside of the State. Our intention here is not to draw the boundaries between NGO and State but rather to explore the tension that exists at these boundaries. First, it is necessary to explore where the border is typically drawn. Although usually defined by negation, what they are *not*, organizations so defined are expected to look and act a certain way.

Since the 1990s, NGOs have become major players and expected contributors in national and global politics (Bernal and Grewal 2014: 1). Accordingly, they have captured the interest of social scientists, particularly anthropologists. However, despite, or perhaps because of, their ubiquity and increasing global, social, and political importance, NGOs remain poorly understood (Fisher 1997; Leve and Karim 2001; Lewis and Schuller 2017). NGO is in practice an ambiguous, catch-all category. A rather bland, cookie-cutter definition posits NGOs as that which they are not—they are *not* governmental and *not* for profit. This definition,

while technically accurate, falls short of grasping the complexity and nuance of what occurs in the NGO sphere of activity. Therefore, there must be some positive characterization that cognitively ties all organizations designated "NGO" together.

Despite the vast differences in outcomes, intended or otherwise, of NGO work, NGOs—which bears repeating are a "Western" concept, created and defined as binary opposite to the Westphalian State—are understood as "doing good." In order to maintain their mantle of "good," NGOs "must perform as moral actors" by helping, advocating, mobilizing, and channeling resources for those understood as "in need" (Sampson 2017: 9). This presupposes the question, what good for whom? How is the "goodness" of the project revealed? In his analysis of Ainu organizations in Japan, Christopher Loy (this volume) uses Gayatri Spivak's (1990) concept of strategic essentialism to explain how NGOs must continually reframe themselves using essentialist classifications in order to strategically position themselves to do their work. This can be broadly applied to the moral project of nongovernmentalism as well. It is not so much that NGOs "do good" but that they are essentially qualified as representing some kind of moral good and as such are tasked with the function of "being good," and they strategically align themselves as such. The project of morality is not straightforward, but rather is entangled with various other actors and institutions. Briefly, these include entanglements with the State, donors, other NGOs and social activist groups, and the ostensible target populations (Sampson 2017). A plethora of ethnographic studies have cast a critical eye on the goal of "doing good" and highlight the uneasy relationship between NGOs and neoliberalism (Fisher 1997; Mertz and Timmer 2010; Sampson 2017). However, none of this critique has taken away from the association between nongovernmentalism and the moral good. Those involved in this work do so because they want to make a positive change in the world. Altman in this volume, for example, explains how and why individuals engage in volunteer work and argues that many of the women involved in humanitarian work speak of the need to be "neighborly" to support the community. Thus, they clearly position themselves as moral actors.

Despite the wealth of scholarship, it is still necessary to scrutinize the perception that NGOs are "doing good." In his introduction to the volume *Cultures of Doing Good*, Steven Sampson characterizes the world of NGOs as "the world of doing good" (2017: 9) in that such organizations are perceived as having humanitarian aims. Those working within NGOs believe strongly in their mission, which is often to serve

underserved populations. NGOs provide food to the hungry, wigs to children undergoing chemotherapy for cancer, and advocacy for migrants. They do work that, prior to the establishment of a formalized third sector, belonged to churches or women's groups (Barnett 2011; Keck and Sikkink 1998). They work with invisible populations such as members of the LGBTQ+ community (Pimentel; Shirinian), the aging (Crampton), or ostracized minorities (Timmer; Wirtz). It is precisely because of their association with a moral project that NGOs are under more scrutiny than governmental and for-profit enterprises from the public, the government, and donor agencies. Donors expect their monies to go to the beneficiaries and may cry corruption when money goes to infrastructural needs like rent and salaries.

Much scholarship on NGOs remains focused on this question of the inherent "goodness" of NGO interventions, or labeling those that do not accomplish their presumed "good works" as morally bankrupt or corrupt. It is not our intention to critique their claims to morality but rather to question the work that any such association is doing. Ortner's heuristic enables us to recast this discussion away from evaluating claims of morality as such to interrogating the conceptual structures that produce binaries in the first place. Regardless of *if* NGOs are "doing good," the fact that they are assumed to do so is a great salience in their conceptualization.

Gendering Governance

In this volume, we argue that although the NGO/State division is as muddy as the female/male one, notions, which come from broader publics as well as researchers, practitioners, and beneficiaries, of what differentiates the two entities is profoundly gendered. To make this argument, we draw upon the foundational and important collection edited by Victoria Bernal and Inderpal Grewal (2014): *Theorizing NGOs*. In their introduction to the volume, Bernal and Grewal assert that although the "NGO form" is almost impossible to delimit, "the definition of what constitutes an NGO is profoundly gendered" (2014: 3). It is so gendered primarily because feminist issues are often relegated to the NGO sphere of activity and because women are greatly represented as employees, volunteers, and beneficiaries in and of the NGO form. Our focus here is on the manner in which NGOs are more often than not subordinate to states due in part to their alignment with the category of "female."

As the contributors to this volume show, organizations labeled "NGO" function separately from the state, even if they are doing similar work or act in "State-like" ways. Not only are they functionally and discursively distinct, but they are, in many cases, conceived of as "lesser than," as evidenced by the general devaluation of NGO work in terms of pay, prestige, power, and the relative valorization of statists projects (Sampson 2017). Scholars of NGOs have noted that women are greatly over-represented as employees, volunteers, and beneficiaries in and of the NGO interventions in this nongovernmental sphere of activity (Bernal and Grewal 2014; Helms 2014; Stromquist 2011). The works represented in this volume explore the "femaleness" of NGOs, discuss the relative invisibility of NGO activity as a result of this association, and interrogate the convergence of State and NGO operations and the tensions between them in a variety of different geographical locations, projects, and typologies. A gendered analysis of State/non-State provides a useful lens with which to interrogate what Leve and Karim (2001) call the "privatization of the State." Neoliberal policies that characterize the current era of governance are marked by an expansion of the "masculinized" arms of the state such as the armed forces, border patrols, and national security with a corresponding contraction of "feminized" arms such as education, health care, and social aid. When those arms that are deemed nurturing (or feminine) are reduced, nongovernmental organizations mobilize to fill the gaps, particularly in "weak" or repressive states. States' reduced activity in these arenas indicate that they do not see such "feminized" aspects of governance as valuable, a further example of the devaluation of femininity. While NGOs and state organizations may be two sides of the same coin, a gendered analysis helps to understand how they function in distinct manners and how they are perceived differently.

Man the State, Woman the NGO

The State, as we use the term in this volume, refers to administrative bodies of governance. Governance has long been gendered male as positions of power are held by, defined by, and associated with men (Conway 2008). Globally, positions of power have been primarily held by white, cisgender, heterosexual men. Although the gender balance has been shifting, the inclusion of more women into positions of power does not necessarily upset the masculinity of the state because institutions of governance are still associated with men and centered around

notions of masculinity (Heng and Devan 1995; MacKinnon 1989). That is, even as more women hold elected positions and enter governing roles, they are still held to expectations and operate in an environment centered on white masculinity. Moreover, the state is associated with masculinity in that it often takes on functions of governance that are seen as active and involve a demonstrable display of dominance. This includes maintaining armed forces, creating and maintaining civilian law enforcement and judicial systems, conferring citizenship, protecting the borders, and establishing the authority of the nation. As Ortner (1974) explains, these actions are gendered male because they are associated with culture, which is controlling, rather than nature, the controlled.

The patriarchal functions of the state are largely accepted as inevitable, such that, by design, governing bodies engage in policies that favor men because they are dominated by, centered around, and defined by men or masculine ideologies (Hofstede 1998; Olufemi 2020). This hegemonic masculinity is not dependent on a static definition of masculinity, but rather that which is masculine is negotiated through the interplay and gender relations of all members in society and all genders (Connell 1995; Connell and Messerschmidt 2005). It is "simultaneously a place in gender relations, the practice through which men and women engage that place in gender, and the effects of these practices on bodily experience, personality, and culture" (Connell 1995: 71). However, even without a predetermined definition, that which is masculine occupies the seat of power and acts in a manner that maintains "sexist oppression, exposing how it helps to extend control over our bodies, a control that is relentlessly justified as necessary" (Olufemi 2020: 22–23).

The authors in this volume reject the premise that NGOs' association with femininity necessary aligns them with subservience. This is a specious notion rooted in our categories that align femininity with weakness. However, we contend that a powerful NGO no more upsets the State/non-State relationship than a woman in a position of leadership upends patriarchal institutions. We ask what aspects of governance can be revealed by extending Ortner's metaphor (masculine/State/powerful versus feminine/NGO/subservient)? That is, despite very fuzzy boundaries, does the same discursive work that categorically separates male and female operate to maintain a division between State and NGO?

There are many examples of powerful NGOs. In places like Haiti (Schuller this vol.), NGO positions often pay higher salaries and have more prestige associated with them than government ones. Rebecca

Warne Peters (2016) discusses the "professionalization" of NGO work in many developing countries where this work is often the only work available and is therefore highly appealing to the professional class. Similarly, Alexandra Crampton (this vol.) explains how as attention to elderly care increased globally, NGOs working with aging populations became more visible and assertive, acting in more masculine (i.e., State-like) ways. In states that are often categorized as "weak," NGOs are doing work that has largely been abandoned by the state either because the state does not have the capacity or does not have the desire to engage in such work. NGOs that are powerful vis-à-vis the state might engage in forms of governance, but they ultimately do not have the power to create and enact legislation, deploy the military, uphold order, or enter into treaties with governments or international governing bodies. Therefore, even if they have more prestige, their ability to engage in governance is limited. This is why, for example, Schuller argues that state actors "perform drag" in Haiti in order to garner the prestige of NGOs to enforce the power of the State. The actors and labor associated with nongovernmentalism are still often deemed feminine, even as they act in more culturally assigned masculine ways.

Many authors have shown that NGOs often act in "State-like" ways but are still perceived distinct from the State, and the difference is hierarchical. That is, NGOs are decidedly unequal to and lesser than the State. The title to this book and the NGO/State formulation sets up a binary, and, of course, any binary is inherently flawed and an imperfect device for understanding nuance, but dichotomies shape many cultural constructs. We do not accept this binary as a given but instead ask what cognitive processes maintain the divide between NGO and State and assign NGO efforts, which are often humanitarian, as lesser than, and what the effects are of this conceptualized dichotomy. The masculine State controls bodies, conquers, and exerts judicial and police power. As the organizations that run counter to State efforts or fill in the gaps where the State has withdrawn, nongovernmental agencies by default and design are defined more by their nurturing role. Several chapters in this volume, for example, highlight the manner in which NGOs are expected to do the nurturing work for those left out of the State project, such as the Roma (Timmer), indigenous peoples (Loy), refugees (Altman; Wirtz), and LGBTQ+ individuals (Shirinian; Pimentel).

The correlation of NGOs with the feminine is made even more apparent when looking at the issues of inequity in salary, prestige, and job security with NGO work. Evidence of the devaluation of the NGO sec-

tor is apparent in the notorious low-pay, high-stress, and low-prestige work environment. It is not by accident that the work force is largely skewed female. As many authors in this volume point out, women are more likely to take up the call of humanitarian work either because they have what is seen as the necessary personality (Yang), have more time for low or unpaid work (Reinke), or because they are women serving women, who are more likely to be the recipients of NGO aid than men (Panda and Pandey; Schuller). Contributors to this volume use Ortner's suppositions regarding the genders as a salient point to begin exploring the characteristics, function, and differential variations of States and NGOs as well as the formal and informal relationships between them.

Divisions of Labor

The assumed division between the masculinity of the state and the femininity of NGOs can be explained further by delving into the pervasive notions of a gendered division of labor. The intersection of gender with labor has long been recognized and theorized in anthropology (Collins 2003; Freeman 2000; Mills 2003; Ong 1991). That said, the analytical distinction between gender and sex has not always been so clear. Once considered nearly conterminous with sex, gendered domains of labor have been characterized by spatial separation and biological imperatives (Reiter 1975; Rosaldo 1974). In *Making Gender: The Politics and Erotic of Culture* (1997), Ortner reflected on her own conflation of sex and gender in her original article. Gender as identity, lived experience, and performance is generally understood to be a product of discourse and power and is highly variable across cultures and histories (Butler 1990; Mills 2016). Beyond bodies, gender as a cultural formation has the potential to shape economic activity through plotting different domains of work, and even divisions of realms of human activity (public/private), along a feminine/masculine spectrum. There is a critical tradition in feminist anthropology that attends to the social production of value hierarchies that map to (equally socially produced) gender divisions, rendering a tautological relationship between low-value work and low-value people (Wright 2006). Feminized occupations, often occupied by both women and men, were once characterized by the production of inexpensive commodities—for example, food, textiles, and light manufacturing. Today they extend into various domains of knowledge work: data entry, clerical, and call center work (Freeman 2000; Patel 2010).

As noted above, feminized labor is often invested in some form of care. Feeding, cleaning, healing, teaching, and other activities that allow for individual, household, or community reproduction are typically deemed feminized labor. Even when not explicitly "care work," however, women are more likely to be called upon to engage in "emotional labor" (Hochschild 1983). Women's emotional labor, argues Hochschild, is expected because "women in general have far less independent access to money, power, authority, or status in society" (1983: 163). Women are expected to show deference, be adaptive, and have a "managed heart" (Zhan this vol.). The relegation of activities such as care work and emotional labor to the women's domain is often explained in terms of the public/private dichotomy in which women's work occurs in the private (domestic) sphere and men's work takes place in the public sphere. Nelly Stromquist argues that the association with the private could be of benefit to women's NGOs in that "their sensitivity to and knowledge of the private sphere" has enabled such groups to have "expanded the view of the political, going beyond electoral politics and the politics of public office to include the power and powerlessness that exists at the micro level in intimate relationships and the household" (2011: 182–83). Many of the contributors to this volume provide compelling examples of how an association with women that leverages women's nurturing roles can give an organization or a movement political power and might (e.g., Panda and Pandey). Still others, however, contend that due to their presumed feminine qualities, NGOs often struggle with the same fights for visibility that women do (e.g., Reinke).

NGOs do highly public advocacy and activist work, but to the extent that private, household activities need to be done, they more often than not fall to the nongovernmental sector of society. Liisa Malkki asserts that many aspects of "internationalist humanitarian imagination and practice were remarkably *domestic*—in two senses" (2015: 3). Aid work is very often literally domestic in that it involves practices of care undertaken de facto by women and/or in the home—prototypically, nursing, cleaning, and caring for the young, the old, and the vulnerable, but also by involving the "domestic arts" such as knitting, crocheting "for the needy," or participating in "homemade" craft projects organized by humanitarian campaigns (often for fund- and awareness-raising purposes) by aid organizations (Malkki 2015: 3–4).

The value of these private, nurturing tasks is often discredited, evidenced by the fact that they are unpaid, low paid, or, as is often the case, made invisible. They are the unseen daily activities that are vital

to the production of society but go unremarked and unrewarded. For example, in her study of "feeding the family," Marjorie DeVault (1995) found, through interviews with heteronormative couples, that when housework was done by women, it was unseen and only became visible, sometimes hypervisible, when men engaged. Similarly, NGO work is frequently underreported in the media and has been understudied in academia. This can be explained by its association with work that is unremarked upon or invisible in society. Stromquist notes that many women's organizations did not emerge due to a departure of the State, but rather from the lack of any activity to create change emerging from the State. "So, it was," she argues, "not a response to state 'erosion' but to state 'blindness'" (2011: 183). In a similar vein, Panda and Pandey (this vol.) explain how women's organizations formed to protest corporate overreach in the Odisha state of India when indigenous rights were not being protected by/from the State.

It is problematic to assume that NGO work is naturally nurturing. Doing so reifies the categorizations of women/men, claiming that women are naturally mothers and caregivers and not well-suited for other roles, and conversely, that men are not nurturing. In the same sense, despite the association with "nurturance," it is not fair to consign NGOs solely to the world of care. Indeed, this is erroneous as nongovernmental work is often marked by activism and policymaking—activities that arguably defy the nurturing psyche defined by Ortner as concerned with the world of concrete feelings, people, and things and interpersonal subjective experiences (Ortner 1974: 81) and occur very much in the public sphere. In other words, NGOs are often engaged in work that seeks to undo gender, reduce inherent gender division, or de-gender, eliminate, or rethink the role of gender (Butler 2004; Deutsch 2007). However, it is accurate to say that women are often *perceived* as being more emotional and caring than stoic men (see Hochschild 1983, and this perception extends to NGO work as well. Nongovernmental entities, by the nature of their work, are deemed responsible for the care of the humane aspects of society. That is, they are "humanitarian" institutions.

Humanitarianism is "an ideology, a movement, a profession, and a compassionate endeavor to provide assistance and protection to populations as risk" (Donini 2008: 30). As many scholars of NGOs have pointed out, it is the nongovernmental organization and their affiliated workers and volunteers that take up the work of providing food to the poor, care for the destitute, education to the illiterate, and other kinds of care work necessary for the reproduction of a democratic society but

falls out of the purview of state responsibility. There is an expectation that they will take care of the marginalized in society. Indeed, care for the "poor wretches" was Henri Dunant's (1959) rationale for beginning the ICRC, which is still widely regarded as the model for humanitarianism (Terry 2002). NGOs take on the role of love (Timmer this vol.) or "loving heart" (Yang this vol.) and work toward rehabilitation over punishment (Reinke this vol.). This association contributes to the assumption that NGOs are in the business of "doing good," which has been, and should be, challenged (Cooley and Ron 2002; Krause 2014; Lashaw, Vannier, and Sampson 2017), but nonetheless is a factor of NGO existence (Fisher 1997). The requirement to be moral and "good" is both a benefit and a burden (Sampson 2017: 11), but one with which NGOs must continually negotiate and contend. Being morally good in this sense is also aligned with femininity and nurturance, qualities typically depicted as noble and upright.

It is important to reiterate that NGOs can and do behave in statist, "masculine" ways but still exist in a subservient position marked as female and that does not challenge the hegemonic norm. However, as the cases in this volume show, regardless of the reversed roles, the NGOs still function within the auspices of the state. Nature can have power over culture, but this power does not change the dichotomy and the culturally informed value. NGOs can be powerful, but they will be expected to withdraw from their position of power when the State, as it is expected to do, restabilizes and regains its rightful place. NGOs are not seen as legitimate forms of governance in the same way that women in positions of power do not change the discourse of patriarchy.

Deconstructing the Dichotomy

While binaries and analogies are useful thought tools to explain the seemingly natural and actually *un*natural divisions that exist across societies, as the authors in this volume argue, all dichotomies are false dichotomies and fail to capture the nuance and complexity of human and, in this case, political relationships. Ortner herself moved beyond her foundational text, which laid the groundwork for future feminist scholarship, certainly within anthropology. Current gender studies scholarship now *queers* gender, delinking it from the association with biological sex, which is also now understood as being socially constructed. Gender is now understood as a continuum rather than a binary.

Similarly, this volume deconstructs the dichotomies of State/NGO, in effect queering NGOs and the State. Contrary to the expectation of NGOs as not-for-profit and grassroots, due to a saturated market, which leads to increased uncertainty, competition, and insecurity, they must "behave in rational and rent-seeking ways" similar to their for-profit counterparts (Cooley and Ron 2002: 36). They find themselves in a double bind in that they must frame their activities in such a way that they must both highlight their intended humanitarian aims while specifically appealing to donors without whom their agency fails to exist (Timmer 2010). Similarly, they must prove that they are working effectively to improve problems while also demonstrating that such problems still exist and need funding (Wirtz 2017). As Timmer (this vol.) explains, many organizations who work on Roma issues in Hungary state that demonstrating love for the Roma, a historically hated population, is one of their main goals. However, *love* does not pay the bills and many organizations are finding themselves unable to continue to function. NGOs are dependent on official agencies and donors and cannot sustain their activities or remain effectual if they refuse to negotiate or otherwise adapt to dominant discourses of the political economic structure (Cooley and Ron 2002) or the "language of need" (Timmer 2010). Funding agencies limit NGOs' ability to provide the gradual strengthening of capacities and capabilities needed to empower local communities because they are reluctant or unwilling "to support the longtime horizons, careful nurturing, and gradual qualitative results" necessary for effective civil or humanitarian change (Edwards and Hulme 1996: 7).

As a result, NGOs are less *non* than they purport to or are expected to be. NGOs often stand in for services that weak or failed States cannot provide and do not necessarily fulfill this function in a manner consistent with the desires of the local community. Nor do they function independently from the government. It is not uncommon for Western nations to use international aid as a political tool to influence the culture and politics of other nations; the Global Gag Rule, which prevents foreign NGOs that receive US assistance from providing legal abortion services or referrals, is a perfect example. In this way, NGOs can be an avenue for spreading governmental agendas (Fassin 2011). NGO supportive agencies include Western nations, banks, and corporations and therefore are better labeled as BONGOs (business-organized NGOs) or the highly ironic GONGOs (government-organized NGOs). Tina Wallace (2009) commented that far from being independent, democratic, grassroots entities, NGOs should be considered "Trojan horses for global

neoliberalism" because they assist in the future withdrawal of the State from social provision and, therefore, promote the expansion of the neo-liberal agenda into new arenas. As Sangeeta Kamat asserts, "the agentic role prescribed to NGOs is not an innocent one but one that foretells a reworking of democracy in ways that coalesce with global capital inter-ests" (2002: 156).

The contributors to this anthology ask what about NGOs leads to their assumed devalued status in society, a status that persists despite the ubiquity and expansion of the NGO form into more parts of the globe and despite their perceived alignment with "goodness" and the moral imperative. Thus, we are asking a very similar question to the one posed by Ortner. She set out to uncover the rationale for the "secondary status of women" as "one of the true universal, a pan-cultural fact" (1974: 68). Her analysis begins with the assertion that women are universally subordinate because of their ubiquitous association with some con-cept or symbol also universally devalued. She thus identifies the nature-culture continuum as a ready-made structure onto which sexed bod-ies are distributed. Ultimately, she concludes that women occupy an unruly intermediate position that, much like untamed nature, requires constant monitoring, limiting, and redefining; in short, women are kept in a subordinate position relative to men who are, oppositionally as de-manded by the binary, manifestations of politics, religion, economy, and the like (Ortner 1974: 85–86).

Gender and governance can be understood both as a duality and as a boundless spectrum. As such, transgressions of the dichotomy occur. Those identified as women can act in ways deemed masculine by their society in the same way that NGOs can take on roles presumed to be the domain of States; but such transgressions do not ultimately upset the culturally constructed categorization because their behaviors and actions are readily conceptualized as either outliers or subversions of categorical relationships, thus reifying dichotomous categories and the power structures on which they lay.

Structure of the Volume

The contributions to this volume span the globe and represent differing forms of NGOs on the public/private continuum, types of States along a continuum of what political scientists call "strong" or "weak" States, locations within the global neoliberal economy, and degrees of pen-

etration of neoliberal policies. Methodologically, the chapters present a diverse approach, including ethnographies, case studies, participatory engagement, secondary source analysis, and theoretical inquiry. The NGOs examined within work on an array of issues, including care work, conservation, and basic social provisions. As many of the authors here argue, care work within humanitarian agencies can be understood through a gendered lens, and this comparison is fairly intuitive. The ways in which leadership, ideologies, and practices are gendered, however, do not fit neatly within rigid boundaries. Rather than simply reiterating the dichotomy of male/culture/State to female/nature/NGO, the contributors to this volume, through varied and rich ethnographic examples, demonstrate the complex and dynamic interplay of gendered narratives in the sphere of "third sector" activity in neoliberal States.

To address the diversity of studies, this volume is comprised of three sections. In the first section, "Patterns of Reproduction: NGO and State Relations through a Gendered Lens," authors speak to the manner in which, in a neoliberal context, the relationship between the State and the nongovernmental organizations and actors can be broadly understood through the lens of gender. As the authors discuss, however, the boundaries between State and NGO, much like the boundaries between male and female, are blurry and not well-defined. In the first chapter of this section, Alexandra Crampton compares NGO elder advocacy in the United States and Ghana and makes the argument that in Ghana, a "weak State" that is modernizing, NGO work is masculinized whereas in the "strong," modern State of the United States, nonprofit elder care work is feminized. Elder advocacy work, Crampton asserts, has been constructed as universally necessary and also dominated by a particularly western cultural construction of aging as a social problem demanding State and NGO intervention. Beyond that, however, the structures of the State factor largely in the construction of elder care. Christopher Loy explains how the Ainu Association in Japan exists in an ambiguous position within the State bureaucracy and is therefore able to function both inside and outside of the State apparatus. His use of "strategic essentialism" (Spivak 1990) underscores how NGOs represent themselves in ways that strategically ignore internal differences (including connections to the State or subaltern organizations) in order to better function in different contexts to achieve defined ends. This chapter contributes to the understanding of the fuzziness of categorizations between male/female and State/NGO. In the final chapter of this section, Amanda J. Reinke examines the gender and racial power dynamics embedded in

alternative justice programs in the San Francisco Bay Area and northern Virginia. Using this lens, she is able to show how White women as aid providers reinforce exclusionary systems wherein people of color may be excluded from both the services and volunteer opportunities.

The second section of this volume, "Care Work as Feminized Work," specifically focuses on the feminization of NGO work. Chapters in this section discuss how the work of NGOs itself has been feminized in the sense that nurturance, for example, is associated with feminine qualities. Tess Altman examines how the work of providing aid for refugees has been largely taken up by women. She explains how and why volunteerism is inadvertently gendered female in relation to the (masculine) militarization of Australia's border and immigration policy. In the next chapter, Smita Misha Panda and Annapurna Devi Pandey show how in the Indian State of Odisha women's bodies become spaces of resistance. Rural women led the charge in defending the land and resources. Andria D. Timmer looks at the manner in which the Roma in Hungary are treated as a child-like population in need of nurturing care. NGOs, then, take on and act out a mothering role as opposed to the paternal role of the State. Moreover, they are single mothers as the State has largely removed itself from any responsibility for the Roma population. Analyzing NGOs in China, Yang Zhan, in the final chapter of this section, demonstrates how the gendered discourse of *aixin* ("loving heart") has contributed to State control over NGOs. *Aixin*, a State-promoted value, generally reinforces a moral imperative among its citizens to take care of the poor and needy. By doing so, it confines the more "proper" NGO work to the feminized sectors, including service, aid, poverty alleviation, and disaster relief.

The last section, "Beyond the Binary: Intersectionality and Queer Spaces in NGOs," expands our inquiry of gender beyond the male/female dichotomy and opens up the discussion to include alternative gender identities and queer spaces of activism. In the first chapter of this section, Mark Schuller explores feminized NGO programs in Haiti hailed "little dear mothers" in the hypermasculinized Martelly regime. Post-quake aid to Haiti has contributed to multiple boundary blurrings, as State programs have become NGO-ized and target women. Alejandra Wundram Pimentel interrogates trans identity in Guatemala and through her ethnography discusses how NGOs have defined trans identities strategically to function within the State. Tamar Shirinian explores the problem of visibility and inclusion for nonheterosexual-

identified women in feminist and lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, and intersex (LGBTI) NGOs in the post-Soviet Republic of Armenia. Shirinian explains how the NGO issue of homosexuality is marked male while feminism is marked heterosexual in such a way that nonheterosexual women are excluded from both. Elizabeth Wirtz closes the volume by challenging readers to think outside of binaries, even those that frame this book. In her ethnographic inquiry of residents of Kakuma refugee camp, Wirtz questions how to analyze NGO/State relationships in the absence of the State.

This collection highlights local conceptualizations as key. Shaped by regional expectations of how States *should* function, the reality of localized State projects as always already incomplete and/or breaking down, and culturally embedded hierarchies of value that valorize nationalist exclusions against the reality of shared human needs, NGOs mobilize under an ethos of care that is at once locally legible and immanently universal. It is precisely this intersection of regionally specific norms of care and the global extension of a generalizable mode of organization and functionality that makes NGO studies a crucial entry point to understanding the unfolding of regional political economy and universalist notions of human rights and ethical governance.

The chapters in this volume represent a diversity of perspectives that explore what is profoundly gendered about the project of nongovernance. The contributors argue that despite the ambiguity of the NGO form, organizations labeled as such share certain features, namely, their association, albeit sometimes misplaced, with democratic and morally good ways of acting and being and their subordinate position relative to the State. We argue that Ortner's male/female, culture/nature analogy helps us understand how, through institutional power and everyday practice, the blurred boundaries between NGO and State are negotiated, solidified, and made real.

Andria D. Timmer is an Associate Professor of Anthropology at Christopher Newport University. Her research focuses on efforts to affect social change, and she studies this by centering her inquiry on nongovernmental and humanitarian organizations. Her work has focused on Roma rights, food justice movements, and migration policy. Her book, *Educating the Hungarian Roma: Nongovernmental Organization and Minority Rights* (2017), explores NGO work to desegregate the Hungarian education system for the Hungarian Roma. Current research concerns

border protectionist policies in Hungary and their impact on notions of citizenship.

Christopher Loy is a Senior Lecturer in anthropology and is the Director of the Interdisciplinary Studies program at Christopher Newport University in southeast Virginia. His research interests focus on how local peoples negotiate life amid shifting environmental conditions. His work with the Ainu focuses on indigenous land-use issues as the Japanese state continues to "develop" the forests and waterways of northern Japan. Closer to home, he works with watermen communities on Chesapeake Bay as they struggle to adapt to the deteriorating ecology of the region. In both fieldsites the cultural assumptions about community self-determination, what should and should not be subject to regulatory oversight, and the nature of human–environment interactions shape adaptive responses to environmental change.

Elizabeth Wirtz is a Qualitative Analyst in the Center for Access and Delivery Research and Evaluation at the Department of Veterans Affairs, Iowa City, IA. A cultural anthropologist, her research centers on veteran/military health, telemedicine, refugees/forced migration, humanitarianism in relief and development, sexual and gender-based violence, reproductive/maternal health, human-centered design in technology and engineering, and STEM higher education. She serves as Senior Co-Chair of the Gender Based Violence Topical Interest Group of the Society for Applied Anthropology and as a board memeber for the Society for Medical Anthropology.

References

Agg, Catherine. 2006. *Trends in Government Support for Non-Governmental Organizations: Is the "Golden Age" of the NGO Behind Us?* Geneva: United Nations Research Institute on Social Development.

Alvarez, Sonia E. 1999. "Advocating Feminism: The Latin American Feminist 'Boom.'" *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 1(2): 181–209.

Anderson, Mary B. 1999. *Do No Harm: How Aid Can Support Peace—or War*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Appadurai, Arjun. 2001. "Deep Democracy: Urban Governmentality and the Horizon of Politics." *Environment and Urbanization* 12(2): 23–43.

Barnett, Michael N. 2011. *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Barnett, Michael N., and Thomas G. Weiss, eds. 2008. *Humanitarianism in Question: Politics, Power, Ethics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bernal, Victoria. 2017. "NGO Fever and Donor Regimes: Tanzanian Feminist Activism within Landscapes of Contradictions." In *Cultures of Doing Good: Anthropologists and NGOs*, edited by Amanda Lashaw, Christian Vannier, and Steven Sampson, 37–55. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Bernal, Victoria, and Inderpal Grewal, eds. 2014. *Theorizing NGOs: States, Feminisms, and Neoliberalism*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Boroditsky, Lera, Lauren A. Schmidt, and Webb Phillips. 2003 "Sex, Syntax, and Semantics." In *Language in Mind: Advances in the Study of Language and Thought*, edited by Dedre Genter and Susan Godin-Meadow, 61–80. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Brettell, Caroline B., and Carolyn F. Sargent. 2017. *Gender in a Cross-Cultural Perspective*. 7th ed. New York: Routledge.

Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

———. 2004. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.

Collins, Jane L. 2003. *Threads: Gender, Labor and Power in the Global Apparel Industry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Comaroff, John L., and Jean Comaroff, eds. 1999. *Civil Society and the Political Imagination in Africa: Critical Perspectives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Connell, R. W. 1995. *Masculinities*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Connell, R. W., and James W. Messerschmidt. 2005. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." *Gender and Society* 19(6): 829–59.

Conway, Daniel. 2008. "The Masculine State in Crisis: State Response to War Resistance in Apartheid South Africa." *Men and Masculinities* 10(4): 422–39.

Cooley, Alexander, and James Ron. 2002. "The NGO Scramble: Organizational Insecurity and the Political Economy of Transnational Action." *International Security* 27(1): 5–39.

Deutsch, Francine M. 2007. "Undoing Gender." *Gender and Society* 21(1): 106–22.

DeVault, Marjorie L. 1995. *Feeding the Family: The Social Organization of Caring as Gendered Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Diamond, Larry Jay. 1994. "Rethinking Civil Society: Toward Democratic Consolidation." *Journal of Democracy* 5: 4–18.

Donini, Antonio. 2008. "Through a Glass Darkly: Humanitarianism and Empire." In *Capitalizing on Catastrophe: Neoliberal Strategies in Disaster Reduction*, edited by Nandini Gunewardena and Mark Schuller, 29–44. Lanham: AltaMira Press.

Douglas, Mary. 1966. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of the Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London: Ark.

Dunant, Henri. 1959. *A Memory of Solferino*. Geneva: International Committee of the Red Cross.

Edwards, Michael, and David Hulme. 1996. *Beyond the Magic Bullet: NGO Performance and Accountability in the Post-Cold War World*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press.

Fassin, Didier. 2011. "*Noli Me Tangere:* The Moral Untouchability of Humanitarianism." In *Forces of Compassion: Humanitarianism Between Ethics and Politics*, edited by Erica Bornstein and Peter Redfield, 35–52. Santa Fe: School for Advanced Research.

Fausto-Sterling, Anne. 2000a. "The Five Sexes, Revisited." *The Sciences* (July/August): 18–23.

———. 2000b. *Sexing the Body: Gender Politics and the Construction of Sexuality*. New York: Basic Books.

Ferguson, James. 2014. "Transnational Topographies of Power: Beyond the 'State' and 'Civil Society' in the Study of African Politics." *Occasional Paper* 19: 45–71.

Ferguson, James, and Akhil Gupta. 2002. "Spatializing States: Toward an Ethnography of Neoliberal Governmentality." *American Ethnologist* 29(4): 981–1,002.

Fisher, William F. 1997. "Doing Good? The Politics and Antipolitics of NGO Practices." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 439–64.

Freeman, Carla. 2000. *High Tech and High Heels in the Global Economy: Women, Work, and Pink-Collar Identities in the Caribbean*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Fukuyama, Francis. 2003. *Social Capital and Civil Society: Foundations of Social Capital*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Pub.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Goodenough, W. H. 1981. *Culture, Language, and Society*. Menlo Park, CA: Benjamin/Cummings Publishing.

Grohmann, B. 2009. "Gender Dimensions of Brand Personality." *Journal of Marketing Research* 105: 105–19. doi:10.1177/014667299025004002.

Gunewardena, Nandini. 2008. "Human Security Versus Neoliberal Approaches to Disaster Recovery." In *Capitalizing on Catastrophe: Neoliberal Strategies in Disaster Reduction*, edited by Nandini Gunewardena and Mark Schuller, 3–16. Lanham: AltaMira Press.

Haney, Lynne. 2002. *Inventing the Needy: Gender and the Politics of Welfare in Hungary*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hann, Chris, and Elizabeth Dunn, eds. 1996. *Civil Society: Challenging Western Models*. New York: Taylor and Francis.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, UK: Harvard University Press.

Harvey, David. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hearn, Julie. 2001. "The 'Uses and Abuses' of Civil Society in Africa." *Review of African Political Economy* 28(87): 43–53.

Helms, Elissa. 2014. "The Movementization of NGOs? Women's Organizing in Postwar Bosnia-Herzegovina." In *Theorizing NGOs: States, Feminisms, and Neoliberalism*, edited by Victoria Bernal and Inderpal Grewal, 21–49. Durham: Duke University Press.

Heng, Geraldine, and Janadas Devan. 1995. "State Fatherhood: The Politics of Nationalism, Sexuality, and Race in Singapore." In *Bewitching Women, Pious Men: Gender and Body Politics in Southeast Asia*, edited by Aiwha Ong and M. G. Peletz, 343–64. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Herbert, David. 2017. *Religion and Civil Society: Rethinking Public Religion in the Contemporary World*. New York: Routledge.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkely: University of California Press.

Hofstede, Geert. 1998. *Masculinity and Feminity: The Taboo Dimensions of National Cultures*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Hulme, David, and Michael Edwards, eds. 1997. *NGOs, States, and Donors: Too Close for Comfort?* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Inglehart, Ronald, and Pippa Norris. 2003. *Rising Tide: Gender Equality and Cultural Change Around the World*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kamat, Sangeeta. 2002. *Development Hegemony: NGOs and the State in India*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Keane, John. 1998. *Civil Society: Old Images, New Visions*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Krause, Monika. 2014. *The Good Project: Humanitarian Relief NGOs and the Fragmentation of Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kroeber, A. L. 1952. *The Nature of Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kulick, Don. 1998. *Travesti: Sex, Gender, and Culture among Brazilian Transgendered Prostitutes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lashaw, Amanda, Christian Vannier, and Steven Sampson. 2017. *Cultures of Doing Good: Anthropologists and NGOs*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press.

Leve, Lauren, and Lamia Karim. 2001. "Privatizing the State: Ethnography of Development, Transnational Capital, and NGOs." *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 24(1): 53–58.

Lévi-Strauss, Claude. 1969. *The Raw and the Cooked: Introduction to a Science of Mythology*. Vol. 1. Translated by Doreen and John Weightman. New York: Harper and Row.

Lewis, David, and Mark Schuller. 2017. "Engagements with a Productively Unstable Category: Anthropologists and Nongovernmental Organizations." *Current Anthropology* 58(5): 634–51.

MacKinnon, Catharine A. 1989. *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Malkki, Liisa. 2015. *The Need to Help: The Domestic Arts of International Humanitarianism*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Mertz, Elizabeth, and Andria Timmer. 2010. "Introduction: Getting it Done: Ethnographic Perspectives on NGOs." *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 33(2): 171–77.

Mills, Mary Beth. 2003. "Gender and Inequality in the Global Labor Force." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 32: 41–62.

Mills, Maura, ed. 2016. *Gender and the Work-Family Experience: An Intersection of Two Domains*. New York: Springer.

Nanda, Serena. 1998. *Neither Male Nor Female: The Hijras of India*. Boston: Cengage Learning.

Olufemi, Lola. 2020. *Feminism, Interrupted: Disrupting Power*. London: Pluto Press.

Ong, Ainhwa. 1991. "The Gender and Labor Politics of Postmodernity." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 20: 279–309.

Ortiz-Ospina, Esteban, and Max Roser. 2018. "Economic Inequality by Gender." *Our World in Data*, 21 March 2018. https://ourworldindata.org/economic-inequality-by-gender.

Ortner, Sherry. 1974. "Is Female to Male as Nature Is to Culture?" In *Woman, Culture, and Society*, edited by Michelle Rosaldo and Louise Lamphere, 68–87. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

———. 1997. *Making Gender: The Politics and Erotics of Culture*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Ottaway, Marina, and Thomas Carothers. 2000. *Funding Virtue: Civil Society Aid and Democracy Promotion*. New York: Carnegie Endowment.

Patel, Reena. 2010. *Working the Night Shift: Women in India's Call Center Industry*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Peters, Rebecca Warne. 2016. "Local in Practice-Professional Distinctions in Angolan Development Work." *American Anthropologist* 118(3): 495–507.

Prato, Guiliana B. 2016. "The 'Costs' of European Citizenship: Governance and Relations of Trust in Albania." In *Citizenship and the Legitimacy of Governance: Anthropology in the Mediterranean Region*, edited by Italo Pardo and Giuliana Prato, 133–52. New York: Routledge.

Reiter, R. 1975. "Men and Women in the South of France: Public and Private Domains." In *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, edited by R. Reiter, 252–82. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Rosaldo, Michelle Z. 1974. "Woman, Culture, and Society: A Theoretical Overview." In *Women, Culture, and Society*, edited by Michelle Z. Rosaldo, Louise Lamphere, and Joan Bamberger, 17–42. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Rutherford, Blair. 2004. "Desired Publics, Domestic Government, and Entangled Fears: On the Anthropology of Civil Society, Farm Workers, and White Farmers in Zimbabwe." *Cultural Anthropology* 19(1): 122–53.

Sahlins, Marshall. 1981. *Historical Metaphors and Mythical Realities: Structure in the Early History of the Sandwich Islands Kingdom*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Sampson, Steven. 2017. "Introduction: Engagements and Entanglements in the Anthropology of NGOs." In *Cultures of Doing Good: Anthropologists and NGOs*, edited by Amanda Lashaw, Christian Vannier, and Steven Sampson, 1–20. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Schuller, Mark. 2012. *Killing with Kindness: Haiti, International Aid and NGOs*. Foreword by Paul Farmer. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Sharifian, F. 2010. "Cultural Conceptualisations in Intercultural Communication: A Study of Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal Australians." *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(12): 3,367–76.

Spivak, Gayatri. 1990. *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*. New York: Routledge.

Stromquist, Nelly P. 2011. "A Social Cartography of Gender in Education: Visualizing Private and Public Spheres of Interconnecting Forces." In *Beyond the Comparative: Advancing Theory and Its Application to Practice*, edited by John C. Weidman and W. James Jacob, 173–92. New York: Springer.

Terry, Fiona. 2002. *Condemned to Repeat? The Paradox of Humanitarian Action*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Timmer, Andria. 2010. "Constructing the 'Needy Subject': NGO Discourses of Roma Need." *PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 33(2): 264–81.

Vannier, Christian, and Amanda Lashaw. 2017. "Conclusion: A Second Generation of NGO Anthropology." In *Cultures of Doing Good: Anthropologists and NGOs*, edited by Amanda Lashaw, Christian Vannier, and Steven Sampson, 1–20. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

van Rooy, Alison, ed. 2013. *Civil Society and the Aid Industry*. New York: Routledge.

Wallace, Tina. 2009. "NGO Dilemmas: Trojan Horses for Global Neoliberalism?" *Socialist Register* 40: 202–19.

West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender and Society* 1(2): 125–51.

Wilkie, James E. B., and Galen V. Bodenhausen. 2012. "Are Numbers Gendered?" *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 141(2): 206–10.

Wirtz, Elizabeth. 2017. "The Inhumanity of Humanitarian Aid: Gender and Violence in a Kenyan Refugee Camp." PhD diss., Purdue University. ProQuest.

Wright, Melissa. 2006. "Differences That Matter." In *David Harvey: A Critical Reader*, edited by Noel Castree and Derek Gregory, 80–101. Hoboken: Blackwell.