



MINISTERSTVO ŠKOLSTVÍ,
MLÁDEŽE A TĚLOVÝCHOVY



OP Vzdělávání
pro konkurenceschopnost



INVESTICE DO ROZVOJE VZDĚLÁVÁNÍ

NGOS AND ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT

BEBBINGTON, A.J.; Hickley, S.; Mitlin, D. C. (ed.) (2008) in:
**Can NGOs Make a Difference? The Challenge
of Development Alternative**, London: Zed Books.

CAN NGOS MAKE A DIFFERENCE?

- ◉ Bebbington et al.
- ◉ Cowen and Shenton (1996) *Doctrines of Development*
- ◉ Distinction between **development as an immanent and unintentional process** (development of capitalism)
- ◉ And intentional policies
- ◉ Difference – small and big D - Development

SMALL 'D' DEVELOPMENT

- ◉ Hart(2001:650) geographically uneven, profoundly contradictory set of processes underlying capitalist development
- ◉ What is the impact of globalization on on inequality and social stratification?

DEVELOPMENT (BIG D)

- ⊙ 'project of intervention in the third world – that emerged in the context of decolonization and the cold war
- ⊙ Mutual relationships but non-deterministic

BIG D AND SMALL D DEVELOPMENT

- ⊙ Offers a means of clarifying the relationship between development policy and development practice
- ⊙ Diverse impact for different social groups (cf Bauman, Globalization)
- ⊙ And underlying process of uneven development that create exclusions and inequality for many and enhanced opportunities for others.

ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT - ALTERNATIVES TO BIG D DEVELOPMENT

- ⊙ Alternatives – cf alternative ways of arranging microfinance, project planning, services delivery
- ⊙ Eg **alternative ways of intervening**
- ⊙ Alternatives can be conceived in relation to the underlying process of capitalist development (little development)
- ⊙ emphasis is on alternative ways of organizing the economy, politics and social relationships in a society

REFORMIST VS RADICAL CHANGES

- ◉ **Remormist** – partial, intervention-specific,
- ◉ **Radical** – systemic alternatives
- ◉ Warning of too sharp distinction – NGOs can forge between apparently technocratic interventions (service delivery) and broader transformations
- ◉ Dissapointments Bebbington et al. – tendency to **indentify more readily with alternative forms of intervetions than with more systemic changes**
- ◉ Strong grounds for reversing this trend.

TRIPARTITE DIVISION

- ⊙ State, market and civil society
- ⊙ Tripartite division – is often used to understand and locate NGOs as civil society actors
- ⊙ Problems:
- ⊙ A) excessively normative rather than analytical
– sources of 'good' as opposed to 'bad' -
imputed to the state and market

TRIPARTITE DIVISION - FLAWS

- ⊙ Understate the potential role of the state in fostering progressive change
- ⊙ Downplaying the extent to which civil society – also a real of activity for racist organizations, business-sponsoer research NGOs and other organization that Bebbingtal and al. do not consider benign

FLAWS OF TRIPARTITE DIVISION

- ⊙ The **relative fluidity of boundaries** + politics of **revolving door** –
- ⊙ growing tendency for people to move back and forth between NGOs, government and occasionally business
- ⊙ underestimated in academic writing

FLAWS OF TRIPARTITE DIVISIONS

- ◎ NGOs – relatively recent organizational forms compared to religious institutions, political movements, government and transnational networks
- ◎ Existence of NGOs – understood in terms of relationship to more constitutive actors in society

DEVELOPMENT STUDIES AND NGOS

- ◉ **1) level of ideology and theory –**
notion of civil society – flourishes most fruitfully within either the neoliberal school of thoughts that is reduced role for the state
- ◉ **Or neomarxist and post/structural approach** emphasizing the transformative potential of social movements within civil society.

DEVELOPMENT STUDIES AND NGOS

- ◉ 2) **Conceptual level**
- ◉ **Civil society – civil society treated in terms of associations or as an arena of contesting ideas about ordering of social life**
- ◉ Proponents of both approaches – civil society offering a critical path towards Aristotle's 'the good society'.

BEBBINGTON ET AL.' PERSPECTIVE

- ⊙ Gramscian understanding of civil society
- ⊙ as constituting an arena in which hegemonic ideas concerning the organization of economic and social life are **both established and contested**

GRAMSCI (1971)

- ◉ **Gramsci (1971) perceived state and civil society to be mutually constitutive rather than separate autonomous entities**
- ◉ With both formed in relation to historical and structural forces

GLOCAL NGOS

- ◉ Globalization – as the most potent force within late modernity
- ◉ **NGOs have increasingly become a transnational community, itself overlapping the other transnational networks and institutions**
- ◉ Linkages and networks disperse new forms of development discourse and modes of governance

GLOCAL NGOS

- ◉ Some southern NGOs – began to gain their own footholds in the North with their outposts in Brussels, Washington etc

(Grameen Foundation, BRAC, breadline Africa)

- ◉ Drawback - transnationalizing tendencies – exclusion of certain marginalized people and groups

GLOCAL NGOS

- ◉ Transnationalizing tendencies – excluded certain actors for whom engagement in such process is harder

- ◉ Emergence of **international civil society elites**

who **dominate the discourses and flows channelled** through the transnational community

- ◉ **Question – as to whose alternatives gain greater visibility in these processes !!!!!**

TRANS-NATIONALIZING DEVELOPMENT

- ⊙ Transnationalizing *Development* (big D) – SAPs, poverty-reduction strategy papers)
- ⊙ Growing importance **of any alternative project**
- ⊙ **Increasing channelling of state-controlled resources through NGOs**
- ⊙ Resources become bundled with particular rules and ideas
- ⊙ NGOs – increasingly faced with opportunities related to the dominant ideas and rules

NGOS - FAILED ALTERNATIVES?

- ⊙ NGOs – vehicle of neoliberal governmentality?
- ⊙ Disciplining local organizations and populations in much the same way as the Development has done it
- ⊙ Underestimate the extent to which such pressure are resisted by some NGOs

POTENTIAL OF NGOS

- ◎ **NGOs – sustain broader funding base** – tool to negotiate and rework some of the pressures
- ◎ Potential ability of NGOs **to mobilize the broader networks and institutions** within which they are embedded
- ◎ Potential for muting such **disciplining effects**

POTENTIAL OF NGOS

- ⦿ Cf International Campaign to Ban Landmines; Jubilee 2000
- ⦿ can provide other resources and relationships of power – cf Jesuit community, but also transnational corporate actors (sit on a number of NGOs boards)

POTENTIAL OF NGOS

- ◉ NGOs – not necessarily characterized by uneven North-South relations
- ◉ More horizontal experience (Slum Dwellers International) **Spatial reworking of development**
- ◉ increased opportunities for socially excluded groups
- ◉ Reconstruction of ActionAid – HQ in Johannesburg

NGOS AS ALTERNATIVES - A BRIEF HISTORY

- ◎ 1980s NGOs decade
- ◎ These new actors - lauded as the **institutional alternative to existing development approaches** (Hirschman, Korten)

CRITICAL VOICES

- ⦿ largely muted, confined to expressing concerns – that NGOs - externally imposed phenomenon
- ⦿ Far from being alternative; they heralded a new wave of imperialism

1990S

- ⊙ NGOs under closer and more critical scrutiny
- ⊙ Internal debate how **to scale up NGO activities**
- ⊙ more **effectiveness** of NGOs and to ensuring their **sustainability**

STANDARDIZATION OF PRACTICES

- ⦿ Closeness to the mainstream **undermined their comparative advantage as agents of alternative development**
- ⦿ With particular attention falling on problems of **standardization and upwards accountability (discuss)**

NGOS AND INDIGENOUS CS

- Apparently limited success of NGOs as agents of democratization came under critique
- Threatened the development of **indigenous civil society** and distracted attention from more political organization (Bebbington et al., 2008:10)
-

ABRIDGED HISTORY OF NGOS A/ALTERNATIVES

- ◎ **First period** - long history of limited number of small agencies
- ◎ responding to the needs of groups of people perceived as poor who received little external professional support
- ◎ (Bebbington et al., 2008:11)

FIRST PERIOD - UNTIL MID/LATE 60S

- ⊙ **Largely issue-based organizations combined both philanthropic action and advocacy**
- ⊙ Northern based - against generally embedded both in broader movements and in networks that mobilized voluntary contributions

FIRST PERIOD - UNTIL MID/LATE 60S

- ◉ Often linked to other organizations providing them with an institutional base and funding,, frequently linked to **wider religious institutions and philanthropists**
- ◉ Also clear interactions **with state around legal reform as well as with market** - generated most resources then transferred through foundations
- ◉ (model that continues through today on a far massive scale)

FIRST PERIOD - UNTIL MID/LATE 60S

- ◉ From the North - some interventions emerged from the **legacy of colonialism**
- ◉ Such as volunteer programmes sending experts of 'undercapacited' countries or organization that derived from missionary interventions (Bebbington et al., 2008:11)
- ◉ **Minor or no structural reforms**

FIRST PERIOD - UNTIL MID/LATE 60S

- ⊙ some interventions were of organization whose mission and/or staff recognized the need for structural reforms, only rarely was such work alternative in any systemic sense,
- ⊙ Or in the sense that it sought to change the balance of hegemonic ideas, be these about the organization of society or the provision of services.
- ⊙ (Bebbington et al., 2008:11)

SECOND PHASE - LATE 60S TO EARLY 1980S

- ◉ consolidation of NGOs **co-financing programmes,**
- ◉ willingness of Northern states and societies to **institutionalize NGOs projects within their national aid portfolios** (direct financing)
- ◉ Geopolitical moment - sector became increasingly critical
- ◉ NGOs imperative - to elaborate and contribute to alternative arrangements among state, market and civil society

SECOND PHASE - LATE 60S TO EARLY 1980S

- Development (as a project) closely scrutinized, reflecting the intersection between NGOs and political struggles around national independence and various socialisms
- Struggles between **political projects and intellectual debates on dependency, structuralist and Marxian interpretation of the development process**
- Alternative development – become a strong terms, intellectual backing – cf (Schumacher)
-

SECOND PHASE - LATE 60S TO EARLY 1980S

- ⊙ Numerous influences - awareness of the need for local institutional development,
- ⊙ reduction in the formal colonial presence and **contradictions inherent in the Northern NGOs model** –
- ⊙ steady shift from **operational to funding roles for Northern NGOs and the growth of a Southern NGOs sector**

THIRD PHASE 1980S

- ⊙ Growth and recognition for NGOs
- ⊙ 80s - period of NGOS boom
- ⊙ contradiction of NGO alternatives

increase of NGO activity during the 80s was **driven to a significant extent by unfolding neoliberal agenda** - the very agenda that development alternatives have sought to critically engage

DAGNILO EVELINA – CASE STUDY – BRAZIL AND LA

- ⊙ Challenges to Participation, Citizenship and Democracy: Perverse Confluence and Displacement of Meaning
- ⊙ Brazil – participation of civil society in the building of democracy and social justice
- ⊙ Existence of perverse **confluence between participatory and neoliberal** political projects

PERVERSE CONFLUENCE

- ◉ The confluence characterizes the contemporary scenario of this struggle for defending democracy in Brazil and LA
- ◉ Dispute over different meanings of citizenship, civil society and participation
- ◉ - core referents for the understanding of that confluence and the form that it takes in the Brazilian conflict

PERVERSE CONFLUENCE

- ◉ The process of democratic construction in Brazil – faces important dilemma because of this confluence
- ◉ Two different processes
- ◉ 1) process of enlargement of democracy – creation of public spaces and increasing participation of civil society in discussion and decision making processes
- ◉ Formal landmark – Constitution 1988
- ◉ Consecrated the principle of the participation of civil society

PARTICIPATION PROJECT

- ⦿ Grew out of a participation project constructed since 1980s around extension of citizenship and deepening democracy
- ⦿ - project emerged from the struggle against the military regime
- ⦿ Led by sector of civil society among which social movements played an important role

PARTICIPATION PROJECT – REVOLVING DOOR

- ⊙ Two elements important:
- ⊙ 1) **re-establishment of formal democracy**
- ⊙ Democracy taken into the realm of state power
- ⊙ Municipal as well as state executives
- ⊙ 1990s actors making the transition from civil society to the state
- ⊙ Led by belief in the possibility of joint action between the civil society and the state

NEOLIBERAL PROJECT

- ⦿ - reduced minimal state
- ⦿ Progressively exempts itself from its role as a guarantor of rights by shrinking its social responsibility
- ⦿ Transferring the responsibility to the civil society
- ⦿ The perversity – these projects points in opposite even antagonistic directions
- ⦿ Each of them requires as a proactive civil society

CONFLUENCE OF THE PROJECTS

- ⊙ Notion of citizenship, participation and civil society are central elements
- ⊙ This coincidence at the discursive level hides fundamental distinctions and divergence of the two projects
- ⊙ Obscuring them through the use of common vocabulary

DISCURSIVE SHIFT

- ◉ Obscuring them through the use of a common vocabulary as well as of institutional mechanism that at first seemed quite similar
- ◉ Discursive shift – common vocabulary obscures divergences and contradictions
- ◉ - a displacement of meaning becomes effective
- ◉ In this process the perverse confluence creates image of apparent homogeneity among different interests and discourses
- ◉ Concealing conflict and diluting the dispute between these two projects.

STATE ACTORS

- ◉ In practice unwilling to shape their decision making with respect to the formation of public policies
- ◉ Basic intention – have the organization of civil society assume the functions and responsibilities restricted to the implementation and the realization of these policies
- ◉ Providing services formerly considered to be duties of the state

CIVIL SOCIETY

- ◉ Some CS organizations accept this circumscription of their roles and the meaning of participation
- ◉ CS accept the circumscription of their roles and the meaning of participation
- ◉ In doing so they contribute to its legitimization
- ◉ Others react to these perverse confluence – regarding their political role

REDEFINITION OF MEANING

- ◉ The implementation of the neoliberal project – requires shrinking of the social responsibilities of the state
- ◉ And their transference to civil society
- ◉ Significant inflection of political culture
- ◉ Brazilian case – implementation of neoliberal project - had to confront a consolidated participatory project maturing for more than 20 years