Addressing Anti-Discrimination in Inter-Group Advocacy: Intersections of Allyship, and Intervention and Development

by

Abigail Myles

A Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of

The University of Manitoba

in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Faculty of Law

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg

ABSTRACT

Inter-group advocacy is relied upon and consistently evoked to facilitate meaningful change for the realization of human rights. However, there is a large disconnect between different modes of advocacy, and the perceptions of out-group roles in anti-discrimination pursuits. These miscommunications lead to reproducing and/or reinforcing systems of oppression that destroy inter-group relationships and collaboration. This paper evaluates the research and practices of allyship, and intervention and development to identify best practices in inter-group advocacy. Such examination points to the integration of autonomy-oriented transformation, restorative approaches, and daily immersive and lifelong commitment. It is suggested that when these themes are implemented, cross-cultural collaboration is optimized as are pursuits of anti-discrimination and human rights.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

> "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood. Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, birth or other status." (United Nations, 1948, art. 1-2).

Discrimination and exclusion based on membership and identity are direct violations of human rights. The need for anti-discrimination and inclusion protection is evident as ethnic and national conflicts gain greater media coverage and global attention (Wolff, 2006). To contest these abuses the active collaboration of humanity is required to restore dignity and rights to those impacted (Boersema, 2011; Broberg & Sano, 2018; Park et al., 2019). The United Nations guiding frame for transformation emphasizes six consistent human rights principles: universality and inalienability, indivisibility, inter-dependence and inter-relatedness, accountability and rule of law, participation and inclusion, and equality and non-discrimination (Broberg & Sano, 2018). These human rights principles facilitate civic participation and protest, as rights holders contest the ignorance or violation of their rights (Boersema, 2011; Park et al., 2019). This action requires the promotion of participation and autonomy through inclusion and capacity building (Broberg & Sano, 2018). Thus, tolerance should be entwined with freedom and moral ethics where social justice mobilizes choice and access to decision-making (Boler & Zembylas, 2003; Sen, 1999). Further, empowerment requires that all groups and individuals are mobilized and able to co-learn, think, act, and fulfill their potential as equal rights holders and members of society (Boler & Zembylas, 2003; Broberg & Sano, 2018; Sen, 2009).

Allyship, intervention, and development are key tools in advocacy and the realization of human rights that aim to combat abuses and discrimination. Humanitarian intervention and development lead by the Global North in the Global South are accepted and relied upon internationally and institutionally. Allyship discourse and action is emerging in the fields of social justice and conflict transformation. While these responses to discrimination and human rights violations are trusted, they are typically isolated. This eliminates space for collaboration and expansion for enhancement and support in conflict transformation. Further, these concepts are primarily implemented and enacted by those belonging to dominant culture that hold structural power in international or national contexts, due to location, identity, or socioeconomic factors. This is highlighted as an area of concern in conflict transformation as power imbalances and hierarchies emerge. Therefore, this analysis explores responses to such critiques for guidance in ethical and constructive inter-group participation, relationship, and overall engagement. This analysis begins with a focus on allyship literature to outline key considerations in both theory and practice. Second, intervention and development are reviewed to unveil the foundations and progress in this discourse. Bridging these topics concludes with key frames for practitioners, advocates, and those desiring to ethically engage with conflict transformation. From this guide, themes of autonomy-oriented transformation, restorative practices, and daily immersive and lifelong commitment are at the cornerstone.

Key Language

Language is a social construct that is continually evolving, being re/constructed, and is problematic (Tatum, 1997). Chosen language holds power and impacts dynamics of existing structures that hold historical significance dependent on perspective and experience (Cormier,

2017; Gillborn, 2015). To challenge problematic constructs, language must be discussed and evaluated (Tatum, 1997). Diversity within and among groups lead to differing preferences in language use (Cormier, 2017). This section aims to outline the terminology utilized to categorize power dynamics and identity groups where oppression is present. For example, distinctions of marginalized vs. privileged, dominant vs. non-dominant, oppressor vs oppressed, etc. will be discussed. Second, different terms utilized to discuss the role of allyship and distinctions of activist, ally, co-conspirator, etc. are outlined and discussed. Throughout these discussions the language chosen for the remainder of the paper is outlined and reasoned. The chosen language is outlined with understanding that it is likely to be contested by some and preferred by others, however offense is not intended. This language is selected to challenge imbalances of power and ensure the dignity of all groups.

Identity Group Terminology

Societal power imbalances are revealed through normative narratives that dictate in-group and out-group distinctions (Walton et al., 2019; Wolff, 2006). Categorization through subtleties becomes an effective tool of power reinforcement, voice silencing, and discrediting the place of the other (Cormier, 2017). The presence of this dynamic fosters an environment that is ingrained and entwined with inequalities. Similarly, the language utilized to discuss and outline these social constructions play a role in the reinforcement or resistance of power hierarchies (Carlson et al., 2019; Cormier, 2017; Wiley & Dunne, 2019). There are numerous dichotomies utilized to express existing power relations, such as: privileged and marginalized (Carlson et al., 2019; Kluttz et al., 2020; Sumerau et al., 2020; Wiley & Dunne, 2019); oppressor and oppressed (Ghabra & Calafell, 2018); dominant and non-dominant (Brown, 2015); advantaged and

disadvantaged (Droogendyk et al., 2016); or simply in-group and out-group (La Macchia & Louis, 2016). However, to avoid favouring, silencing communities or pushing groups to the periphery of society, terminology of under-served or impacted, and dominant are utilized to reference existing power imbalances. Language is active and holds power that influence intentions and impacts (Cormier, 2017; Tatum, 1997; Wolff, 2006). The use of under-served or impacted intend to demonstrate the relationship of power and the missing attention and action by those monopolizing the power. Similarly, dominant represents the active containment and gatekeeping that locates the control of power. The chosen language aims to accurately address social reality and empower transformation, while avoiding further division between communities.

Allyship Terminology

Past and present conceptualizations of support and aid have led to numerous titles and labels to define a similar sentiment. This terminology typically refers to an individual that desires to support or be involved in the changing of an unjust situation affecting a collective or individual of a different identity group (Brown, 2015). In this practice, the unaffected individual offering support belongs to the dominant identity group, whereas those impacted belong to the under-served identity group. This position of support by members of the dominant culture is most commonly referenced as allyship or an “ally” (Brown, 2015; Casey & Ohler, 2012; Sumerau et al., 2020; Wiley & Dunne, 2018). However, additional terms have emerged, such as, “in solidarity” (Ghabra & Calafell, 2018; hooks, 2000; Kluttz et al., 2020), activists (Brown, 2015; Carlson et al., 2019; Droogendyk et al., 2016), accomplices (Carlson et al., 2019; Cormier, 2017). For the purpose of this paper, ally and allyship are utilized to encapsulate these sentiments

as it is most commonly known and understood (Carlson et al., 2019; Sumerau et al., 2020; Wiley & Dunne, 2018).

Oppressive Systems

Oppressive systems in society include, but are not limited to, racism, sexism, ageism, heterosexism, elitism, classism, etc. that are constructed on the basis of a dominant and superior group over all others (Dueck-Read, 2016; Lorde, 1984; Walton et al., 2019). These constructions perpetuate harm as prejudice combines with institutional power to continue and reinforce negative and harmful messages (Lorde, 1984; Tatum, 1997). The socially constructed nature of societal categorization and identifiers demonstrate that manifestations of oppression are flexible, intersecting and different across identity factors that are hidden by normative and societal patterns to keep them hidden (Gillborn, 2015; Wolff, 2006). The dominant identities that hold power are incompatible with the realities of the majority; therefore, the majority begin to closely identify with their difference and isolate focus to that aspect of oppression (Lorde, 1984; Tatum, 1997). Intersectionality asserts that there are patterns and layers of privilege and oppression that are determined by impacts of representation, context, and setting (Sacks & Lindholm, 2002; Walton et al., 2019).

Learned oppression is revealed through the existence and superiority of normative identities and behaviours that create a false expression of universalism and neutrality to define all individuals (Dueck-Read, 2016; Sacks & Lindholm, 2002; Saguy et al., 2008). Oppressive systems require a rejection of difference at the institutional level where only one identity of human difference is deemed legitimate as a means of control (Gillborn, 2015; Lorde, 1984). This is maintained by social institutions that protect those belonging to the dominant group from

experiencing the oppressive effects of the structure and limits challenges to the normative narrative (Sacks & Lindholm, 2002; Saguy et al., 2008; Walton et al., 2019). Intra-group hierarchies are created in oppressive systems under the guise of power sharing that maintain dominant control but divide the impacted (Lorde, 1984; Tatum, 1997). Therefore, for impacted communities to survive in oppressive systems, they are required to become familiar with the dominant culture and at times adopt these norms for protection (Lorde, 1984; Saguy et al., 2008).

Oppressive systems are at their strongest when their messages are internalized by the impacted community at the individual level (Tatum, 1997). To escape and dismantle the oppression within the system, deconstructing the roots of internalization and presence of oppression at the individual level is crucial (Freire, 1970; Lorde, 1984). Furthermore, as oppressive systems are revealed and understood, boundaries and distance between groups are reduced to build bridges and inter-group relationships (Gillborn, 2015; Sacks & Lindholm, 2002; Saguy et al., 2008). By evaluating oppressive systems, the foundations of privilege are evaluated and insights into correcting stratification and combatting inequality are found (Sacks & Lindholm, 2002; Walton et al., 2019).

ALLYSHIP

As human rights and conflict transformation fields expand, awareness of injustice and oppressive systems increase. Many people previously unaware and/or unaffected by these dynamics and inequalities are becoming motivated to combat them through allyship. But, even when well-intentioned, this engagement may perpetuate harm further. Here, current scholarly writing is reviewed to examine expectations, challenges, and suggestions for constructive and positive engagement.

Ally Expectations

Power imbalances and inequalities are facilitated by systems of oppression and to combat this injustice, the cause of allyship is enlisted. Oppressive systems are upheld by the norms that develop and reinforce the foundation of meaning making, norms, and patterns in society (Sumerau et al., 2020). Current realities display societal frames that state a post-oppressive state and believe that inequality is of the past, discussion of oppression is divisive, and good people do not contribute to or allow oppression to exist (Sumerau et al., 2020). However, these realities are far from the expectations and requests of the impacted communities. This section outlines the expectations within the allyship role by those they aim to partner with. Highlighted expectations of allies include education and acknowledgement, speaking out, autonomy-oriented action, and utilizing intersectional approaches.

Education and Acknowledgement

Allyship requires understanding oppressive narratives and learning the experiences of under-served communities (Ghabra & Calafell, 2018; hooks, 2000). This supports identification of dominant norms of oppression and how members of dominant culture re/produce this harm (Brown, 2015; Ghabra & Calafell, 2018). Allies should share resources with under-served communities and diversify their information sources for greater understanding and access to justice and representation (Carlson et al., 2019; hooks, 2000). Allyship requires awareness of systematic inequality, power imbalances, and the history that founds the current expressions of oppression and marginalization (Brown, 2015; Kluttz et al., 2020). Self-motivated education should empower individual initiative to listen, learn, and seek out resources for education and

confidence-building without extracting or relying on the energy of the under-served community (Carlson et al., 2019; Casey & Ohler, 2012; Kluttz et al., 2020). Allies are not expected to always have an answer but to be willing to do the work on their own to fill gaps in their understanding (Carlson et al., 2019).

As knowledge and understanding expands, allies must be willing to acknowledge past harms, and their role in re/creating them (Cormier, 2017; Droogendyk et al., 2016). For those in dominant positions to effectively engage in change, they must realize their own complicity in systems of oppression and the false dominant narratives that they have believed (Kluttz et al., 2020). Lack of recognition and evaluation of privilege greatly increases the likelihood of harmful help when their privilege and commitment are openly questioned (Droogendyk et al., 2016). Therefore, reflection and critical thinking in practice to incorporate intentionality and introduce constructive patterns becomes critical (Ghabra & Calafell, 2018). Additionally, partnering with under-served groups should not be easy, static or settled, but should invoke ongoing reflection, reconsideration and evaluation of power, privilege, and oppressive systems in support of under-served communities (Brown, 2015; Kluttz et al., 2020). This internal consciousness leads to transformation that inspires social action (Carlson et al., 2019).

Speaking Out

Key actions for allies include recognizing privilege, de-centring their voice and experience, listening to marginalized communities, and speaking against injustice that they see (Wiley & Dunne, 2018). Daily use of voice is a primary source of action, especially in groups or settings with other members of dominant culture as it motivates others to educate themselves and holds them accountable (Carlson et al., 2019; Tatum, 1997). Within their spheres, allies must

question and challenge representation of voices throughout their lives to advocate for those excluded from access to places of authority (Carlson et al., 2019; Cormier, 2017; hooks, 2000). When allies counter oppressive systems, as the primary beneficiaries of societal power and privilege, the realities and experiences of the under-served community are validated and the influence and awareness of the movement is expanded (Casey & Ohler, 2012; Droogendyk et al., 2016; Tatum, 1997; Wiley & Dunne, 2018). Further, allies can utilize their group membership to create a barrier of privilege for protection of under-served communities (Carlson et al., 2019; Ghabra & Calafell, 2018).

Autonomy-Oriented Action

Allies must ensure that their support of the cause is displayed beyond conversations and throughout their conduct and everyday life (Brown, 2015; Cormier, 2017; Droogendyk et al., 2016). Allies must strive for intentional, actionable change that eliminates the conditions of oppressive systems and replaces them with structures that support the needs of all communities (Brown, 2015; hooks, 2000). To combat perpetuating harm through allyship action, allies should place emphasis on autonomy-oriented help that supports and empowers the solutions generated by the under-served community (Droogendyk et al., 2016). Allies that provide autonomy-oriented help are viewed positively, as they affirm the capacity and abilities of the under-served group (Cormier, 2017; Wiley & Dunne, 2018). Through action, participation, and inter-group support relationship and commitment are strengthened for transformative change and societal shifts (Brown, 2015; Casey & Ohler, 2012; Kluttz et al., 2020; La Macchia & Louis, 2016).

Intersectional Approaches

Intersectionality is described as the complexity of people, experience, and the world in group membership that demonstrates different levels and dimensions of identity (Carlson et al., 2019; La Macchia & Louis, 2016). People hold multiple memberships that challenge traditional dominant and under-served binaries to eliminate fixed positionalities based on singular identity factors (Carlson et al., 2019; La Macchia & Louis, 2016). Therefore, an individual is capable of being an oppressor and oppressed simultaneously due to their multiple identities and socially constructed roles in society (Casey & Ohler, 2012; Ghabra & Calafell, 2018). Intersectional allyship is open to difference and connects through effects of oppression (Wiley & Dunne, 2019). This creates community and allows progress to inter-group relationship and action for change and social progress (Ghabra & Calafell, 2018). Allies are encouraged to speak against injustice, utilizing an intersectional frame of reference, and rejecting singular narratives or roles for identity groups (Wiley & Dunne, 2018). When intersectional approaches are forgotten, identity groups become isolated in pursuit of combatting systems of oppression (Ghabra & Calafell, 2018; Sumerau et al., 2020). Genuine allyship must be rooted in the acknowledgement of the interdependent reality of life and sustainability (hooks, 2000).

Challenges of Allyship

Due to the privilege held by allies, they must enter movements with consideration of potential challenge and harm of their involvement for the impacted community (Brown, 2015; Droogendyk et al., 2016). While allies act out of good intention, the impacts can often lead to harm for the marginalized group and their social movements (Carlson et al., 2019; Droogendyk et al., 2016; Ghabra & Calafell, 2018). This section outlines the perceptions of allyship and

disparities between intention and impact through key themes of status and co-optation, power hierarchies, and fear and discomfort.

Status and Co-optation

Allyship is not a label that is claimed by members of dominant culture but that is given by under-served communities (Carlson et al., 2019; Cormier, 2017; Kluttz et al., 2020). However, it has become a self-proclaimed title to signal moral status and promote performative action that centres dominant culture and creates saviour identities for personal gain (Carlson et al., 2019; Cormier, 2017; Droogendyk et al., 2016; Sumerau et al., 2020). The nature of the allyship title generates an ideal of a finite destination and achievement that does not require further effort (Droogendyk et al., 2016; Kluttz et al., 2020). This title becomes a marker for those in dominant culture to self-identify as an exception from the dominant structures of oppression (Casey & Ohler, 2012; Kluttz et al., 2020; Sumerau et al., 2020).

While this title may create connection to movements through involvement, the continual distinction of groups is necessary and allies must not view themselves as symbolic members to avoid co-optation (Droogendyk et al., 2016; Sumerau et al., 2020; Wiley & Dunne, 2018). When movements are shifted to privileged groups, it silences and eliminates the experiences and realities of those outside of that group (Ghabra & Calafell, 2018). Therefore, visionaries that experience the oppression must be at the forefront of the restorative movement to display capability and representative leadership (hooks, 2000).

Power Hierarchies

Dependency-oriented help strengthens power inequalities as it views allies as being needed for success and the under-served group as unable to help themselves (Carlson et al., 2019; Wiley & Dunne, 2018). When they co-opt, dominate leadership, and offer unwanted advice in the movement, allies question the abilities and independence of the under-served group that is perceived as an admission of lower power or status (Droogendyk et al., 2016; Sumerau et al., 2020) Therefore, allies may oppose oppressive systems while simultaneously reenforcing that oppression (Sumerau et al., 2020; Wiley & Dunne, 2018). When these oppressive systems are reproduced in social movements, allies have the capability of de-mobilizing or sabotaging the movement's fight for equality (Ghabra & Calafell, 2018; Wiley & Dunne, 2018). Some separatist groups do not agree with allyship of those belonging to the dominant identity when combatting oppressive systems, as it leaves the oppressive hierarchies and power structures intact (Wiley & Dunne, 2018). As a result, allyship must look to centre under-served communities for effectiveness (Carlson et al., 2019; Kluttz et al., 2020; La Macchia & Louis, 2016). By centring other perspectives, allies become more aware of those missing from representation and existence of further marginalization (Ghabra & Calafell, 2018; hooks, 2000). In this nature, allyship should be co-creation and collaboration; a "with" not "for" strategy (Ghabra & Calafell, 2018).

Fear and Discomfort

Allies must become comfortable with the uncomfortable, as they are entering a space of vulnerability that requires ongoing learning, reflection, mistakes, and not having all of the answers (Carlson et al., 2019; Cormier, 2017). The fear and silence surrounding oppressive systems by dominant culture is due to a lack of experience in participation and impact of these

conversations (Tatum, 1997). Speaking against group norms generates fear through increased perceived risks and costs within personal significant relationships and potential for social rejection (Casey & Ohler, 2012). When members of the dominant group don't feel confident in their ability to intervene, they are likely to avoid intervention as the perceived risks and costs outweigh rewards and benefits (Casey & Ohler, 2012; Ghabra & Calafell, 2018). For allies to openly convey their inter-group support they must overcome anxiety associated with guilt, fear of appearing biased, and behavioural norms (Droogendyk et al., 2016). Allies must not allow their fear to create conditions to their allyship (Ghabra & Calafell, 2018). To combat these fears and discomforts, those within dominant culture should consider fighting and speaking for themselves, as they are also negatively impacted by the oppressive systems (Tatum, 1997).

Suggestions for Allyship

While the challenges and complexities of allyship are expressed, suggestions for effective, productive and accepted allyship are provided. These recommendations to overcome the harms of allyship are inter-group connection, daily and long-term commitment, and a posture of humility in practice. Such suggestions aim to expand current practices for the realization of the expectations of allyship.

Inter-Group Connection

Allyship is not permanent or fixed, but it is continually evolving as needs of allies from impacted communities are constantly shifting (Kluttz et al., 2020). Without cross-cultural dialogue in allyship, the methods and frames of each group are not fully explored or communicated (Droogendyk et al., 2016). This leaves gaps for frustration, miscommunication

and disconnect when collaborating on projects that are combatted by relationship formation, inclusion and belonging (Cormier, 2017; Ghabra & Calafell, 2018). When inter-group contact is positive, it challenges negative stereotypes between groups and supports relationship for collective action (Droogendyk et al., 2016). Therefore, a restorative approach to supporting under-served groups is central in building positive connections that avoid extractive practices and focus on the importance of under-served voices (Kluttz et al., 2020). Developing community is central to ongoing support and energy to strengthen motivation, provide accountability, and increase action throughout the change process (Casey & Ohler, 2012; Cormier, 2017; Tatum, 1997). These networks for change must renounce hate and division through a coalition of purpose, vision and hope for equality rooted in compassion and trust (Brown, 2015; Ghabra & Calafell, 2018; Kluttz et al., 2020).

Daily & Long-Term Commitment

It is at the individual, micro-level that the societal, macro-level norms and patterns are created (Carlson et al., 2019; Ghabra & Calafell, 2018; La Macchia & Louis, 2016). Therefore, allies should look to incorporate understandings of intersecting empowerment and disempowerment daily (Ghabra & Calafell, 2018). Allyship requires commitment that is continual and not conditional, to avoid reverting to complicity (Carlson et al., 2019; Cormier, 2017; Droogendyk et al., 2016). As commitment, consistency and confidence increase, allyship action and response become incorporated in everyday life (Casey & Ohler, 2012; La Macchia & Louis, 2016). Commitment is fundamental to allyship through self-awareness in behaviours, attitudes and actions - or lack thereof - to oppose oppressive systems. (Brown, 2015; Droogendyk et al., 2016; hooks, 2000). Allyship should be fluid and act as an aspiration for

motivation and ongoing engagement on a journey without an arrival point (Carlson et al., 2019). An effective mindset is to "show up anyway" and learning to foster space for unpredictable evolving and ongoing work (Kluttz et al., 2020).

Humility

When allies are open to failure, the potential of allyship is conceptualized (Carlson et al., 2019; Ghabra & Calafell, 2018). The allyship journey begins by claiming responsibility of mistakes, understanding impacts, and learning to avoid harm in the future (Ghabra & Calafell, 2018). A willingness to make mistakes and recognize them for improvement is necessary as the vulnerability foster deeper relationships (Cormier, 2017; Ghabra & Calafell, 2018; Kluttz et al., 2020). Additionally, openness to feedback is significant, but it is only effective when those receiving it take responsibility, apologize for harm done, and learn (Carlson et al., 2019; Cormier, 2017). Through a posture of humility, harmonious perceptions of allies are founded through trust, loyalty and attentive concern in support of non-dominant group members and their movement (Brown, 2015).

Conclusion

An evaluation of contemporary discussions on allyship unveil numerous topics of consideration for effectiveness in practice. Allyship literature outlines expectations of education and acknowledgement, speaking out, autonomy-oriented action, and intersectional approaches. While these are the expected behaviours, challenges, and discrepancies between intentions and impacts of allies are unveiled through status and co-optation, power hierarchies, and fear and discomfort. Finally, suggestions to reconcile and avoid harms in allyship outline necessities of

inter-group connection, daily and long-term commitment, and a posture of humility. With these considerations in mind, allyship can be effective and positively contribute to social movements that dismantle oppressive systems and support the cause of under-served communities.

INTERVENTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Intervention and development under the guise of humanitarian aid are largescale actors in global governance, emergency response, and international status and power. These campaigns are traditionally viewed as honourable and a display of goodwill. However, emerging discourse and the unveiling of colonial ties and legacies are bringing light to diverging perspectives on this work. Foundational and emerging literature in intervention, development, and human rights are utilized to inform discussion of aspirations, challenges, and recommendations in past, present, and future praxis.

Intervention

Humanitarian intervention is action across national borders to eliminate human suffering and human rights violations when domestic authorities are unable or unwilling to act (Moore, 2007). Intervention highlights humanitarian action and emergency support that is short-term in the initial stages of change processes to address conflict (Dueck-Read, 2016; Jeong, 2005). This is typically carried out by powerful and rich states in the West that impose and limit processes to their interests and preferences that can restrict peace and justice (Pilisuk et al., 2015; Richmond, 2019). Intervention should aim for neutrality to maintain and control conflict as “taking sides” and engaging with the conflict creates further conflict (Moore, 2007). A lack of agreed-upon guidelines or standards for intervention is recognized as a gap in policy and practice (Moore,

2007). Therefore, to save and protect lives, intervention must be intertwined with development to build capacity and improve livelihood (Dueck-Read, 2016; Escobar, 1995; Moore, 2007).

Development

Development occurs following the end of physical violence when the focus is on rebuilding and preparing for future (Dueck-Read, 2016; Jeong, 2005). Development is described as an aspect of a larger peacebuilding process with a long-term commitment to reconstruction and capacity-building (Jeong, 2005; Lederach, 1995). Development is a space where representation, identities, and violence are constructed and inseparable from peace and security for full realization (Escobar, 1995; Moore, 2007; Pilisuk et al., 2015). Development predominantly relies on a singular system of knowledge that derives from Western thinking and disqualifies all others (Escobar, 1995). Economic and political development typically utilize GDP and transformation in market or financial infrastructure growth to gauge success (Donnelly, 2013).

Human development has been defined as the expansion of choice and opportunity that involves critical thought, idea generation and design, creation and preparation, observation, information gathering, analysis, and the distribution and reporting of results (Donnelly, 2013; Pilisuk et al., 2015). Additionally, development must incorporate fluidity, relationality, connection, and networks to connect with peace, global justice, and human rights (Escobar, 1995; Lederach, 1995; Richmond, 2019). Development is an individualized process with numerous strategies, forced into standardized methods (Scott, 1998).

Aspirations

Intervention and development are an intersection of moral and political realms, where the political is meant to serve, not dominate, the moral (Moore, 2007). This section presents the positive impacts and investments that are desired through intervention and development processes. Discourses of social movement and action, human rights implementation, and local and grassroots movements are explored. The presented intervention and development processes are utilized to demonstrate ethical and desired intentions for policy and practice.

Social Movement & Action

Social action is facilitated by the sharing of knowledge and the expansion of global networks that empower action through collective identity (Dueck-Read, 2016; Rodriguez, 2004). When historical windows of opportunity facilitate social change, many perspectives and groups unite and participate in structural processes for transformation (Rodriguez, 2004). Mobilization in this regard focus on social action and participation to hold the international community and nation states accountable (Richmond, 2019; Rodriguez, 2004). Social action is a critical element to the generation, development, and implementation of human rights (Donnelly, 2013; Dueck-Read, 2016; Rodriguez, 2004). Thus, global partnerships that facilitate this movement are paramount when international approaches and external actors are present (Donnelly, 2013; Richmond, 2019; Rodriguez, 2004).

Human Rights Implementation

State legitimacy is critiqued and considered at risk if development and human rights are not pursued as they are considered essential for building global governance and justice

(Donnelly, 2013; Richmond, 2019; Scott, 1998). As human rights connect to transformation and justice, they expand and are grounded at the centre of order, justice, and peace (Jeong, 2005; Richmond, 2019). Human rights systems can support balances of progress, autonomy, intervention, and power across local and global contexts (Donnelly, 2013; Richmond, 2019). Human rights aim to provide order to markets and democracy by creating healthy limits to their practices (Donnelly, 2013). Implementation of human rights in liberal frameworks are connected to democracy, capitalism, and the rule of law, however, there is risk of politics overtaking ethics in their implementation (Richmond, 2019; Rodriguez, 2004). Therefore, promotion of individual empowerment in human rights practice is essential to limit governments (Donnelly, 2013). This is fundamentally contradictory to campaigns of global capitalism and governance by ensuring sovereignty does not violate basic rights (Donnelly, 2013; Richmond, 2019).

Implementation of human rights instill accountability and transparency for national development and economic growth, especially as they expand to maintain relevance (Donnelly, 2013; Richmond, 2019). Development should seek to reduce, prevent, and transform structural violence to support recovery from violence to freedom (Dueck-Read, 2016; Pilisuk et al., 2015; Rodriguez, 2004). Freedom moves beyond justice and equality to create, venture, and construct new realities, identities, and statuses that are negotiated and scrutinized (Escobar, 1995; Freire, 1970; Rodriguez, 2004). For true liberation and transformation to be realized, local communities must be in close proximity to development processes with life-long action and reflection (Freire, 1970; Richmond, 2019; Sen, 2009).

Local and Grassroots Involvement

When governance is distant and/or elite, the localized and context-specific issues are missed, resulting in the implementation of inappropriate strategies (Escobar, 1995; Pilisuk et al., 2015; Richmond, 2019). Local participation, culture, and voice are often a missing key in current responses to injustice that cause standardization, and do not account for the presence of diverse voices (Dueck-Read, 2016; Lederach, 1995; Pilisuk et al., 2015). Bottom-up approaches are utilized to facilitate horizontal and localized connections for development that improve results of productivity and sustainability (Bush, 2002; Moore, 2007; Pilisuk et al., 2015; Richmond, 2019). Local communities have greater dedication to change as their livelihood is directly impacted (Freire, 1970). Therefore, true development must transform social, economic, and cultural realms of society that adapts to, and reflects the local context (Escobar, 1995; Scott, 1998). Local knowledge of environment, political, and economic standing are important to inform praxis and support resolution (Lederach, 1995; Moore, 2007; Scott, 1998). Local populations have the ability to define justice, fairness, and act in accordance with these conceptions that should be integrated into evaluation processes (Pilisuk et al., 2015; Sen, 2009). Respecting voice and healing can provide space that is empowering to those impacted, and fosters greater ownership (Lederach, 1995; Pilisuk et al., 2015).

Building local capacity is necessary in intervention to reduce external force and presence that allows for indigenous empowerment to lead development and rebuilding strategies (Escobar, 1995; Lederach, 1995; Moore, 2007). Assessment of local capacities and efforts must be recognized and integrated into planning to appropriately allocate international resources that will support and work in tandem with local actors (Jeong, 2005; Moore, 2007; Scott, 1998). Context-

specific responses to conflict promote creativity, autonomy, renegotiations, and relationships that are cultivated through appropriate implementation (Dueck-Read, 2016; Escobar, 1995; Lederach, 1995; Pilisuk et al., 2015). This prioritizes local ownership, autonomy, and accountability in the transformation process that foster responsibility, trust, voice, and confidence to address conflict (Freire, 1970; Moore, 2007; Pilisuk et al., 2015; Sen, 2009). Development processes should aim to cultivate empowerment and leadership among young generations to rise up, and sustain the efforts (Pilisuk et al., 2015).

Challenges

While there are many positive aspirations and intentions for intervention and development, these objectives are not always congruent with the impacts and results of praxis. Current practices typically follow liberal peace models that involve legitimacy and long-term processes; power, poverty, and access; globalization and capitalism; and democracy. These themes of praxis are unpacked to unveil discrepancies between intervention and development aspirations and challenges to identify areas for improvement.

Legitimacy & Long-term Processes

Development is defined by legitimacy and prosperity (Donnelly, 2013). Implementation of intervention strategies are often negatively impacted by lack of attention and priority (Moore, 2017). Considerations of adequate reasonings for intervention serve an ongoing debate as legitimate authority, intent, and “just cause” are continually debated (Donnelly, 2013; Moore, 2007). International engagement brings legitimacy to processes; however, it typically slows and elongates them (Richmond, 2019). Intervention is critiqued for its lengthened process that do not

facilitate prompt and decisive response or action (Moore, 2007). Current intervention is experiencing largescale disparities between decision-making authority actors, and those who implement and ensure long-term action success (Jeong, 2005; Moore, 2007). Incremental and long-term planning can be utilized to reduce skepticism and provide responsible, sustainable, and adequate projections for investment that avoid dependency (Donnelly, 2013; Moore, 2007; Pilisuk et al., 2015).

Power, Poverty and Access

Development should aim to spread power justly across identity groups, especially as distinctions of superiority arise among dominant identity groups (Bush, 2002; Dueck-Read, 2016). However, development is often associated with desires and productions of economy, violence, and difference (Escobar, 1995). Those in the dominant groups see their privilege as an inalienable right that they have earned (Freire, 1970). Equal opportunity and greater access to those in society's lowest places should be utilized to reverse social and economic inequalities (Rodriguez, 2004; Sen, 2009). Currently, knowledge is conceptualized and dispersed to those holding leadership and power positions, which typically excludes the grassroots perspectives (Dueck-Read, 2016). This disparity in access to technology creates an additional layer and extension of current inequities (Bush, 2002; Rodriguez, 2004).

Humanitarian labels in intervention are utilized to justify use of power and serving state interest (Moore, 2007). Narratives of difference allow dominant members to be perceived and judged as individuals, whereas under-served members are viewed collectively to represent the entire group (Bush, 2002). When this power goes unchecked, corruption and inequality follow (Sen, 2009). This manifestation of inaccessibility breeds imbalances and hierarchies of power,

whereas balanced power and agency across networks promotes peace and justice (Richmond, 2019; Scott, 1998). When knowledge hierarchies are removed in learning environments co-investigators emerge, and dialogue takes place (Freire, 1970).

International Hierarchies & Imposition

Humanitarian aid can be manipulated by international actors for their state interests even without cultural or contextual knowledge of the setting (Dueck-Reed, 2016; Moore, 2007). International involvement in intervention and development can introduce unintended conflict and dependency on external actors for progress and rebuilding (Bush, 2002; Jeong, 2005; Scott, 1998). This imposed response by external actors continues and mirrors colonial practices through ongoing patterns of power, domination, and uniformity (Dueck-Read, 2016; Scott, 1998). Pre-existing methods of domination do not facilitate effective humanization or transformation processes (Freire, 1970). Such imposition requires an unlearning process where local knowledge is devalued, and re-education creates new mindsets and understanding (Scott, 1998).

When objectives are imposed, those impacted become an object to be conquered and the model of humanity becomes oppression (Freire, 1970; Sen, 2009). Ignorance hinders this intervention as decision making is not rooted in local understanding that increase the likelihood of success and strategic mobilization (Moore, 2007). When intervention is primarily focused on international actors and control, internal capacity-building is forgotten, and citizens are left feeling inept and hopeless (Moore, 2007; Pilisuk et al., 2015).

Globalization and Capitalism

Universal methodologies enforce a belief of an objective reality that can be captured by standardization and do not account for differences (Escobar, 1995; Scott, 1998). Ideals of development derive from replication of urbanization, industrialization, and modern cultural values through capital, technology, and science under the branding of globalization (Escobar, 1995; Scott, 1998). The expansion of globalization in the Global South is perceived as a bridge to join the Global North that creates largescale change through increased democracy, rule of law, and economic distribution (Escobar, 1995; Rodriguez, 2004). However, it has resulted in the exacerbation of inequality and economic disparities that introduce power relations, market systems, and production (Escobar, 1995; Scott, 1998). Such systems uphold capitalism as essential for democratic states and the realization of human rights (Pilisuk et al., 2015; Rodriguez, 2004).

Development should imply economic increase for the state, often by means of globalization and capitalism, however, this growth is not equally beneficial across the population (Donnelly, 2013; Escobar, 1995; Rodriguez, 2004). In practice, development tends to hold primary focus on financial and economic increase that leaves rehabilitation and social development to the sidelines (Donnelly, 2013; Moore, 2007). This is an expression of elitism and hubris, where the developers' "rationalities" are implemented over all others, often resulting in failure and unequal power systems (Dueck-Read, 2016; Scott, 1998). Consumerism claims that accumulating more is worth imposing cost or oppression on others (Donnelly, 2013; Escobar, 1995; Freire, 1970). Global capitalism limits governance capacity to reform and intervene for justice and equality (Jeong, 2005; Richmond, 2019). Capitalism and materialism create mindsets where all things or beings encountered become potential possessions, and those at the top are

defined by what they accumulate (Freire, 1970). Ensuing economic disparities increased and perpetuated by capitalism create a context with conditions that are not conducive to the achievement of human rights (Donnelly, 2013; Rodriguez, 2004). As capitalism continues to be imposed and enforced for political agendas, the poor will continue to bear the greatest injustice, exploitation, and vulnerabilities (Dueck-Read, 2016; Rodriguez, 2004; Scott, 1998).

Democracy

Development is typically realized in a liberal approach with focus on state-building and democracy, as it is believed democratic countries will not enter into war with one another (Dueck-Read, 2016). Systems built on democracy are considered more conducive to social movements than authoritative regimes, thus creating a spurious relationship with human rights (Rodriguez, 2004). Democracy encourages political enthusiasm and accountability as counter parties are present that strengthen plurality and increase sources of voice and representation (Donnelly, 2013; Sen, 2009). It expresses the determination of citizens in matters of political, social, and economic life (Donnelly, 2013).

On the other hand, democracy is critiqued for preparing populations for Western ideals and methodologies, and only supporting basic rights when not conflicting with sovereign interest (Donnelly, 2013; Dueck-Read, 2016). Therefore, institutions should not be trusted as manifestations of justice or considered the totality of justice and equality (Sen, 2009). Institutions considered to be just must be evaluated as they are often contributing to or continuing oppression, especially as elites see benefit in maintaining systems of inequality (Dueck-Read, 2016; Sen, 2009). Constant assessment is necessary to identify and combat the unreliability, imperfections, and harmful impacts of institutions (Sen, 2009).

Recommendations

Foundational review of the current challenges in the creation and implementation of intervention and development unveils gaps or downfalls in these processes. As a result, researchers and conceptualizers in the field provide emerging lenses and key mindsets necessary to adequately comply with "do no harm" doctrines and field intentions (Pilisuk et al., 2015). These recommendations include identifying and addressing root causes of conflict, restorative praxis and relationship building, dialogue and openness, and accountability and sustainability.

Identifying & Addressing Root Causes of Conflict

Ethical praxis include hope, focus on root causes and systems that create the problem, context-specific knowledge, inclusion of impacted voice, and local autonomy (Dueck-Read, 2016; Escobar, 1995; Moore, 2007; Pilisuk et al., 2015). Knowledge is a key tool that fuels action and participation; and consequently, isolation of conflict removes causal factors and likely implications to deflect rage from structures (Donnelly, 2013; Freire, 1970; Lederach, 1995). Patterns and causes of inequality are major contributors for identifying strategic goals and actions to transform situations (Pilisuk et al., 2015). Therefore, objective truths must be deconstructed in pursuit of meta-narratives that root systems of oppression and social constructs of what is real, important, and "true" (Lederach, 1995; Pilisuk et al., 2015). Lived experience and storytelling unveil the manifestations and conceptions of oppression, as well as key needs for communal and successful healing and transformation (Freire, 1970; Pilisuk et al., 2015). Root causes of oppression must be critically assessed to transform the situation and move to a fuller

humanity (Freire, 1970; Sen, 2009). As humanity is centred, dehumanization and injustices are identified and can be addressed (Freire, 1970).

Restorative Praxis & Relationship

Conflict is not an event but a network of interconnecting relationships (Lederach, 1995). Ubuntu believes every existence is evidence of humanity's interconnectedness, and ethical praxis must refute ideals of humans being lost, unworthy of change, or without potential for good (Pilisuk et al., 2015). Freedom and equality require cooperation and collaboration with increased inclusion and diverse perspectives in decision making, increase engagement and critical problem solving (Moore, 2007; Sen, 2009). Thus, restorative praxis should be utilized to address and eliminate mistrust, and cultivate relationships (Freire, 1970; Jeong, 2005). Peacebuilding requires ongoing and active strategies that build infrastructure and reduce violence for the restoration of relationship, building trust, the acquisition of justice, and the realization of just structures (Dueck-Read, 2016; Freire, 1970; Lederach, 1995). Morality and ethical practices are aligned with teachings of non-violence, and collaboration in diverse environments to enact resilience and protection (Sen, 2009; Scott, 1998). Collaboration reconciles groups to facilitate co-learning environments that support the development of knowledge through reflection and action (Freire, 1970; Lederach, 1995). As collaboration deepens, trusting relationships are sustained, stronger, and more successful for longer time periods (Sen, 2009). This joint responsibility facilitates growth for all, expansion of processes, and enacts greater dynamics of justice, sustainability and identity (Freire, 1970; Richmond, 2019). These constructive relationships require openness and commitment to flourish (Freire, 1970).

Dialogue & Openness

Openness is required by practitioners to evaluate their biases, position, and preconceptions to utilize all available spheres of interest in countering and dismantling systems of oppression (Bush, 2002; Pilisuk et al., 2015). Flexibility in intervention increases ethics due to openness and inclusion of indigenous voices to combat silencing (Freire, 1970; Pilisuk et al., 2015). Stories invite collaboration, interaction, and empowerment (Lederach, 1995). This empowerment increases participation, voice, and decision-making capabilities that create a foundation of courage, commitment, and authentic dialogue (Donnelly, 2013; Freire, 1970; Pilisuk et al., 2015). Humility and humanity of all involved parties are required to facilitate authentic transformation (Freire, 1970). Cooperation highlights development through interaction that cultivates a sense of belonging, purpose, and meaning (Donnelly, 2013). Dialogue allows for order to be changed and reconstructed to question existing structures in pursuit of collective action and truth (Escobar, 1995; Freire, 1970; Lederach, 1995). Therefore, discourse must move beyond differences of opinion or perception to the root causes of these divergences and initiate action (Bush, 2002; Escobar, 1995). Dialogue and commitment must lead and guide praxis to ground collaboration (Freire, 1970).

Accountability and Sustainability

Humility, dialogue, commitment, and restoration of truth and relationships promote sustainability (Freire, 1970; Lederach, 1995). Sustainability involves forward thinking that solves current conflict without compromising or creating new conflict for future generations (Donnelly, 2013; Richmond, 2019). Zealousness often initiates change processes with mindsets

of conflict eradication that can be lost as long-term processes follow (Escobar, 1995). Therefore, effective intervention requires commitment, patience, and perseverance as processes are long and burn out is evident among practitioners in the field (Moore, 2007; Pilisuk et al., 2015).

Trust is founded on integrity in word, action, and impact (Freire, 1970). Practitioners hold an obligation to "do no harm" and ensure the appropriate use of their knowledge (Pilisuk et al., 2015). When leaders and citizens are informed and do not speak against injustice, they are complicit and join those that act immorally (Rodriguez, 2004; Scott, 1998). The "do no harm" doctrine requires reflection of wider and unintended repercussions that can be brought upon by praxis and cause harm (Pilisuk et al., 2015; Richmond, 2019). Therefore, ethics must be continually evaluated, challenged, and raised further for ongoing appropriateness and success (Moore, 2007; Pilisuk et al., 2015).

Conclusion

By considering multiple perspectives and interpretations of foundational and contemporary literature, various conclusions in intervention and development are drawn. First, there are aspirational and desired outcomes that hope to be realized through practice. These outcomes include social movements and action, the implementation of human rights, and local or grassroot engagement. Next, the challenges and typical strategies of implementation discussed are summarised that include legitimacy and long-term processes; power, poverty, and access; globalization and capitalism; and democracy. Finally, recommendations for improvement and future practice are highlighted through topics of identifying and addressing root causes of conflict, restorative praxis and relationships, dialogue and openness, and accountability and sustainability. This discourse aims to provide insight into current harm and negative impacts

occurring through intervention and development, while suggesting strategies to actualize affirmative intentions and constructive, positive impacts throughout these change processes.

CONCLUSION

Ethical inter-group campaigns to dismantle systems of oppression are not achieved through a singular model or checklist of tasks for success. True collaboration with impacted communities and localized methods require context-specific and evolving responses to transformation for effectiveness, appropriateness and local ownership. Three overarching themes emerge from discussions in both allyship, and intervention and development to inform ethical cross-cultural collaboration: autonomy-oriented transformation, restorative approaches, and daily immersive and lifelong commitment. Incorporating these themes support justice, acknowledgement and deconstruction of oppressive systems, and cross-cultural collaboration.

Autonomy-Oriented Transformation

Contrary to a solution-oriented approach, an autonomy-oriented approach places emphasis on the role and impact of individuals, their dignity, and their capacity (Freire, 1970; hooks, 2000). This encourages empowerment that expands potential and possibilities for transformation (Lederach, 1995). Space for autonomy empowers the discovery of self and affirms the immense power and resource existing in the impacted community (Freire, 1970; Wiley & Dunne, 2018). This encompasses intersectionality, localized and grassroots involvement, social movement and action, and accountability and sustainability that are outlined in the expectations and suggestions for ethical practice. With an orientation of autonomy, action

focuses on direct deliverables that foster change outside of frames and methods of dominant culture that openly engage with new environments (Cormier, 2017).

Empowerment facilitates the sustainability and ownership of transformation (Freire, 1970; Lederach, 1995). When approaches do not consider or include the local populations, they are unable to exercise autonomy over their circumstances or life (Moore, 2007). As support and collaboration flow from recognition and faith in impacted communities, social movements and action are accountable to and powered by those with the greatest understanding of conflict impacts (Droogendyk et al., 2016; Richmond, 2019). This accountability supports efforts of inter-group transformation as solidarity, non-judgement, respect and genuine interest are cultivated due to power sharing and decentralization of control (Brown, 2015; Carlson et al., 2019). This de-centres external and dominant narratives to ensure focus on the injustices occurring and the resulting impacts (Wiley & Dunne, 2018). Thus, as social movements and actions arise to eliminate oppression, the structures introduced are informed by and support the needs of the diverse needs of all communities involved (hooks, 2000).

Restorative Approach

Restorative approaches encapsulate numerous expectations and recommendations outlined throughout discourse of allyship, and intervention and development. These include addressing root causes of conflict, inter-group connection, dialogue and openness, and humility. As these are demonstrated, like-minded individuals and visions create a network and source of courage to sustain the movement and build unity (Freire, 1970; Tatum, 1997). This cultivates creative opportunities for interdisciplinary and intercultural relationships (Pilisuk et al., 2015).

Right relationship and connection must be at the centre of an authentic restorative approach. Before entering relationship, one must locate themself to cultivate shared understanding for relationship and entering into partnership (Cormier, 2017). Hence, praxis must focus on building trust and coalition where there has previously been distrust and division. Oftentimes, relationship is a per-cursor to dominant member involvement in social movements to establish commitment and investment in the partnership and transformation (Brown, 2015; Cormier, 2017). The degree of responsibility to intervene parallels with the degree of association and connection seen throughout life (Casey & Ohler, 2012). As inter-group connection is mended, the broken relationships that root the conflict are revealed (Pilisuk et al., 2015). Positive experiences between groups inspire the growth of supportive behaviours, collective action and inter-group engagement (Droogendyk et al., 2016). From this foundation of connection, support is established to maintain momentum and direct it forward (Cormier, 2017).

Transformation processes rooted in restorative processes must involve openness to the perspectives and inclusion of others. This prepares those involved to listen to one another and consider the perspectives and experiences of others in transformation (Cormier, 2017). Critical to this is the skill and practice of dialogue (Kluttz et al., 2020). By continually participating in dialogue, the knowledge and worth of relationship expand to create a space conducive to growth (Tatum, 1997). Humility is necessary, as it requires that you put aside assumptions and plans to listen and value the contribution of others. It recognizes humanity, inter-connectedness and continuous interaction (Freire, 1970). When openness, dialogue and humility are coupled, improvements are implemented for enhancement and further conflict is avoided (Ghabra & Calafell, 2018).

Daily Immersion and Lifelong Commitment

The realization of justice and transformation require involvement in all spheres of life and influence. It cannot be compartmentalized or isolated but should become a lens for seeing and interacting with the world that is incorporated into all routines and aspects of life (Brown, 2015). Transformation is not limited to location or work life but must impact all areas through ongoing and consistent commitment, without a point of arrival (Cormier, 2017). It highlights the immense impact of intentional, compounding and consistent action in facilitating transformation. Isaiah 1:17 (ESV) proposes that conflict and injustice be combatted routinely by learning to do good, seeking justice, correcting oppression, bringing justice, and speaking up for the cause. The aspirations and suggestions outlined throughout analysis of allyship, and intervention and development mirror these sentiments. This frame provides a reminder and outline of requirements to inform ethical practices and reduce harm.

First, learning to do good requires dedicating oneself to conflict transformation through lifelong learning and listening (Carlson et al., 2019). To begin conversations of injustice and conflict, it is necessary to learn about the realities of oppressive systems and the need for transformation (Bush, 2002). This requires education outside of the dominant narrative and culture that silences and erases contradictory or differing narratives (Freire, 1970; Pilisuk et al., 2015). Second, as the educational journey continues, a new foundation to seek justice is created. Seeking justice requires the evaluation of existing systems to unveil areas of prejudice, injustice and biases that do not align with the goals and vision of transformation (Carlson et al., 2019). Thus, those incorporating daily immersion and lifelong commitment must search for communities, networks and leaders that enact and embody justice to mentor, support and empower pursuits of transformation (hooks, 2000).

Third, in order to correct oppression, it must first be identified and acknowledged. As oppression is recognized the socialization and norms rooted in it can be unlearned and challenged (Cormier, 2017). Further, personal correction and evaluation is required, and willingness to accept feedback is integral to the process of correction (Pilisuk et al., 2015). Next, to bring justice, the foundations developed require that it be followed by action (Carlson et al, 2019). This active participation in opposing, deconstructing and transforming oppression must be instilled and engrained in daily and long-term actions (Brown, 2015; Freire, 1970). Finally, it is critical to speak up. All individuals hold their own perspectives, experiences and identities that contribute to their unique position and sphere of influence (hooks, 2000). Dominant members of society hold "in-group" status that provide access typically not available to campaigns that dismantle systems of oppression and centre the experience of impacted communities (Carlson et al., 2019; Casey & Ohler, 2012; Droogendyk et al., 2016). Therefore, voice holds great power as it enables direct response to vocally address injustice and have difficult conversations with compassion (Brown, 2015; Wiley & Dunne, 2018).

Final Thoughts

Themes of autonomy-oriented transformation, restorative approaches, and daily immersive and lifelong commitment provide overarching frames to inform allyship, and intervention and development. The evolving nature and the divergent needs of transformation, point to focusing upon lenses and approaches to advocacy, as opposed to prescribed checklists or models (Moore, 2007). Intersecting interests and understandings within these fields reaffirm the need to bridge them to support ethical practice in cross-cultural efforts. This has been displayed through evaluation of allyship, and intervention and development by reviewing the expectations,

challenges and suggestions for improvement in these fields. When transformation is rooted in these overarching recommendations, cross-cultural partnerships and transformation can be ethical, effective and constructive.

REFERENCES

Boersema, D. (2011). *Philosophy of Human Rights: Theory and Practice.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Boler, M. & Zembylas, M. (2003). Discomforting Truths: The Emotional Terrain of Understanding Difference. *Pedagogies of difference: rethinking education for social change,* 116-139. New York: Routledge.

Broberg, M. & Sano, H. (2018). Strengths and weaknesses in a human-rights based approach to international development – an analysis of a rights-based approach to development assistance based on practical experiences. *International Journal of Human Rights, 22*(5), 664-680. doi: 10.1080/13642987.2017.1408591

Brown, K. T. (2015). Perceiving Allies from the Perspective of Non-Dominant Group Comparisons to Friends and Activists. *Current Psychology, 34*, 713-722. Springer. doi: 10.1007/s12144-014-9284-8

Bush, M.E.L. (2002). Breaking the Code of Good Intentions. *Souls, 4*(4), 25-44. doi: 10.1080/10999940216615

Carlson, J., Leek, C., Casey, E., Tolman, R. & Allen, C. (2019). What's in a Name? A Synthesis of "Allyship" Elements from Academic and Activist Literature. *Journal of Family Violence.* Springer. doi: 10.1007/s10896-019-00073-z

Casey, E. A. & Ohler, K. (2012). Being a Positive Bystander: Male Antiviolence Allies' Experiences "Stepping Up." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 27*(1), 62-83. Sage. doi: 10.1177/0886260511416479

Cormier, S. (2017). *Walk With Me: Sharing Space Along the Path.* M.A. Thesis. University of Manitoba.

Donnelly, J. (2013). *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice* (3rd ed.). New York: Cornell University Press.

Droogendyk, L., Wright, S. C., Lubensky, M. & Louis, W. R. (2016). Acting in Solidarity: Cross-Group Contact between Disadvantaged Group Members and Advantaged Group Allies. *Journal of Social Issues, 72* (2). doi: 10.1111/josi/12168

Dueck-Read, J. (2016). *Transnational activism: Intersectional identities and peacebuilding in the border justice movement.* PhD Thesis. University of Manitoba.

Escobar, A. (1995). *Encountering development: the making and unmaking of the Third World.* Princeton University Press.

Freire, P. (2017). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* New York: Bloomsbury Publishing Inc. (Original work published in 1970).

Ghabra, H. & Calafell, B. M. (2018). From failure and allyship to feminist solidarities: negotiating our privileges and oppressions across borders. *Text and Performance Quarterly, 38*(1), 38-54. Routledge. doi: 10.1080/10462937.2018.1457173

Gillborn, D. (2015). Intersectionality, Critical Race Theory, and the Primacy of Racism: Race, Class, Gender, and Disability in Education. *Qualitative Inquiry, 21*(3), 277-287. Sage Publishing. doi: 10.1177/1077800414557827

hooks, b. (2000). *Where We Stand: Class Matters.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203905104.

Jeong, H. (2005). *Peacebuilding in Postconflict Societies: Strategy & Process.* Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Kluttz, J., Walker, J. & Walter, P. (2019). Unsettling allyship, unlearning and learning towards decolonising solidarity. *Studies in the Education of Adults, 52*(1), 49-66. Informa UK Limited. doi: 10.1080/02660830.2019.1654591

La Macchia, S. T. & Louis, W. R. (2016). Crowd Behaviour and Collective Action. In Mckeown, S., Haji, R. & Ferguson, N. (Eds.), *Peace Psychology Book Series. Understanding peace and conflict through social identity theory: Contemporary global perspectives,* 89-104. Springer International Publishing. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-29869-6_6

Lederach, J.P. (1995). *Preparing for peace: conflict transformation across cultures.* Syracuse University Press.

Lorde, A. (1984) Age, Race, Class, and Sex: Women Redefining Difference. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches.* New York: Ten Speed Press.

Moore, J. (2007). Deciding Humanitarian Intervention. *Social Research: An International Quarterly, 74*(1), 169-200. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Park, B., Murdie, A. & Davis, D. R. (2019). The (co)evolution of human rights advocacy: Understanding human rights issue emergence over time. *Cooperation and Conflict, 54*(3), 313-334. Doi: 10.1177/0010836718808315

Pilisuk, M., Anderson-Hinn & Pellegrini, G. (2015). Ethical Objectives and Values in Peace Psychology and Social Justice Research. In *Methodologies in Peace Psychology, 26*(1), 139-157. Springer International Publishing AG. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-18395-4

Richmond O. (2019). Human rights and the development of a twenty-first century peace architecture: unintended consequences? *Australian Journal of International Affairs, 73*(1), 45-63. Routledge. doi: 10.1080/10357718.2018.1557106

Rodriguez, H. (2004). A “Long Walk to Freedom” and Democracy: Human Rights, Globalization, and Social Injustice. *Social Forces, 83*(1), 391-412. The University of North Carolina Press.

Sacks, M.A. & Lindholm, M. (2002). A Room Without a View: Social Distance and the Structuring of Privileged Identity. *Working Through Whiteness: International Perspectives* (Levine-Rasky, C., Ed.). Albany: University of New York Press.

Saguy, T., Dovidio, J.F. & Pratto, F. (2008). Beyond Contact: Intergroup Contact in the Context of Power Relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 43*(2), 432-445. Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc. doi: 10.1177/0146167207311200

Scott, J.C. (2020). *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed.* Connecticut: Yale University Press. (Original work published in 1998).

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom.* New York: Anchor Books.

Sen, A. (2009). *The Idea of Justice.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sumerau, J. E., Forbes, T. D., Grollman, E. A., & Mathers, L. A. (2020). Constructing Allyship and the Persistence of Inequality. *Social Problems.* doi: 10.1093/socpro/spaa003

Tatum, B. D. (2017). *Why Are All the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria.* New *Cafeteria.* New York: Basic Books. (Original work published in 1997).

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 183 UNTS 1948, art 1-2 (entered into force 10 December 1948) [UDHR].

Walton, R., Moore, K. R. & Jones, N. N. (2019). Oppression. *Technical Communication After the Social Justice Turn: Building Coalitions for Action,* 17-31. New York: Routledge.

Wiley, S. & Dunne, C. (2018). *Comrades in the Struggle? Feminist Women Prefer Male Allies Who Offer Autonomy - not Dependency-Oriented Help.* Springer. doi: 10.1007/s11199-018-0970-0

Wolff, S. (2006). *Ethnic Conflict: A Global Perspective.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.