1

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

**POST-MARXIST DEVELOPMENT PRAXIS:
NGDOs AND NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY**

by

JANICE HOOPER, B.A.

**A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of**

Master of Arts

The Norman Paterson School of International Affairs

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
1 December 1993
© copyright
1993, Janice Hooper**

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-89853-4

Canada

Name JANICE HOOPER

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

POLITICAL SCIENCE - INTERNATIONAL LAW AND RELATIONS

SUBJECT TERM

0616

SUBJECT CODE

U·M·I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0272
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0679
General 0289
Ancient 0290
Linguistics 0291
Modern 0401
Literature 0294
General 0295
Classical 0297
Comparative 0298
Medieval 0316
Modern 0591
African 0305
American 0352
Asian 0355
Canadian (English) 0593
Canadian (French) 0311
English 0312
Germanic 0315
Latin American 0313
Middle Eastern 0314
Romance 0314
Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion 0318
General 0321
Biblical Studies 0319
Clergy 0320
History of 0322
Philosophy of 0469
Theology 0323

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology 0324
Archaeology 0326
Cultural 0327
Physical 0310
Business Administration 0272
General 0770
Accounting 0454
Banking 0338
Management 0385
Canadian Studies 0501
Economics 0503
General 0505
Agricultural 0508
Commerce-Business 0509
Finance 0510
History 0511
Labor 0511
Theory 0358
Folklore 0366
Geography 0351
Gerontology 0578
History 0578
General 0578

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science 0615
General 0616
International Law and Relations 0617
Public Administration 0814
Recreation 0452
Social Work 0626
Sociology 0627
General 0938
Criminology and Penology 0631
Demography 0628
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0629
Individual and Family Studies 0630
Industrial and Labor Relations 0630
Public and Social Welfare 0344
Social Structure and Development 0709
Theory and Methods 0999
Transportation 0453
Urban and Regional Planning 0453
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture 0473
General 0285
Agronomy 0475
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0476
Animal Pathology 0359
Food Science and Technology 0478
Forestry and Wildlife 0479
Plant Culture 0480
Plant Pathology 0817
Plant Physiology 0777
Range Management 0746
Wood Technology 0306
Biology 0287
General 0308
Anatomy 0309
Biostatistics 0379
Botany 0329
Cell 0353
Ecology 0369
Entomology 0793
Genetics 0410
Limnology 0307
Microbiology 0317
Molecular 0416
Neuroscience 0433
Oceanography 0821
Physiology 0778
Radiation 0472
Veterinary Science 0786
Zoology 0760
Biophysics 0760
General 0760
Medical 0760

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences 0566
General 0300
Audiology 0992
Chemotherapy 0567
Dentistry 0350
Education 0769
Hospital Management 0758
Human Development 0982
Immunology 0564
Medicine and Surgery 0347
Mental Health 0569
Nursing 0570
Nutrition 0380
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0354
Occupational Health and Safety 0381
Therapy 0571
Ophthalmology 0419
Pathology 0572
Pharmacology 0382
Pharmacy 0573
Physical Therapy 0574
Public Health 0575
Radiology 0575
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences 0485
Chemistry 0749
General 0486
Agricultural 0487
Analytical 0488
Biochemistry 0738
Inorganic 0490
Nuclear 0491
Organic 0494
Pharmaceutical 0495
Physical 0495
Polymer 0754
Radiation 0405
Mathematics 0605
Physics 0986
General 0606
Acoustics 0608
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0608
Atmospheric Science 0748
Atomic 0607
Electronics and Electricity 0798
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0759
Fluid and Plasma 0609
Molecular 0610
Nuclear 0752
Optics 0756
Radiation 0611
Solid State 0463
Statistics 0346
Applied Sciences 0984
Applied Mechanics 0984
Computer Science 0984

Engineering 0537
General 0538
Aerospace 0539
Agricultural 0540
Automotive 0541
Biomedical 0542
Chemical 0543
Civil 0544
Electronics and Electrical 0348
Heat and Thermodynamics 0545
Hydraulic 0546
Industrial 0547
Marine 0794
Materials Science 0548
Mechanical 0743
Metallurgy 0551
Mining 0552
Nuclear 0549
Packaging 0765
Petroleum 0554
Sanitary and Municipal 0790
System Science 0428
Geotechnology 0796
Operations Research 0795
Plastics Technology 0994
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

The undersigned hereby recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research acceptance of this thesis, submitted by JANICE HOOPER, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Maureen Appel Molot

Maureen Appel Molot, Director
The Norman Paterson School
of International Affairs

L. Macdonald

Professor L. Macdonald, Supervisor

ABSTRACT

This paper examines Non-Governmental Development Organizations (NGDOs) as a new transnational social movement which acts to extend the reach of civil society within the international aid regime and to democratize new and existing public spaces at local, national and international levels. The paper concludes that the movement is divided with regard to the degree that it contests the 'orthodox' meaning of development associated with market-led/state-managed export growth strategies under the rubric of structural adjustment. The terrain of civil society, occupied by the NGDO movement within the international aid regime, is itself the site of struggle between progressive/post-marxist and neo-conservative NGDOs. Therefore, the NGDO movement has a transformative potential only to the degree that the popular sector organizations with whom they work, act on 'participatory development' ideology to effect institutional insertions within the formal political arena, on their own terms, and in a way that transforms previously non-responsive state and multilateral aid agency structures.

Acknowledgements

.

I would like to thank Professors Laura Macdonald and Maxwell Cameron for their comments and suggestions during the preparation of this paper. I also thank my husband, Jonathan Hooper, for his encouragement and patience over the course of its development

CONTENTS

CHAPTER

- I.** Introduction 1

PART ONE NGDOs IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

CHAPTER

- II.** European, Canadian and American NGDOs
1600-1990 26

- III.** Evolution of Southern NGDOs
Regional Patterns 53

- IV.** Consolidation of the International NGDO Community
The 1990s 64

- EPILOGUE TO PART ONE 68**

PART TWO NGDOs AND NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY

CHAPTER

- V.** Resource Mobilization Theory and
The NGDO 'Instrumental' Movement 75

- VI.** Identity Theory and
The NGDO 'Expressive' Movement 91

- VII.** Post-Marxist Theory and
The NGDO 'Post-Marxist' Movement 105

- EPILOGUE TO PART TWO 112**

PART THREE
THE NGDO MOVEMENT AND
GRAMSCI'S THEORY OF CIVIL SOCIETY

CHAPTER

VIII.	Gramsci and the State/Civil Society Relationship	
	The NGDO Movement and	
	The International Aid Regime	125

IX.	Gramsci and Civil Society Revisited	
	The NGDO Movement and	
	The War of Position	134

EPILOGUE TO PART THREE	141
---	------------

<i>BIBLIOGRAPHY</i>	144
--------------------------------------	------------

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

NGOs, PVOs, and NGDOs are the contemporary acronyms that describe legally registered, non-governmental and not-for-profit, Northern and Southern charitable organizations which work mainly or entirely in the field of international development cooperation, or in education and policy advocacy activities related to international development. Their work and activities are characterized by a focus on issues and people beyond their own staff and membership. The scope of their work may be local, national or international, and their areas of interest may span one or more sectors of the economy or social issues.¹

Perceived to be motivated by altruism and the real needs of the poor majority in developing countries, and not by the geopolitical and economic interests of state and multilateral aid agencies, these organizations have established themselves in the eyes of both donor and recipient communities as legitimate alternative agents of development. Hence, whether these agencies are called Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs), or Non-Governmental Development Organizations (NGDOs),

¹See: Tim Brodhead and Brent Herbert-Copley, Bridges of Hope?: Canadian Voluntary Agencies and the Third World (The North-South Institute: Ottawa, 1988): x.; United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report 1993: 87; and Samuel Paul and Arturo Isreal (eds.), Nongovernmental Organizations and the World Bank (Washington: The World Bank, 1991): 3 - for the definitions from which this description has been constructed.

they have as a group become an increasingly organized "third sector" of the international development community in the last quarter of the 20th Century.

As their name indicates, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are any of those organizations which are not part of a government and which have not been established as a result of an agreement between governments. As the UN has defined them, NGOs may be research institutions, professional associations, trade unions, chambers of commerce, youth organizations, religious institutions, senior citizen's associations, tourist bodies, private foundations, political parties, zionist organizations, funding or development - international and indigenous - agencies, and any other organization of a non-governmental nature. Mario Padron has argued, however, that the the concept of NGO is wrongly used to denote non-governmental development organizations (NGDOs) which are in fact one form of NGO devoted specifically to the design, study, and/or execution of development projects and programs in Southern countries, with the direct involvement of the popular sectors.² In the interests of clarity then, the acronym NGDO will be used throughout this paper.

The 1990 OECD Directory of Non-Governmental Organizations in International Development had information on more than 2,500 NGDOs in the 25 OECD countries, up from 1,600 in 1980, and, estimated that there were up to 50,000 indigenous NGDOs in

²Mario Padron, "Non-governmental Development Organizations: From Development Aid to Development Cooperation, World Development Vol 15 (1987) Supplement: 70.

developing countries in the 1980s. Moreover, the total US dollar amount transferred by and through Northern NGDOs increased from \$1.0 billion in 1970 to \$7.2 billion in 1990 - in real terms twice the rate of increase for international development assistance. In the early 1980s, one rough estimate suggested that NGDO activity 'touched' 100 million people in developing countries - 60 million in Asia, 25 million in Latin America, and 12 million in Africa. In 1993 the total has been estimated by the UNDP to be nearer 250 million. In real terms Northern NGDOs accounted for 13 percent of net disbursements of official aid and 2.5 percent of total resource flows to developing countries in the early 1990s.³

Given the growth displayed by both the Northern and Southern constituents of the NGDO sector over the last 20 years, and the fact that the volume of resource flows through this sector demonstrates its increasing vitality as an agent of development, a case can be made for the scholarly study of the non-governmental organization sector engaged in international development. Which aspect of this sector is selected for study, however, depends on at least three factors; namely, the scope of the existing literature, the theoretical orientation of the author, and what end the author believes knowledge is to serve. These three factors will be highlighted in the following section of this introduction which outlines the main bodies of thought and research on NGDOs, and, offers a rationale for a critical theory orientation to the study of the NGDO sector in international development.

³United Nations Development Programme, Human Development Report 1993: 96, 93.

Rationale

Robert Cox has argued that theory is always *for* someone and *for* some purpose, and that the primary task of theory is to become clearly aware of the pressures of social reality which present themselves to consciousness as problems. Beginning with its problematic, which is traceable to a historically conditioned awareness of certain problems and issues, theory can serve two purposes. The first is to act as a guide to help solve problems posed by prevailing social and power relationships and the institutions into which they are organized - giving rise to what Cox has termed *problem-solving theory*. The general aim of problem-solving is to make these relationships and institutions function smoothly by dealing with sources of trouble. Because the general pattern of institutions and relationships is not called into question particular problems can be considered in relation to the specialized areas of activity in which they arise. As a matter of practice or methodology, the problem-solving approach "fixes limits or parameters to a problem area and reduces the statement of a particular problem to a limited number of variables which are amenable to relatively precise examination."⁴

The second purpose of theory, according to Cox, is to become clearly aware of the perspective which gives rise to theorizing, and

⁴Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," in R. Keohane (ed.) Neorealism and its Critics (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987): 209.

its relation to other perspectives, by standing apart from the prevailing order of the world and asking how that order came about - giving rise to *critical theory*. Critical theory, unlike problem-solving theory, calls institutions and social and power relations into question by concerning itself with their origins and how and why they might be in the process of changing. Critical theory, Cox maintains, is theory of history in the sense of being concerned not just with the past but with a continuing process of historical change - history as the *longue duree* in Fernand Braudel's words. In contrast, problem-solving theory is non or ahistorical, since it posits a continuing present, or the permanence of the institutions and power relations which constitute its parameters. As a matter of practice, Cox maintains that critical theory, like problem-solving theory, takes as its starting point some aspect or particular sphere of human activity. But "whereas the problem-solving approach leads to further analytical subdivision of the issue to be dealt with, the critical approach leads toward the construction of a larger picture of the whole of which the initial part is just one component, and seeks to understand the processes of change in which parts and whole are involved."⁵

While not unconcerned with the problems of the real world, critical theory approaches practice from a perspective which transcends that of the existing order and allows for a normative choice in favour of a social and political order different from the prevailing order. At the same time, critical theory limits the range of

⁵Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory": 210.

choice to alternative orders which are feasible transformations of the existing world. The principal objective of critical theory, therefore, is to clarify this range of possible alternatives.⁶

Although Cox's discussion of problem-solving and critical theory prefaces an examination of theories of international relations, it can be conveniently employed in delineating the main lines of the literature elicited by the growth of the NGDO sector over the 1970s and 1980s. This literature may be grouped according to a "perception of legitimate development roles for NGDOs" typology proposed by the Regional and Sectoral Studies Division of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD); a typology which locates its discussion within the realm of development theory, but nonetheless dovetails neatly with the distinctions between problem-solving and critical theory drawn by Cox.

According to the IBRD authors, perceptions of legitimate development roles for NGDOs, which also inform academic and policy research agendas, are influenced by two contrasting views of the nature of development and role of the state. The first of these approaches views development primarily as a technical and financial problem involving the transfer and allocation of economic resources and may be termed the *technocratic development* orientation. The second, the *participatory development* orientation, approaches development as a political and institutional problem involving the redistribution of power and the creation of new human and

⁶Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory": 210-211.

institutional capacities at sub-national, national and international levels.⁷

Those analysts and practitioners who view development in terms of allocating investment resources to efficiently maximize economic growth tend to emphasize NGDOs' potential as low-cost alternatives to both the market and the state in the provision of services to the poorest groups in society, but nonetheless view government as the sovereign representative of the national interest and the principal agent of development. Hence, this perspective supports NGDO involvement in development to the extent that they deliver services that enhance the productivity and welfare of the poor more efficiently and effectively than either the public or private sectors.

A modest literature focussed on the dynamics of managing NGDOs concerns itself with an assessment of the service delivery efficiency and effectivity of Northern and Southern NGDOs working in the South. This research focuses on the planning, financing, budgeting and evaluation aspects of NGDO activities and performance at either the organizational or sectoral level. Research is generally conducted on a case-by-case basis, and draws 'lessons' from case studies for general adoption by policy makers within NGDOs, or funding agencies establishing linkages with NGDOs, concerned with enhancing NGDO efficiency and effectivity. Although some debate with regard to the cost-effectiveness of NGDOs exists, the general

⁷Samuel Paul and Arturo Isreal (eds.), Nongovernmental Organizations and the World Bank: Cooperation for Development (Washington: The World Bank, 1991): 34-36.

consensus reached by the evaluation literature is that NGDOs receiving official development assistance funding are reasonably efficient, often effective in reaching remote areas and the poor, but generally weak in management and planning.⁸

Further research from this service delivery perspective would seek to answer questions of how the capacity of NGDOs can best be utilized by state and multilateral aid institutions. Research from this perspective would take the individual NGDO as its subject, and the service delivery aspect of NGDOs as its parameters, and seek to understand how and under what conditions the management and planning activities of these organizations could be made to function more effectively in order to enhance their poverty alleviation and welfare provision activities. Pursuit of this type of study would therefore fall within the problem-solving arena of Cox's understanding of theory.

In contrast to the NGDO efficiency/effectivity service delivery concern of this literature, there is a second body of literature which focuses on the human and political empowerment dimensions of development. Unlike the service delivery perspective, this literature

⁸See: [1] American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service (ACVAFS), Evaluation Source Book (Washington, 1983); [2] Tim Brodhead, Brent Herbert-Copley and Anne-Marie Lambert, Bridges of Hope?: Canadian Voluntary Agencies and the Third World (Ottawa: The North-South Institute, 1988); [3] David L. Brown and J.G. Covey, Organizing and Managing Private Development Agencies, Working Paper 128, Program on Nonprofit Organizations, Yale Institution for Social and Policy Sciences, New Haven CT, 1988; [4] Peter E. Druker, Managing the Non Profit Organization (New York: Harper Collins, 1990); [5] K.V. Ramanathan, Management Control in Nonprofit Organizations (New York: Wiley, 1982), [6] Judith Tendler, Turning Voluntary Agencies into Development Agencies, Program Evaluation Discussion Paper 12 (Washington D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development, 1984).

tends to draw an analytical distinction between the state and civil society which together comprise discrete but interrelated facets of the political order. As such, civil society denotes forms of association which generally lie outside of the government, courts, and military which comprise the formal political arena of the state. Within this perspective government is viewed as a structure through which a configuration of class, gender and ethnic interests can be expressed, and through which the powerful can exert control over the coercive power of the state to maintain their advantaged positions. Hence, unlike the service delivery perspective, the state is not understood as a neutral arbiter of the development process, but rather as a structure which has the capacity to delimit exclusion and inclusion in the process of development.

Although this literature acknowledges NGDOs as service delivery organizations it integrates this aspect of NGDO activity with their role as agents of civil society which express civil society's interests vis-a-vis the state. NGDOs are therefore understood primarily as agencies for organizing, representing, and protecting the rights of marginalized groups, with the aim of realigning control over resources and decision making in ways that broaden the power base of the marginalized, sometimes as a complement to government action, and at other times in opposition to oppressive governments and state structures. This literature assesses NGDO activity principally on the basis of its capacity and potential to contribute to pro-democratic economic and political forces at sub-national and national levels. Therefore, while not unconcerned with the poverty alleviation and welfare provision role of NGDOs, this literature tends

to view these as a by-product of the empowerment process through which the political and economic claims of the marginalized are organized and expressed vis-a-vis the state.⁹

Further research from this perspective would seek to understand and assess the strategies of action employed by these NGOs in their quest for democratic development. Questions of how and why Northern and Southern NGOs are formed, how NGOs might be in the process of changing, and assessment of the interface between activities on local, national and international fronts and prevailing political and economic power structures would assume importance from this perspective. This perspective - the critical theory perspective outlined by Cox - would be concerned with understanding NGOs not just as individual institutions but how they as a group have evolved, and how they as a group might affect change in larger social and political processes.

Within this perspective the analyst could move from consideration of NGOs on a case-by-case basis to consideration of NGOs *en masse*, as a transnational social movement which is expressed and embodied by individual NGOs and institutionalized to

⁹See: [1] Asian NGO Coalition (ANGOC), Democratizing Asian Development: A Commitment to Leadership, ANGOC Monograph Series No. 7, Asian NGO Coalition, Manila, Philippines, 1988; [2] Adi Sosono, "NGOs' Roles and Social Movements in Developing Democracy: The South-East Asian Experiences," New Asian Vision Vol 6, No 1 (1989): 14-26; [3] Sheldon Annis, "Can Small-Scale Development be a Large-Scale Policy? The Case of Latin America," World Development Vol 15 (1987) Supplement: 129-134; [4] Mario Padron, "NGOs and Grassroots Development in Latin America," Paper presented at the XIII International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association (LASA) session on non-profit organizations (PVOs) and grassroots development in Latin America (Boston, MA: October 1986); [5] David Korten, Getting to the 21st Century: Voluntary Action and the Global Agenda (West Hartford: Kumarian Press, 1990).

varying degrees (depending on the history of the region) in a network of sub-national, national and international NGDO federations. The pursuit of this type of study would, however, hinge on an analysis capable of substantiating the concept of NGDOs *en masse* as comprising a new transnational social movement in development. Such an analysis would therefore be concerned with fleshing out the concept of a 'new social movement,' with demonstrating that the NGDO sector is engaged in a process of organizational and ideological change profound enough to warrant this conceptualization, and, with locating this movement in a transnational context - that is, within the international aid regime.

Regime has been defined as "the agreed upon sets of principles, norms, rules and procedures around which actor expectations converge" in international cooperation.¹⁰ For the purpose of this paper the actors relevant to international development cooperation will be limited to national and multilateral aid agencies and the NGDO sector. The "sets of principles, norms, rules and procedures" will be understood to comprise development praxis - or, the theory of development and the practical application of it in the execution of development strategies.

While the praxis of the late 20th century aid regime is dominated by national and multilateral aid agencies and has converged around the neo-conservative economic logic of 'structural adjustment' the process of formulating this praxis has been, and continues to be, fraught with tensions due to contestation emanating

¹⁰Paul R. Viotti and Mark V. Kauppi, International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism (New York: MacMillan Publishing, 1987): 602.

from a number of sources. The source of contestation that is of particular interest to this study, however, is that arising from the NGDO community. The form and extent of this contestation, the historical and contemporary forces informing it, and the transformational potential of it within the aid regime constitute the questions that underpin a critical theory perspective on NGDOs. Hence, this paper will ultimately be concerned with understanding how and under what conditions the NGDO sector may act as a force for change on the dominant praxis of the international aid regime.

Cox suggests that in seeking to analyze the sources and potentials for historical change, the notion of a 'framework for action or historical structure' is useful. He posits that all action occurs within a framework of a world order structure which does not determine actions in any direct, mechanical way, but nonetheless, does function to impose pressures and constraints on action. Individuals and groups, including states, international organizations, and organized economic and social interests, may move with the pressures or resist and oppose them, but they cannot ignore them.¹¹

The term 'world order structure,' refers to a configuration of forces interacting with one another at a number of levels. This configuration is conceptualized by Cox of consisting of three spheres of activity: production relations and the social forces engendered by the production process, forms of state as derived from particular state/society complexes, and world orders or the particular configuration of forces which successively define the problematic of

¹¹Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States, and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory": 217-218.

war or peace for the ensemble of states. Cox argues that *historical change* is characterized by change from one world order to another, for example from *pax britannica* to *pax americana* and that the source of historical change resides in the realm of social forces shaped by systemic change in production relations.¹²

Cox's level of analysis, and tools for analysis, have been developed for the purpose of analyzing historical change at the world order level. For Cox, historical change at this level is precipitated by changes in production processes and the social forces unleashed by them. While not ruling out the role that social forces residing within civil society may play in this process, Cox confines his analysis of civil society to the realm of production relations. Hence, all actors within his analysis are class actors, who either engage in progressive struggles to change balances of power within relations of production, or, status quo oriented struggles to circumvent or resist change. Therefore, neither the regime specific nor regional/community specific struggles of organized non-class agents of civil society bear significance within Cox's work, as these non-class actors are incapable of effecting the changes in production relations that generate world order change.¹³

While this paper shares with Cox an understanding of historical change as that characterized by change from one world order to another, stemming from changes in production relations, it is predicated on a less restrictive understanding of the character of

¹²Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States, and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory": 220.

¹³Robert W. Cox, Production, Power, and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987): 352-353.

progressive agents and strategies of action. Through an examination of the international community of NGDOs as a new transnational social movement - that is, as a non-class actor - and an analysis of its strategies of action within civil society and the international aid regime, this paper will seek to demonstrate that an understanding of 'progressive' actors need not be limited to class actors operating within the realm of production relations.

Hypothesis and Methodology

This study will examine NGDOs as a transnational social movement and will utilize a critical theory orientation and methodology as outlined by Cox. In so doing this paper will take the NGDO sector of the international aid regime as its problematic and will seek to demonstrate that the NGDO sector is engaged in a highly politicized process of change with regard to its perception of itself as an agent of development, and with regard to strategies of action and organization on sub-national, national and international levels.

This paper will be concerned with examining the hypothesis that the NGDO sector constitutes a new transnational social movement and that such an understanding of this sector is a legitimate and meaningful way to understand the dynamics of this process of change. Further to this hypothesis, this paper will also argue that it is the conceptualization of the NGDO community as a

transnational social movement that enables a critical analysis of its transformational potential on the international aid regime itself.

To this end, however, the scope of this study must be extended beyond that literature pertaining solely to NGDOs, for although this literature captures and documents the historical change in orientation and strategy being adopted by NGDOs, it fails to locate this in a larger social or political context. Attempts thus far to explain the NGDO phenomenon, why they as a group exist and what motivates their behaviour, have borrowed primarily from the political and economic literature pertaining to the non-profit sector of western national economies, and have generally adopted the service delivery perspective on NGDOs outlined above.

The dominant approach is to explain the phenomenon of NGDOs in terms of the failure of the market and the state and consists of four broad categories of theory. The *subsidy theory* argues that NGDOs are a response to the many implicit and explicit subsidies made available to them by the state and asserts that donations to NGDOs in support of activities such as education, health, poverty alleviation, and welfare are encouraged through a variety of subsidies to both charitable organizations and their financial contributors. The tax subsidies to the NGDOs increase the amount of output available to society beyond what might have been produced without the subsidies, and the deductability of donations on the donor's tax returns stimulates giving because it reduces the after-tax cost to the donor.¹⁴

¹⁴B.A. Weisbrod, The Nonprofit Economy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988): 42-44.

The *public goods theory* argues that NGDOs exist to satisfy the residual unsatisfied demand for public goods in society. That is, the state tends to provide public goods only to the level that satisfies the median voter, thus where demand exceeds this level or where heterogenous demands exist, NGDOs step in to fill the gap. Public television and medical research undertaken by philanthropic groups illustrate this point.¹⁵

The *consumer control theory* explains the existence of NGDOs in terms of the superiority of direct consumer or patron control when the market and government are unable to ensure the desired performance for members. Hence this theory argues that consumer control may help eliminate information asymmetry and the adverse consequences of monopoly for members - as do professional associations, member controlled clubs, and marketing and consumer cooperatives.¹⁶

Finally, the *contract failure theory* suggests that NGDOs arise where ordinary contractual mechanisms do not provide the public with adequate means to police producers. Under these conditions, for-profit firms have an incentive and opportunity to exploit customers by offering less service than was promised and paid for, hence NGDOs are a response to possible opportunistic behaviour by both private and public service providers. This theory argues that when contracts are difficult to define, people are likely to 'trust' NGDOs more than commercial firms. When the public is unable to

¹⁵Henry Hansmann, "Economic Theories of Non-Profit Organizations," in Walter W. Powell (ed.) The Non-Profit Sector: A Research Handbook (New Haven: Yale University Press 1987): 28-29.

¹⁶Hansmann, "Economic Theories of Non-Profit Organizations": 33-34.

monitor certain outputs and services, for example disaster relief, they are likely to turn to organizations with no profit motive for producing and delivering the service.¹⁷

While these four theories may go some way toward explaining the existence of local or national NGOs who provide public goods for their home populations, these theories are not completely satisfactory in explaining NGOs for several reasons. Firstly, they fail to explain those service oriented NGOs which are not attempting to save money or provide a service for citizens in their home societies, but are rather concerned with providing services to non-nationals. Secondly, they fail to explain the existence of those NGOs who may be engaged in service delivery but are primarily oriented toward advocacy work on behalf of the marginalized in Southern countries. Finally, and perhaps most importantly from the critical theory perspective, the four theories have limited themselves to an inert understanding of NGOs in seeking to explain the NGO phenomenon.

These theories stem from a relatively static conception of society as composed of the state and the market, with the 'non-profit' sector 'springing to life' as it were, only as a result of state and/or market failure. This sector then, is not conceived of by these theories as having a life or essence of its own which precedes either state or market failure, and which, while affected by the state and market, nonetheless interacts with both and as a result creates changes in all three spheres over time. In short these theories fail to address the concept of civil society and to incorporate an

¹⁷Hansmann, "Economic Theories of Non-Profit Organizations": 29-31.

understanding of NGDOs into this concept. For an understanding of the NGDO sector as a 'being in itself' which requires analysis, both in terms of its inner dynamics and its transformational potential, other bodies of theory must therefore be sought.

It is this type of analysis which is undertaken by 'new social movement' theory. This literature theorizes, from a civil society perspective, how and why non-class movements such as the women's, ecological, and peace movements have evolved in the second half of the 20th century, and concerns itself with the analysis of their transformational impact on civil society itself. The NGDO community, however, has not been analyzed within this literature. For this reason it appears both useful and timely to draw on this literature, in order that it may inform an alternative understanding of the NGDO sector, and, in order that this study may advance knowledge with regard to transformations occurring within the international community of development agents.

In order to facilitate a critical analysis of the transformational potential of the NGDO movement on development praxis not only within civil society, but within the aid regime itself, and at the level of state and multi-lateral aid institutions, however, it is necessary that the state/civil society relationship be explored with more analytical rigor than that undertaken by the new social movement literature. While this literature is characterized by a civil society-centric focus, the relationship between civil society and the state is relatively under theorized. Hence this literature does not provide a suitable basis for a broader analysis of civil society's transformative potential on state and multilateral aid institutions. For this reason,

this study will also draw upon Gramsci's concept of civil society, noteworthy for its sensitivity to the interplay between the state, civil society and the economy, in order to conduct a critical analysis of the NGDO community's transformative potential on the development praxis of groups within civil society, as well as that of state and multilateral aid institutions.

To this end Part One of this study will be concerned with undertaking an historical analysis of the ideological and organizational evolution of the Northern and Southern members of the NGDO sector. Chapters II and III will examine the evolution of Northern and Southern NGDOs at the regional level and Chapter IV will examine joint initiatives undertaken at the international level in order to demonstrate that the consolidation of a conscious civil society orientation and identity characterizes the contemporary NGDO community and distinguishes it from state and multilateral aid institutions within the aid regime.

The Canadian NGDO community has been selected for a particular focus in Chapter II, which deals with the evolution of Northern NGDOs, for two reasons. Firstly, a survey conducted by Brian Smith between August 1981 and May 1986 of forty-five aid-sending NGDOs based in the United States, Canada, England, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Switzerland may be interpreted as one which establishes the range of development ideologies and strategic orientations displayed by the Canadian community as broadly representative of the Northern NGDO

community.¹⁸ Secondly, a study of 129 Canadian NGDOs conducted by the North-South Institute between November 1985 and June 1986 augments Smith's study by providing a broader profile and analysis of the range of Canadian NGDO activities.¹⁹ In the interests of limiting the body of material on Northern NGDOs to a manageable yet representative quantity, the Canadian NGDO community has therefore been chosen as characteristic enough of this community to serve as a basis from which to generate evidence in support of the thesis proposed by this paper.

Part Two will be concerned with an examination of the new social movement literature in order to establish the legitimacy of an understanding of the international NGDO community as a 'new social movement.' Through an application of three schools of social movement theory - resource mobilization, identity and post-marxist - to the NGDO sector, Chapters V, VI and VII will identify the NGDO community as a new social movement characterized by an identity as a non-class-based agent of civil society. Chapter V characterizes the movement as one which engages with the state in the formal political

¹⁸Brian H. Smith, More Than Altruism: The Politics of Private Foreign Aid (Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990), chapter 4, and, Appendix A, "Notes on Methodology". The survey consisted of a pretested instrument of forty-seven open ended and closed questions that focussed on five issues: (1) mission definition and the ranking of current priorities; (2) sources and consequences of financing; (3) whether the organization attempts to influence public opinion and policy making at home and the repercussions for its relationships with private donors and home governments; (4) the methods of evaluating the effectiveness of its overseas activities and the feedback such evaluation provides to the organizations; and (5) its governance, including structure, process of decision-making, relations with overseas counterpart nonprofits who are recipients of its aid, and its cooperative relationships with other North Atlantic private organizations.

¹⁹Tim Brodhead, Brent Herbert-Copley and Anne-Marie Lambert, Bridges of Hope?: Canadian Voluntary Agencies and the Third World (Ottawa: The North-South Institute 1988).

arena through instrumental action designed to effect a redistribution of aid budgets in its favour. Chapter VI is concerned with demonstrating that in the last quarter of the 20th century the development praxis of national and multilateral aid agencies is tending to converge around the neo-conservative economic logic of 'structural adjustment' and that the progressive as opposed to neo-conservative portion of the NGDO movement contests this convergence and struggles to create and defend a space within the regime for the expression and execution of alternative understandings of development. Chapter VII further delineates an understanding of the NGDO sector as a social movement with reference to post-marxist theory. On the basis of this literature the NGDO movement is identified as 'post-marxist' to the extent that it does not draw its identity from a position within relations of production and to the extent that the progressive struggle of the movement is informed by a development ideology that seeks neither a revolutionary overthrow of the state nor of capitalist relations of production. It seeks rather to enlarge and defend spaces for civil society both within the aid regime and within the nation state in order to democratize the process of development policy making at sub-national, national and international levels.

Part Three of this paper is concerned with exploring Gramsci's concept of civil society in order to conduct a critical analysis of how, under what conditions, and to what degree, the NGDO movement may exert a transformational influence on the dominant development praxis of the international aid regime. To this end Gramsci's concept of hegemony is examined in Chapter VIII, and the concept of war of

position in Chapter IX, in order to demonstrate that the NGDO movement's transformative potential is at best marginally related to the fact that the movement has inserted itself, and therefore civil society, directly into the aid regime. It rests rather on the degree to which the popular sector organizations, with which NGDOs engage, act on 'participatory development ideology' to effect institutional insertions within the formal political arena in a way which transforms previously non-responsive state structures.

Conclusion

This chapter has been concerned with delineating the main bodies of thought and research on NGDOs and locating them within the problem solving and critical theory purviews of Robert Cox's understanding of theory. The participatory development literature, which identifies NGDOs as agents of civil society which represent civil society's interests vis-a-vis the state, has been identified as one which provides a basis for a consideration of NGDOs as agencies for organizing, representing, and protecting the rights of marginalized groups in given societies with the aim of realigning control over resources and decision making in ways that broaden the economic and political power base of the marginalized. Hence NGDOs function as agents of civil society and may at times serve to complement progressive government action, and at other times to oppose oppressive governments and state structures.

This chapter has argued that conventional theories of the NGDO phenomenon, which largely concentrate on the service delivery aspect of NGDOs, inadequately theorize this aspect of NGDO activity. This failure is due to a static conception of society as composed of the state and the market with civil society 'springing to life' only to the degree that the state and market fails. In order to facilitate a richer understanding of the NGDO sector, this chapter has argued that an approach to analysis which theorizes civil society as having an integrity of its own which interacts with the state and market to create changes in all three spheres over time is necessary.

Hence, this chapter has hypothesized that new social movement theory, which adopts a consciously civil society-centric perspective, can serve as a useful analytical basis from which to examine and more comprehensively describe the 'essence' of the NGDO sector. This chapter has also identified the NGDO sector, together with national and multilateral aid institutions, as the actors central to the international aid regime. Therefore, to the degree that the NGDO sector comprises a new social movement, its activities within this sphere also establish it as a 'transnational' social movement.

It has further been argued that there are tensions within the international aid regime and that while the praxis of national and multilateral aid institutions is tending to converge around the neo-conservative economic logic of 'structural adjustment' the NGDO sector is striving to create and defend a space for an alternative development praxis within the regime. Through recourse to new social movement theory, this paper will also be concerned with lending substance to this claim.

In keeping with a critical theory approach to analysis, however, which is ultimately concerned with clarifying the range of possible alternative orders which are feasible transformations of the existing world, this paper will also be concerned with assessing the transformational potential of the NGDO sector vis-a-vis the dominant praxis of the aid regime. This chapter has hypothesized that non-class actors can be understood as potential agents of historical change, and that new social movement theory can facilitate a richer understanding of this potential. It has also hypothesized that conceptualizing the NGDO sector as a new social movement enables a critical analysis of how and to what degree the NGDO sector may serve to influence the praxis characteristic of the late 20th century international aid regime.

This chapter has also argued, however, that in order to critically assess the NGDO sector's transformative potential, the state/civil society relationship requires a more rigorous analysis than new social movement theory provides. Therefore, Gramsci's theory of civil society, which is noteworthy because of its nuanced understanding of the complex relationship between the state and civil society, has been identified as one which can facilitate such an analysis.

This introduction has argued that a study of the NGDO sector is worth undertaking because of the increasingly significant role the sector is assuming as an agent of development in the late 20th century. While this stems in part from the rapid increase in the size of the global NGDO community and its increasingly visible presence within the aid regime, the aspect of the sector that has elicited the

attention of this study is its contestational role within the aid regime. As such it merits consideration by students of development interested not only in understanding the complex dynamics of the NGDO sector itself, but in understanding the process of dominant and contestational praxis formation within the aid regime, the relationship between them, and the potential outcomes of their association. While this study cannot claim to offer a definitive analysis of this process, the chapters which follow are nonetheless predicated on the belief that the process itself is an important area of study. A focus on the NGDO sector, and an analysis of it as a non-class actor - a transnational social movement - can contribute to the body of knowledge concerned with analysis of the international aid regime, and with historical change.

PART ONE

NGDOs IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Prior to any discussion of NGDOs embodying a 'movement' and of how that movement may be evolving into a transnational force for historical change in the realm of development praxis, it is necessary first of all to describe what the universe of NGDOs consists of and how it has evolved over time. Part One of this paper will therefore be concerned with undertaking a three part review of the ideological and organizational evolution of both the Northern and Southern NGDO communities from the 1600s to the 1990s. Although the histories of these communities are undeniably intertwined, for ease of analysis the Northern and Southern constituents of this community will be considered separately in Chapters II and III. Chapter IV, however, will be concerned with examining two initiatives jointly undertaken by Southern and Northern NGDOs at the international level in the 1990s, which serve to indicate that despite their different histories, a self-conscious identity as a global community of NGDOs is emerging.

In undertaking this historical analysis these chapters are ultimately concerned with delineating three broad trends which characterize the evolution of the international NGDO community. These trends include: [1] the development of a self-conscious awareness on behalf of both the Northern and Southern constituents

of the NGDO community that it is an organized agent of civil society with interests and agendas separate from those of the state; [2] a movement towards an ideological convergence on behalf of Northern and Southern NGDOs around the principle of promoting democratic development through a strategy of nurturance of popular organizations; and [3] the expansion and consolidation of coordinated international policy advocacy activity on behalf of Northern and Southern NGDOs. The three chapters of Part One will be concerned with identifying these trends as they have emerged in different periods of NGDO history.

Because it is in the post-colonial period that Northern and Southern NGDOs have undergone the most rapid changes, both numerically and with regard to strategic orientations, it is this period which will receive the most intensive examination. Nonetheless, the earlier period is an important one, because placing the relationship between the Northern NGDOs and their respective governments in historical perspective serves to highlight the extent of the transformation which Northern NGDOs have undergone in the last three decades, and why they have come to be viewed by many analysts as agents of civil society with an agenda and strategic orientation independent of, and at times in conflict with, the foreign and domestic policy positions of Northern governments.

This historical perspective is also important in that it allows for an analysis of Southern NGDOs which is sensitive to the fact that differences between them and their Northern partners are rooted in histories that are specific to each region. At the same time this perspective can account for the thickening web of linkages that unite

Northern and Southern NGDOs as a community which is becoming increasingly organized and self-conscious of its role as a force for change in the formulation and execution of the development policies of national governments and multilateral aid institutions.

CHAPTER II

EUROPEAN, CANADIAN AND AMERICAN NGDOs 1600-1990

Brian Smith has argued that the history of Northern NGDOs is characterized by three distinct periods of development. The first of these spans the period between 1600 and the beginning of World War II and is characterized by a rapid increase in the growth of missionary organizations, cultural associations, and war-time relief agencies which played a 'system maintenance' role with regard to home governments' foreign policies. That is, these NGDOs either adopted a self-conscious role in support of home government policies in overseas colonial territories, and/or as in the case of the International Red Cross, adopted a neutral position with regard to the war policies of Northern governments. The second period includes the World War II years and the beginning of the 1960s, and is characterized by the emergence of a new group of NGDOs who began to distance themselves from, and at times actively oppose, Northern governments' foreign policy agendas. The third is the post-colonial period and spans the 1960s to the 1990s. It is characterized by an entrenchment of an advocacy stance on behalf of NGDOs, and a shift away from a predominantly relief focus toward a focus on analyzing and dealing with the longer term problems associated with poverty.

The following discussion of Northern NGDOs will therefore be divided into an overview of these periods.²⁰

I

System Maintenance 1600 - 1940

Beginning in the early sixteenth century, religious orders and congregations sent personnel and resources to the Americas, East Africa, Southern Asia and the Far East who sought to convert indigenous peoples to Christianity and who provided a variety of social and humanitarian services in education, health and social welfare. Subsidized by the Spanish and Portuguese Crowns for both their religious and social work, the earliest missionary organizations emerged from the Iberian Peninsula and travelled to the Americas where they were perceived, by themselves and the crown, as an agent of the crown in the Spanish and Portuguese empires. Hence the vast majority of Catholic missionaries in the Americas, with the notable exceptions of Bartolome de las Casa and Antonio Valdivieso, neither protested the treatment of the indigenous peoples at the hands of the *conquistadores* nor supported the political independence movements that spread through the Spanish Americas in the nineteenth century.²¹

²⁰Smith, More Than Altruism: chapters 2, 3, and 4, *passim*.

²¹Lloyd J. Meacham, Church and State in Latin America: A History of Politico-Ecclesiastical Relations (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966). Cited in Smith, More Than Altruism: 28.

In the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries - during the rapid expansion of colonization by Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium and the Netherlands in Africa, Asia and the Middle East - new Christian missionary societies were created by both Catholics and Protestants, who as in the case earlier with religious orders in Latin America, were subsidized by home governments for the schools, clinics, orphanages and other charitable works they administered. These organizations were joined by American and Canadian religious groups in the late nineteenth century. As in the Latin American case, the expatriate missionary population and societies tended to support the legitimacy of colonial rule, were not openly critical of the colonial policies of home governments, and were largely unsupportive of the independence movements which emerged in Africa and Asia in the early and mid-twentieth century.²²

In the late 1850s the International Committee of the Red Cross was founded in Switzerland to care for the wounded in the War of Italian Succession, and spawned the establishment of national Red Cross societies in Europe, Canada, and the United States to aid victims of other wars. In order to carry out their work these societies adopted a neutral position with regard to the war policies of their respective governments, and were partially subsidized by governments as they were recognized by them as valuable agencies in caring for each nation's wounded during war. Like the missionary societies then, although for different reasons, the Red Cross societies

²²Hastings. History of African Christianity: 5-34, 86-107. Cited in Smith. More Than Altruism: 29.

were not openly critical of the foreign policy decisions of national governments.²³

In addition to missionary organizations and the Red Cross, educational, labour and professional associations, temperance societies and women's emancipation groups began to support overseas activities in education and humanitarian service in various parts of the South during the 19th century. Between 1850 and 1910 the number of private non-profit institutions based in Europe, Canada and the United States that engaged in some form of overseas activity grew from 66 to 344 - an increase of more than 400 percent in sixty years. There was then, a burgeoning of international activity by religious denominations, humanitarian societies, and labour and cultural associations throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that coincided with both the expansion of colonialism and the spread of North Atlantic economic and political influence in Latin America, Africa, the Middle East and Asia.²⁴

World War I and its aftermath provided a stimulus for another surge of growth of international humanitarian relief organizations, who, as in the case of the Red Cross, remained relatively apolitical with regard to the war related foreign policies of their respective governments. In the early years of the war, relief efforts were organized by private citizens in the United States, Canada, Great

²³David P. Forsythe, Humanitarian Politics: The International Committee of the Red Cross (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977). Cited in Smith, More Than Altruism: 30.

²⁴Jorgan Lissner, The Politics of Altruism: A Study of the Political Behaviour of Voluntary Development Agencies (Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 1977). Cited in Smith, More Than Altruism: 31.

Britain, Australia, and New Zealand to assist victims in Belgium and France. Co-funded by their respective governments, these efforts resulted in the creation of some of the largest Canadian and European NGDOs currently in operation, including Swedish Save the Children (1919), World University Service in Switzerland (1919), Danish Church Aid (1922), Canadian Save the Children (1923) and Canadian Foster Parents Plan (1937).

II

World War II and the Origins of Dissent

World War II marked a watershed in the evolution of European NGDOs as it was in response to the unprecedented destruction of the war that a new generation of NGDOs emerged in the allied countries. These NGDOs differed from their predecessors in that they were formed by coalitions of dissident groups in France and England and served as vehicles through which these coalitions both expressed open dissent to home government policies and worked to achieve their objectives.

Ecumenical Aid Service (CIMADE) was established by French Protestant churches in 1939 to assist refugees fleeing the advance of Naziism in Europe and continued operations after the surrender of France in 1940. Throughout the remainder of the war it ministered to the needs of political prisoners in detention centers in France and on several occasions protested the Vichy government's treatment of

captives. It also used its own church networks to assist Jewish citizens in France to avoid deportation to Germany.²⁵

Founded in 1942 by a group of faculty and students at Oxford University, The Oxford Famine Relief Committee in Great Britain (later called Oxfam), in concert with a number of prominent British citizens led by the Anglican Bishop of Chichester, Dr George Bell, publicly protested the allied policy of total war against the Axis powers. The group also protested the economic blockade of the continent of Europe on the grounds that it hurt not the Germans but the civilians in the occupied countries sympathetic to the allies. This group organized a delegation to the British Ministry of Economic Warfare and a written petition of eight thousand signatures demanding a lifting of the blockade so that relief supplies could be shipped into Belgium and Greece. Although the petition was denied, the committee succeeded in mounting a modest aid effort of its own by sending resources to the Greek Red Cross for noncombatant famine victims.²⁶

III

The Post-Colonial Period and the Shift From Relief to Development

As economic recovery accelerated in Europe throughout the 1940s and 1950s, NGDOs based in larger European nations, especially

²⁵Smith, More Than Altruism: 42-43.

²⁶Smith, More Than Altruism: 42-43.

Great Britain and France, expanded their relief efforts to other parts of the world suffering the ravages of war or famine - particularly where their colonial interests were strong. But it was not until the UN Food and Agriculture Organization initiated the Freedom From Hunger Campaign (FFHC) in 1960, that the predominantly relief focus among European and Canadian NGDOs began to give way to a theoretical and practical concentration on longer term solutions, and, that NGDOs began to act as advocates for changes in official development policies.

The campaign brought NGDOs into closer cooperation with other organizations in their home societies through service on national FFHC committees which included their own representatives as well as those of political parties, church groups, governments, professional associations and trade union organizations. In some instances, new NGDOs grew out of FFHC committees and as a result had in their ranks from the start significant trade union or political party activists, many of whom were arguing publicly against home-country policies towards overseas territories and newly emerging nations in the 1960s.²⁷

Older groups in Britain, such as Oxfam, worked closely with trade unions, parties and government representatives on the FFHC campaign. These groups not only supported overseas projects but

²⁷The Catholic Committee/Freedom From Hunger in Spain (1959), The Committee for the Freedom from Hunger Campaign and the Catholic Committee Against Hunger (1961), both in France, Freedom from Hunger (later renamed German Agro Action in the FRG (1962), and the Catholic Fund for Overseas Development (CAFOD) in Great Britain (1962), were all examples of this new type of NGDO that emerged out of the FAO campaign with a close affinity to other organizations in their societies with political agendas.

acted as a pressure group against Conservative Party governments to grant independence to British colonies in Africa and Asia and to commit greater resources to their socio-economic development. Hence in the early 1960s, many European NGDOs began to act as part of wider political coalitions in their home countries working to support independence for colonies, and to bring about increased foreign public aid to alleviate world hunger. They also initiated development education campaigns to heighten public awareness about these issues.²⁸

For the Canadian NGDO community, as for those in Europe, the 1960s represented a coming of age. The creation of the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC) in 1964, and the establishment of regional CCIC committees in British Columbia, the Prairies, Ontario, Quebec, and the Atlantic provinces was the first step toward inter-agency cooperation and advocacy.²⁹ This development coincided with the expansion of the External Aid Office created in 1960, into an autonomous government department renamed the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) in 1968, which in its first year disbursed \$5 million to 50 development projects carried out by 20 agencies.³⁰

It was during the late 1960s that the first of the volunteers, sent by new private volunteer sending organizations modelled on the International Civil Service active in European reconstruction, began

²⁸Benedict Nightingale, Charities (London: Allen Press, 1988). Cited in Smith, More Than Altruism: 79.

²⁹Brodhead, Bridges of Hope?: 19-20.

³⁰Brodhead, Bridges of Hope?: 3-4.

returning to their home countries. These experiences in concert with intellectual influences ranging from Paolo Freire, Andre Gunder Frank and Ivan Illich contributed to an awareness among the Canadian NGDO community that 'development' entailed more than the simple transfer of material assistance. This awareness in turn motivated the beginning of a shift from material assistance, in the form of child and family sponsorship and emergency relief, toward a longer term development focus emphasizing small projects, appropriate technology and efforts to animate local communities with a view to strengthening capacities for self-reliance. This led as well to the initiation of development education activities designed to stimulate awareness and support for international development efforts among Canadians, and an orientation toward policy advocacy which entailed both lobbying the government directly, and the mobilization of public opinion against Northern trade and aid policies which were perceived as injurious to the interests of the South.

In addition to this shift in focus from relief to development, and from 'system maintenance' to advocacy, European and Canadian NGDOs were growing in terms of absolute numbers and financial resources. One of the reasons lay in the fact that by the mid 1970s NGDOs themselves were engaging in active lobbying campaigns to persuade their respective parliaments to initiate or substantially increase public subsidies for their own overseas activities. Many made the argument to their governments that they had a comparative advantage over public agencies both in reaching the poor and in meeting basic needs. By the mid 1970s European and Canadian NGDOs were sharing information and strategies on a regular

basis through participation in regional federations of NGDOs such as the International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA) in Geneva and the International Cooperation for Socio-Economic Development (CIDSE) headquartered in Brussels, which increased their expertise in the field and their effectiveness as a lobbying force.³¹ Public assistance to European and Canadian NGDOs grew in real terms by over \$520 million (325 percent) between 1973 and 1983 and private donations to European and Canadian NGDOs grew by 44 percent in real terms over the same period - indicating that these NGDOs were successful in their lobbying efforts on the public front, and in development education on the private front.³²

The process of change with regard to the strategic orientation of Canadian and European NGDOs continued to evolve throughout the 1980s on two fronts. The first of these entails an entrenchment on behalf of much of the NGDO community away from an apolitical relief orientation and toward a politicized technical and institution building one. The second of these entails an ideological evolution of what Inglehart has termed 'post-material values' which are being articulated by the NGDO community as a 'participatory development' paradigm.

³¹Smith, More Than Altruism: 105-106.

³²Smith, More Than Altruism: 197.

Politicization

Brian Smith's survey of forty-five North Atlantic NGDOs led him to distinguish between three types of agencies differentiated on the basis of strategic orientation: *relief agencies* oriented toward alleviating immediate suffering with food, clothing and medical supplies; *technical assistance agencies* oriented toward supporting training, education, and credit initiatives, as well as basic physical infrastructure; and *institution building agencies* oriented to supporting multi-purpose development programs that, in addition to the provision of services, strengthen local private community organizations attempting to make the marginalized, whether on the basis of class, race or gender, more aware of the deeper underlying causes.³³ His survey revealed that approximately three-fourths of the overseas aid of the 125 largest European and Canadian NGDOs in 1980 was administered by NGDOs that were predominantly technical assistance or multiservice institution building agencies.³⁴

The North-South study of the Canadian NGDO community augments these findings and indicates a clear pattern over the 1975-1985 period. In 1975, seventeen agencies supported child sponsorship and eighteen specialized in direct material assistance, such as providing blankets, clothing or medical supplies. By 1985, thirteen of the original seventeen agencies supporting child

³³The 45 NGDOs represented only 22 percent of the largest 205 agencies in 1980 but accounted for nearly one-half (48.1 percent) of the overseas aid resources of these 205 agencies. The study included fifteen NGDOs based in the United States, seven in Canada, and twenty-three in the six West European countries

³⁴Smith, *More Than Altruism*: 131.

sponsorship had cut the child sponsorship share of their program budgets, and twelve of the eighteen relief agencies had reduced their involvement, many of them eliminating it altogether. The study also indicates that by 1986 almost one third (30.5 percent) of Canadian NGDO disbursements were directed to multiservice institution building.³⁵

Part of the reason for this shift lies in the fact that well over four-fifths of government assistance in Canada (84.9 percent) and Europe (91.3 percent) went to NGDOs supporting long term structural types of overseas programs. Hence, according to Smith's study, in 1980 government subsidies accounted for 21.8 percent of the budget of Canadian relief NGDOs, 37.4 percent of the budget of technical assistance NGDOs, and 41.3 percent of the budget of multiservice institution building NGDO's.³⁶ The other reason for this shift lies in the fact that only 30 percent of private donations went through relief type NGDOs in Canada and only 36.9 percent in Europe. Sixty to seventy percent of philanthropy in Canada and Europe donated to NGDOs then, was channeled to those with a long-term development orientation, indicating that the support bases of these organizations endorsed the orientation toward a technical assistance and multiservice institution building strategy.³⁷

Smith's study also revealed that not only were NGDO resources increasingly geared toward structural rather than relief types of assistance but that these agencies were explicit in defining the goal

³⁵Brodhead, Bridges of Hope?: 16.

³⁶Smith, More Than Altruism. Appendix C, Tables 4,5,6: 299-301.

³⁷Smith, More Than Altruism: 133.

of realigning political and economic power distributions in favour of the poor as integral to overseas objectives. Only one out of the six largest Canadian agencies that ranked their agency's priorities and only three of nineteen in Europe, ruled out empowerment of the marginalized to challenge and change the dominant political and economic institutions in their environments. Many considered this objective to be part of a top cluster of priorities, related to promoting participatory organizations among the marginalized and increasing bargaining skills of low-income groups vis-a-vis significant elites who affect their lives.³⁸

Most Canadian and European NGDO representatives spoke very frankly about the explicit political (but non-party affiliated) character of their organizations. Lawrence S. Cumming, National Secretary of Oxfam Canada in 1983, stated:

We support certain causes in polarized situations - e.g., in Central America. You are on one side or the other and this can't be avoided. ... We now judge projects both on technical criteria (sound, self-sustaining, etc.) and on social-political criteria. Does the group have a vision for change and empowerment - ie., some sort of structural analysis and mobilization of the people to change institutions.³⁹

Tim Brodhead, executive director of INTER PARES in 1983, which supported overseas popular organization programs and exchanges between Canadian and Southern community organizations, acknowledged that development inherently required working for

³⁸Smith, More Than Altruism: 134-135.

³⁹Smith, More Than Altruism: 135.

empowerment of people and that political motives shaped INTER PARES' decisions about taking on new projects:

We recently began working with refugees in Central America. We got into this work for political reasons - so as to be able to speak out in Canada on Central American issues ... Development is not so much about education and training, but analysis of currents of social change and finding ways to empower people to change structures and act collectively.⁴⁰

Juan Josi, Project Officer in MISEREOR, the official Catholic development agency in West Germany, also indicated that a political perspective informs MISEREOR's selection of projects:

We also see projects in the function of social change - vis., on behalf of freedom and social rights. We look for integral human development, not just a technical goal. We believe that capitalism can work in a humane way but justice must be done within it. Therefore, structural change is sometimes necessary to achieve this.⁴¹

Moreover, representatives of six of the seven Canadian NGOs included in the study stated that part of their mission in Canada was to affect Canadian government foreign policy decision making. Working through the auspices of the CCIC these included (1) pressure on the Canadian government to renew aid to Cuba, Vietnam and Kampuchea; (2) pressure on CIDA to provide assistance to Nicaragua after the 1979 revolution; (3) pressure for parliamentary restrictions on Canadian trade with South Africa; (4) urging the Department of External Affairs to take a more independent stance from U.S. foreign

⁴⁰Smith, More Than Altruism: 137.

⁴¹Smith, More Than Altruism: 137.

policy towards Central America and Namibia; (5) pressure on the Canadian government to take a stance on political prisoners in Guatemala; (6) pressure on the government to lift countervailing duties on Tanzanian sisal; and, (7) petitioning the government to place more emphasis on basic needs and human rights in its foreign aid programs. Although these NGDOs acknowledged that success had been only marginal or not forthcoming on several of these issues, they cited some cases which resulted in a change of government policy including the expression of concern for Guatemalan political prisoners by the Canadian ambassador, the lifting of import duties on the Tanzanian goods, and the dispatch of Canadian government grain to Nicaragua as well as contributions to its literacy campaign.⁴²

This finding is borne out by the trend in advocacy activity established by the North-South Institute study. In 1970 only two NGDOs, CUSO and a coalition of church groups, appeared before the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs' enquiry into Canadian - Caribbean relations. In 1980 eleven agencies presented written statements and a further seven appeared before the Parliamentary Task Force on North-South relations. Most recently, in 1986 fifty written statements were presented by NGDOs to the the House of Commons Standing Committee on External Affairs and a further fifty appeared in person before the Committee. The 1986 North-South survey also indicated that forty-six percent of Canadian NGDOs attached importance to policy advocacy and that fifteen percent of these view policy advocacy as an integral part of their mandate.⁴³

⁴²Smith, More Than Altruism: 143.

⁴³Brodhead, Bridges of Hope?: 50.

Smith's survey led him to observe, however, that in contrast to the European and Canadian NGDO communities, a relief focus dominates the largest U.S. NGDOs - which account for nearly two-thirds of total U.S. NGDO resource transfers. A major reason for this, according to Smith, has been governmental food and food-related subsidies that are provided to just a few very large agencies, and account for 60 percent of their budgets. In the 1950s the government began using NGDOs to help in the disposal abroad of food surpluses that the U.S. Department of Agriculture purchased from American farmers to keep domestic food prices high. This pattern accelerated in the 1960s and continues to be the thrust of overall resource allocations of the whole NGDO community. Hence although government cash subsidies between 1973 and 1980 substantially increased, the food proportion remained about the same - accounting for 65.1 percent in 1973 and 66.1 percent in 1981.⁴⁴

It is not, however, the U.S. government's agricultural policy alone that accounts for the predominance of a relief focus in overall NGDO aid resources. It is also the preferences of private donors who prefer to contribute to larger relief oriented NGDOs. Nearly two-fifths of the overseas aid of the largest relief oriented NGDOs in 1980 originated from private donations. This accounted for well over one-half of all private contributions to the eighty largest U.S. NGDOs.⁴⁵

Technically oriented and multiservice institution building NGDOs outnumber the larger relief agencies. In 1981, however, these accounted for only about one-fifth and one-fourth respectively of the

⁴⁴Smith, More Than Altruism: 117.

⁴⁵Smith, More Than Altruism: 118.

resources sent abroad by the twenty-three largest relief agencies. As a group they receive substantially less U.S. government aid than relief oriented NGDOs, with technically oriented agencies receiving about 33.4 percent and multiservice institution building agencies about 31.2 of their budget in government subsidies.⁴⁶

Moreover, respondents to Smith's study among relief and technically oriented NGDOs did not rank empowerment high on their list of priorities. Some of the respondents said it had no place in the scope of activities of a nonprofit organization in a developing country, as aiding the poor is essentially a humanitarian or technical issue and not related to politics. Some also indicated that their respective organizations could work under all types of regimes because they were totally apolitical.

In contrast, respondents from multiservice institution building NGDOs ranked enhancing recipient bargaining power vis-a-vis local merchants, credit institutions, government agencies etc., and building new participatory institutions and networks as the priorities of their organizations. Several commented on how these two goals fit together. The creation of private participatory structures among the poor would lead to enhancement of their bargaining position with other important social and economic groups or institutions that critically affect their lives. Nine out of the ten NGDOs in this category acknowledged that a totally apolitical position was impossible to maintain in their development organizations and all distinguished between what they considered to be a political position, which they

⁴⁶Smith, More Than Altruism, Appendix C, Tables 1,2,3: 294-298.

believed unavoidable given the nature of their work, and a partisan political position, involving close linkages with specific parties, which they believed harmful. Smith notes that "all respondents indicated that building grass-roots institutions among the poor had political implications with a 'small p' since, when these institutions were effective, they would eventually lead to a redistribution of power in society - economic and political - in favour of the poor."⁴⁷

Given the contrast between the activities of Canadian and European NGDOs and their American counterparts, it is obvious that the trend toward a politicized technical and institution building orientation is one of an uneven advance among the Northern NGDO community. The U.S. NGDO community as a whole displays a stronger orientation toward the relief of immediate suffering abroad than the European and Canadian communities, whereas, proportionately, far more NGDOs in Europe and Canada espouse significant political change abroad and attempt to influence public policies at home on behalf of Third World needs.

These critical differences may be interpreted as linked to the resource base of U.S. NGDO aid, as compared to European and Canadian NGDO aid, and to the different state/NGDO community relationships across the North Atlantic region. The degree of politicization displayed by NGDOs in the various North Atlantic regions does appear to be linked to the priorities established by home governments with regard to government subsidy disbursements, a point that will be returned to later in this essay.

⁴⁷Smith, More Than Altruism: 122.

Nonetheless, there is room to argue that politicization (or a relative lack thereof) is not the exclusive result of the effect of state funding priorities, but is also the result of the NGDO/membership and support base relationship.

Ideological Evolution

Smith's study revealed that the membership and support bases of many European and Canadian NGDOs in the 1980s were frequently constituted by organizations or ethnic groups having strong political convictions about foreign or domestic policy in the areas of arms reduction, international human rights, immigration policy, the environment, and women's rights, and, that it was from this sector that the personnel of many NGDOs originated.⁴⁸ This profile helps to explain the increasingly political (although non-party affiliated) orientation that these NGDOs assume.

Smith's research led him to conclude that some personnel gravitate to NGDOs because long established leftist parties cannot or have not consistently implemented policies associated with what Ronald Inglehart has termed a 'post-materialist' orientation. A significant number of the larger NGDOs have come to act as vehicles through which a growing number of Europeans and Canadians, and, to a lesser but still significant degree, Americans, express the values of 'post-materialism'; including intellectual, aesthetic, and

⁴⁸Smith. More Than Altruism: 160.

environmental advancement, and greater social, economic, and political equity at both the national and international levels. Many NGOs espouse development assistance objectives that are meaningful to this group, and, many of them are also linked into a domestic network of advocacy groups working on a range of issues that are perceived by them to be inter-related - such as arms reduction, international human rights, women's rights, poverty alleviation, and the environment.⁴⁹

This understanding of the membership and personnel basis of the majority of Canadian and European NGOs, and some U.S. NGOs, may go some way toward explaining the genesis of the 'participatory development paradigm' in the mid 1980s - a paradigm to which both NGOs and analysts seeking to understand the evolution of the NGO community are increasingly referring. David Korten, perhaps the most prolific of these analysts offers the following definition:

It [the participatory development paradigm] views development as a people's movement more than as a foreign funded government project. It looks to government to enable the people to develop themselves. It seeks a synthesis of the change objectives of the environmental, human rights, consumer, women's and peace movements. ⁵⁰

Although this paradigm will be elaborated on in Part Two of this paper it is worth noting at this point in the discussion that the synthesis of change objectives articulated in it moves NGOs beyond defining their roles as either relief or apolitical technical assistance

⁴⁹Smith, More Than Altruism: 160.

⁵⁰David Korten, Getting to the 21st Century: Voluntary Action and the Global Agenda (West Hartford: Kumarian Press, 1990): 5.

agencies and into the realm of advocacy, human empowerment and institution building. It also moves NGDOs beyond defining relations of power within a traditional Marxist framework which identifies them as revolving around ownership and control of factors of production. In effect, this paradigm is acknowledging contemporary post-marxist conceptions of power relations, such as those identified by the women's movement as revolving around patriarchy.

Nonetheless, while there is a trend on behalf of members of the Northern NGDO community toward identification with this paradigm, Korten cautions that this identification has progressed unevenly within the NGDO community. He has therefore proposed that a useful distinction may be drawn between four 'generations' or types of NGDOs, including: relief and welfare NGDOs; small scale, self-reliant local or community development NGDOs; sustainable systems development NGDOs; and fourth generation 'participatory development' NGDOs.⁵¹ Although the generational framework has been posited on an evolutionary progression of NGO activities, Korten notes that different generations not only exist simultaneously within the community, but may also exist within the same agency.

First generation strategies involve the NGDO in the direct delivery of services to meet an immediate deficiency or shortage experienced by the beneficiary population, such as needs for food, health care or shelter. Often characterized as 'humanitarian assistance' these agencies respond in emergency situations (war, flood, famine) directly to the individual or the family who is entirely

⁵¹The following discussion is taken from Getting to the 21st Century , 113-132, passim.

dependent on the funds, staff and administrative capability of the NGDO.

In contrast, second generation strategies focus the energies of the NGDO on developing the capacities of the people to better meet their own needs through self-reliant local action or community development. Activities are usually undertaken at the village level with popular organizations, and may involve development of health committees to carry out preventative health measures, improvement in agricultural services, the building of feeder roads, etc. In this sense, these activities can be categorized as technical assistance rather than relief type endeavors, but Korten notes that these activities are undertaken by NGDOs on the somewhat short-sighted assumption that the impediment to self-help lies exclusively in the individual's lack of skill, and not in structural constraints imposed by the national or regional political-economy.

It is this attention to structural constraints that characterizes third generation strategies, as these seek changes in policies and institutions at local, national and global levels that impede or are hostile to self-sustaining community level and popular organization development. The underlying theory of third generation strategies is grounded in an assumption that local inertia is sustained by structures that centralize control of resources, keep essential services from reaching the poor, and maintain systems of corruption and exploitation. Hence, Korten notes that:

Creating the necessary changes often depends on working simultaneously to build the capacity of the people to make demands on the system and working to build alliances with enlightened power holders in support of action that makes the system more responsive to the people. The third generation

strategies of Southern NGOs often benefit from financial and technical assistance, and political pressures provided by partner NGOs of the North⁵²

While these strategies are neither pursued nor advocated by the entire Northern NGDO community they begin to practically capture the role of NGDOs envisioned by participatory development theorists, namely as organizers and defenders of civil society within developing countries. This strategic civil society orientation becomes clearer in Korten's vague, but nonetheless, intriguing discussion of the strategy of fourth generation NGOs.

Although his discussion is not accompanied by specific examples of NGDOs pursuing this strategy his meaning is clear enough. He suggests that NGDOs must look beyond focused initiatives aimed at changing specific policies and institutional sub-systems and concentrate on promoting and energizing social movements (environmental, women's, peace, peasant, squatters, etc) already in motion in developing countries, and at the same time, through development education in the North, promote the various 'change values' contained in his definition of participatory development. While it is not clear how links with these movements will be established or maintained, nor what the outcome of the struggles these movements are engaged in will be, it is clear that this orientation, if adopted is predicated on the assumption that the role of NGDOs in development is to promote the strengthening of civil society.

⁵²Korten, Getting to the 21st Century, 121

This chapter has suggested that the ideologies and strategies of North Atlantic NGDOs are evolving unevenly but perceptibly in the direction of a strategic civil society orientation. Changes, or conversely, the lack of change in the ideology and strategies of Northern NGDOs over the post-colonial period may be linked both to the funding orientations of governments across the North Atlantic region and to an ideological evolution of post-material values among NGDO staff and private support bases. There is, also, however, another factor at work, namely sustained interaction with Southern NGDOs and popular organizations over the post-colonial period. The once again uneven but perceptible evolution of Southern NGDOs towards a strategic civil society identity is examined in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III

THE EVOLUTION OF SOUTHERN NGDOs: REGIONAL PATTERNS

The overview of the Latin American, African, Asian, and South-East Asian NGDO communities which follows must be prefaced with the observation that it cannot do justice to the intra-regional economic and political diversities which have affected NGDO development. Nonetheless, as the purpose of these regional overviews is to demonstrate that, like Northern NGDOs, Southern NGDOs have evolved into civil society organizations who represent the interests of civil society vis-a-vis the state, and to broadly capture the evolving strategic orientations, and national and regional institutional networks of NGDOs, these descriptions should suffice.

At this point in the discussion, however, it is useful to draw a distinction between contemporary Northern NGDOs, Southern NGDOs, and popular organizations, and to outline the relationship between them. Although there is considerable debate in the literature with regard to appropriate organizational labels, Northern NGDOs may be defined as non-profit organizations based in the Northern industrial countries which fund and implement development projects either directly through links with Southern popular organizations, or indirectly through links with Southern national NGDOs. Southern NGDOs may be defined as private non-profit organizations whose principal function is to implement development projects favouring

popular sectors. The sources of financial support are almost always Northern NGDOs operating in the framework of international development cooperation, although in some cases national governments and multilateral aid institutions may also channel resources through them. Popular organizations are composed of direct beneficiaries of development projects and may take the form of any number of neighbourhood associations, agricultural cooperatives, peasant unions, women's groups, political interest groups, etc., which have proliferated in the post-colonial period.⁵³

I

Latin America

Leilah Landim argues that the category of NGDO is very much in the process of being forged in Latin America. Until the mid-1960s NGDO activities in Latin America were oriented primarily toward charitable welfare and were premised on the prevailing wisdom of the time - namely, that the solution to underdevelopment would be found in the large-scale transfer of resources and technology, and that this transfer would be managed by the state. Most NGDO efforts involved transfers of food surpluses from Northern donors as a stop-gap measure to relieve food shortages among the poor.⁵⁴

⁵³Mario Padron, "Non-Governmental Development Organizations": 70-71, and, Leilah Landim, "Non-Governmental Organizations in Latin America," *World Development*, Vol 15 (1987) Supplement: 30.

⁵⁴Landim, "Non-Governmental Organizations in Latin America": 32.

During the 1970s, however, buttressed by the politically activist stance of the Catholic church and liberation theology, and key Latin American opinion leaders who began to question both conventional development ideology and the excesses of authoritarian rule, a new type of NGDO emerged which redefined its social role and created new forms of social intervention. These NGDOs defined their role as one of resistance and renunciation of government development policies and affirmed during this period their orientation to civil society and commitment to democratic processes - a characteristic which has endured throughout the 1980s and 1990s.

Support for small-scale local development initiatives, and the organization of the popular sectors, became part of a campaign during the 1970s to protest state policies and to strengthen grass-roots resistance movements. Amidst the democratization process in the 1980s, NGDOs became increasingly active in direct community intervention designed to motivate the participation, autonomy, and democratic practices of popular organizations. This, according to Landim, "is sensible, especially in a context such as Latin America where there is a strong authoritarian tradition and exclusion of popular sectors from decision-making and full citizenship."⁵⁵

Mario Padron argues that in addition to this attribute, Latin American NGDOs maintain democratic spaces even under dictatorial regimes, contribute to redemocratization processes in their societies, and help to create, maintain or expand existing forms of democracy. They serve as institutions through which dissident intellectuals can

⁵⁵Landim, "Non-Governmental Organizations in Latin America": 34.

remain active and employed rather than emigrating, and their activities promote democratic transition processes by providing spaces for ideological debate and convergence among progressive political parties that are often extremely divided.⁵⁶

Although there is clearly a trend toward the establishment of national and regional coordinating bodies they have not as yet been institutionalized. The promotion of large conferences of NGDO leaders in Latin America to address this issue is a relatively recent phenomenon. So too is consideration of the issues of relationships with funding agencies and other social actors, the contribution of NGDOs to the process of democracy, and, in Landim's words "the possibility of NGDOs acting in the sphere of what has been called 'informal diplomacy' and establishing specific channels and conditions for international relations separate from relations among states, governments, corporations, and other powerful institutions such as churches and political parties."⁵⁷ Nonetheless, the fact that these issues are being discussed indicates that an identity as a network of civil society organizations adopting a conscious civil-society orientation both nationally and internationally is growing among Latin American NGDOs.

⁵⁶Padron, "Non-Governmental Development Organizations": 74-75.

⁵⁷Landim, "Non-Governmental Organizations in Latin America": 36.

II

Africa

Micheal Bratton has identified Africa's first modern NGDOs as the ethnic welfare associations that emerged in the latter days of colonial rule. These associations served urbanized Africans as vehicles through which to articulate demands for the provision of essential services by colonial governments, and as the foundations for nationalist political parties. Throughout the post-colonial period NGDO involvement in African development has grown rapidly, but more so than in Latin America and Asia, this growth has been associated with the inability of governments to deliver basic services or to implement economic programs for the benefit of the rural and urban poor.⁵⁸

The activities of NGDOs in the delivery of services, however, has been a source of tension between NGDOs and governments. Governments have characteristically based claims for the legitimacy of authoritarian, one-party states on their ability to deliver essential services and act as the agents of national development. In this context, it is not unusual for NGDOs that demonstrate competency in service delivery to be perceived as a political threat. Therefore, although African governments have generally tolerated NGDOs that provide relief and basic services, they have been monitored closely, and NGDOs concerned with civil, political and economic rights and

⁵⁸Micheal Bratton, "The Politics of Government - NGO Relations in Africa," World Development Vol 17, No 4 (1989): 572-76, *passim*.

community activism have largely been actively suppressed.⁵⁹

Unlike Latin American NGDOs then, African NGDOs oriented toward the promotion of democratic pluralism have been slower to take root, and in general African NGDOs are less inclined to openly engage in activities that go beyond conventional service delivery operations. This is not to say, however, that NGDOs engaged in the organization and empowerment of the marginalized, especially in rural areas, do not exist. But as Sithembiso Nyoni cogently argues they are often invisible to Northern NGDOs by virtue of government suppression which may take the form of non-access to national and regional coordinating bodies which control access to donor agencies.⁶⁰

The development of coordinating bodies in Africa at national levels has been fairly brisk and sustained. Some coordinating bodies, particularly in East and Central Africa, were formed as councils of social service agencies in the immediate post independence period and have since incorporated members which do include agencies whose mandates are oriented toward advocacy with regard for civil, political and economic rights. In general, however, African coordinating bodies typically have close, and highly regulated, relations with governments. According to a 1981 PACT (Private Agencies Collaborating Together, New York) report on NGDO coordinating bodies in Africa, "some were set up by governments, some receive assistance from governments, others have government officials on the governing boards, and still others are staffed by

⁵⁹Micheal Bratton, "The Politics of Government - NGO Relations in Africa": 572-76, *passim*.

⁶⁰Sithembiso Nyoni, "Indigenous NGOs: Liberation, Self-Reliance, and Development," World Development, Vol 15 (1987) Supplement: 55.

personnel loaned from government ministries."⁶¹ In Burkina Faso the government looked to the Secretariat Permanent des ONGs (SPONG) as a means of 'keeping track' of NGDO activity, while in Togo the government invited Conseil des Organismes non Gouvernementaux en Action au Togo (CONGAT) to play a role in 'coordinating' NGDO activity with government policy.⁶²

Given the general trend of African government hostility to all but service oriented NGDOs it is not surprising that indigenous NGDOs generally look to coordinating bodies for services to which they do not have access on their own, such as technical information, technical training and links to donors, and not as forums from which to challenge national development policies or to promote democratic policies with regard to civil and political rights. Nonetheless, in the context of a post-colonial period characterized by the emergence of highly authoritarian, one-party regimes, the existence of service oriented NGDOs may be regarded as evidence of a latent civil society capacity to maintain a sphere of limited autonomy from the state.

This interpretation is augmented by the fact that in June of 1987 the Dakar Conference brought together NGDO representatives from 18 African countries and resulted in the establishment of a Pan African umbrella organization known as the Forum of African Voluntary Development Organizations (FAVDO). Included in FAVDO's mandate are the objectives of providing a forum for mutual support and cooperation among African NGDOs through the establishment of

⁶¹Carolyn Stremlau, "NGO Coordinating Bodies in Africa, Asia, and Latin America," World Development, Vol 15 (1987) Supplement: 218.

⁶²Stremlau, "NGO Coordinating Bodies in Africa, Asia and Latin America": 219.

mechanisms for exchange of expertise, resources and facilities; the creation of an environment conducive to NGDO initiatives; and, the establishment of effective channels of communication with governments and intergovernmental organizations for the "purposes of advocacy and partnership in development."⁶³

While the operationalization of these objectives will be an ongoing process, this conference and the establishment of FAVDO indicates that in addition to strengthening their service delivery expertise, African NGDOs are in the process of evolving into an organized transcontinental community and exploring the possibility of establishing channels and networks that would allow them to act both nationally, and in the sphere of international relations, as advocates for NGDO development initiatives in Africa.

III

South and South East Asia

In South Asia, the modern NGDO movement can be traced to the movement for independence, and in particular to the response elicited in the 1920s and 1930s by Mahatma Gandhi's call to work in solidarity among the rural poor and castes. Other NGDOs were founded in this period principally for the relief and rehabilitation of

⁶³Hussein Adam and David Brown, "Forum of African Voluntary Development Organizations: Observations of the Dakar Conference, May/June 1987," World Development, Vol 15 (1987) Supplement: 251-252.

victims of floods and wars, and between the mid-1960s and mid-1970s many of these became successful innovators in areas of appropriate technology, adult education, and health care.⁶⁴

In the mid 1970s a new ethos emerged among NGDOs disenchanted with conventional development theories and state led development strategies and the empowerment theme became central for many NGDOs throughout South and Southeast Asia. Efforts were focussed on village level organizing and consciousness-raising among the marginalized and evolved throughout the 1980s to include a growing commitment to the democratization of institutions at the national as well as the local level. There has also been a growing commitment to advocacy in support of the sustainable use of environmental resources, women's emancipation, human rights and civil rights throughout the region.⁶⁵

Unlike Latin America, Asia and Southeast Asia is characterized by a number of coordinating bodies organized at the national level. Somewhat like African coordinating bodies these 'official' coordinating bodies are largely controlled by governments, and are oriented to the provision of technical services, training, and information to their members. A 1984 PACT study of four South Asian countries concluded, however, that national-level coordinating bodies were playing only limited roles and that existing alongside them was a vibrant network of unofficial coordinating bodies organized by NGDOs themselves. These were providing training and

⁶⁴David Korten, "The Role of Nongovernmental Organizations in Development": 29, in Paul and Arturo (eds.), Nongovernmental Organizations and the World Bank (Washington D.C.: The World Bank, 1991).

⁶⁵Korten, "The Role of Nongovernmental Organizations in Development": 29.

technical assistance and facilitating the coordination of NGDOs at local levels, as well as acting as advocates for their members increased involvement in development policy making at national and sub-national levels.⁶⁶

The study also indicated that there were growing numbers of sector-specific membership organizations. The Voluntary Health Services Society in Bangladesh focused on health and family planning and Wana Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia (WAHLI) created an active program on environment and development. In Sri Lanka two organizations with specific interests - the NGO Water Supply and Sanitation Decade Service and the Sri Lanka Women's Conference - were building records of concrete service and advocacy on behalf of its members.⁶⁷

Although national variations in the size and vibrancy of the NGDO community inevitably exist, the Asian NGDO community formed the Asian NGDO Coalition (ANGOC) in 1980 which has assumed an overtly activist orientation with regard to the role of NGDOs in promoting the democratic process at community and national levels. ANGOC has also been an advocate of the role of the NGDO community in transforming the development policies, and agendas, of Northern NGDOs, Northern governments and multi-lateral aid agencies. One of the consequences of this is that ANGOC plays an increasingly important role in setting and shaping the agendas of

⁶⁶Stremlau, "NGO Coordinating Bodies in Africa, Asia, and Latin America": 219.

⁶⁷Stremlau, "NGO Coordinating Bodies in Africa, Asia, and Latin America": 219.

annual meetings of Northern NGDO consortia, including that of InterAction, the consortium body of U.S. NGDOs.⁶⁸

Like the Latin American and African NGDO communities, the Asian and South Asian community displays a growing civil society orientation. It has developed a dense web of networks partially autonomous of the state sphere, and is evolving into a regional community that is formalizing and institutionalizing its activity in the realm of international relations.

⁶⁸Korten, Getting to the 21st Century: 94.

CHAPTER IV

CONSOLIDATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL NGDO COMMUNITY: THE 1990s

In order to complete this overview of the evolution of the international NGDO community it is necessary to devote some attention to its organized transnational activities, as these bear significantly on this analysis. As discussed in chapters II and III, Northern and Southern NGDOs, in contradistinction to governments, have created a number of national and international consortia and federations which serve as forums for the discussion of NGDO development strategies and as forums from which policy advocacy is launched. At the national level in Canada and the United States these consortia are the Canadian Council for International Cooperation (CCIC) and InterAction respectively. At the international level, Northern NGDOs have organized the International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA) in Geneva and the International Cooperation for Socio-Economic Development Organization (CIDSE) in Brussels. Similarly, the African community of NGDOs has organized the Forum of African Voluntary Development Organizations (FAVDO) and the Asian community the Asian NGDO coalition (ANGOC), and while an organization comparable to these has not yet been institutionalized in Latin America, a process in this direction is clearly underway.

In the last four years, however, two events have occurred that serve to give expression to a perception of Northern and Southern NGDOs comprising an increasingly united and organized social force in the international development community. The first of these events is embodied by The Manila Declaration on People's Participation and Sustainable Development authored by the participants of the Inter-Regional Consultation on People's Participation in Sustainable Development, held in Manila in June of 1989.⁶⁹ The content of the Declaration, which will be elaborated on in Part Two, is important in and of itself as it is a statement of principle committed to promoting democratic development through the nurturance of people's organizations. However, its significance at this point in the analysis lies in the fact that it was crafted by thirty-one NGDO leaders from Africa, Southeast Asia, South Asia, the South Pacific, Latin America, the Caribbean, North America and Europe. Despite the regional diversities, these leaders were united around an understanding that this principle should inform Northern and Southern NGDO strategic action in the realm of both technical assistance and multiservice institution building. This statement then, lends credence to an analysis which identifies a trend toward an ideological convergence of Northern and Southern NGDOs around the empowerment of popular organizations.

The most recent indication of the evolution of the international NGDO community into an increasingly 'united front' with regard to policy advocacy in the national and international arenas, however,

⁶⁹ANGOC, The Manila Declaration on People's Participation and Sustainable Development (Manila, Philippines, 1989).

takes the form of the 39 International NGO forum (INGOF) treaties endorsed by the 3,180 representatives of development and environment NGDOs attending the alternative United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro in 1992.⁷⁰ This series of treaties augments the strategy of nurturance of people's organizations on the sub-national level with pledges to pressure Northern and Southern governments, and multilateral institutions for change in a number of issue areas. These include the establishment of a democratic process within the IBRD and IMF for resolution of the debt problem, restructuring the rules of the GATT in order to enhance access of Southern products to Northern markets, reducing military expenditures, and establishing sustainable economic and environmental development processes.⁷¹ Hence, through these treaties the NGDO community has pledged to pursue united action with regard to policy advocacy vis-a-vis national governments and multilateral institutions.

Moreover, in crafting these treaties the NGDO community has articulated a self-conscious perception of itself as an agent of civil society at both the national and international levels, and indicates that it is from this basis that policy advocacy will be undertaken. The Rio Declaration states:

For civil society, especially, the positive side is that, after the 1992 UNCED process it will be impossible for governments or international institutions to decide on our future without hearing

⁷⁰The NGDO Rio Conference treaties are available on the APC system under the entry UNCED TREATIES.

⁷¹International Forum of NGOs and Social Movements - Commitment for the Future, Treaty on Alternative Economic Models (Treaty #7), Rio de Janeiro, 1992.

our voices. On the basis of our new awareness and autonomy, we will fight for the democratization of states, the international organizations, and the UN itself. We will fight for the active participation of citizens in the various decision-making mechanisms and in control over their policies.⁷²

In addition to this pledge to pursue a united policy advocacy stance, the participants in the International NGO Forum identified themselves as agents that "will mobilize the forces of transnational civil society behind a widely shared agenda that bonds our many social movements in pursuit of just, sustainable, and participatory human societies."⁷³ From the perspective of this study, the choice of language, and in particular, the reference to 'transnational civil society' is significant as it suggests the subjective emergence of an organized transnational civil society identity among the NGDO community.

The self-expression of this identity is of importance for the introduction to this study identified the NGDO sector, together with national and multilateral aid institutions, as the actors central to the international aid regime, and argued that the NGDO sector's activities within this sphere *objectively* establish it as a 'transnational' actor. The subjective expression of this identity therefore serves to augment this claim.

⁷²International Forum of NGOs and Social Movements - Commitment for the Future, Treaty on Alternative Economic Models (Treaty #7), Rio de Janeiro, 1992.

⁷³International Forum of NGOs and Social Movements, The People's Earth Declaration/The NGO Proactive Agenda, Rio de Janeiro, 1992.

EPILOGUE TO PART ONE

Through the use of the lens of historical perspective Part One of this paper has been concerned with delineating three trends that characterize the evolution of the international NGDO community. The first is a trend towards a self-conscious awareness on behalf of the global NGDO community that it is an organized agent of civil society, at both national and international levels, with interests and agendas separate from those of the state, and multilateral institutions. The second is a trend toward a Northern and Southern ideological convergence around the principle of promoting participatory development through a strategy of nurturing popular organizations in the execution of both technical assistance and multiservice institution building projects. The third is a trend toward the expansion and consolidation of coordinated international policy advocacy activity on behalf of Northern and Southern NGDOs.

The first of these trends has evolved slowly, and unevenly, among Northern NGDOs. It was not until the second World War and the organization of new NGDOs composed of coalitions of groups dissatisfied with home government war policies that European NGDOs began to distance themselves from the foreign policy decisions of their governments and in some cases to actively oppose them. This distancing, and the assumption of an advocacy role on behalf of decolonization, grew throughout the 1950s and 1960s. The FFHC

campaign of the period served to enhance cooperation and communication between NGDOs and other organizations searching for longer term structural solutions to the causes of hunger and poverty and contributed to the thickening of a web of informal networks between European NGDOs, who lobbied for increased foreign aid budgets and on behalf of their own involvement as agents of development with the capacity to act more effectively than governments. In Canada, the advocacy orientation of NGDOs evolved throughout the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. Sometimes working independently and sometimes through the CCIC the community established a visible presence both as a foreign policy lobby group, and as experts in the field of community development at various parliamentary task force meetings. While the numerical majority of American NGDOs have moved beyond a relief oriented project focus, and articulate a policy advocacy stance within their projects and vis-a-vis the American government, these NGDOs in fact account for only about one-quarter of all official development aid channelled through American NGDOs. Clearly, then, the trend towards an advocacy role vis-a-vis the foreign aid policy decisions of the U.S. government is one that is not shared by the larger and more powerful NGDOs.

In Latin America, Africa, and South Asia and Asia, a conscious civil society orientation on behalf of NGDOs evolved throughout the 1970s and 1980s. NGDOs in Latin America perceived themselves, and acted as, organizations committed to the promotion of democracy and in opposition to the military regimes which characterized the region. In Africa, service delivery NGDOs have proliferated in an environment hostile to NGDO development initiatives. Hence the

development of the continental organization of FAVDO and its mandate to establish effective channels of communication with government for the purposes of advocacy is a testament to the growing strength and self-perception of African NGOs as agents of civil society. In Asia and South Asia this trend is expressed in networks of often sector specific membership organizations which have organized autonomously from national coordinating agencies, and from which NGOs launch advocacy campaigns vis-a-vis their governments. By 1992 the consolidation of this self-perception had evolved to a point which allowed it to be clearly articulated in the Rio Declaration. In all of these regions then, there is evidence of a clear trend on behalf of NGOs towards an identification with civil society, and an identification of themselves as organizations of civil society whose interests and agendas are different than those of the state and multilateral aid agencies.

The second trend toward an ideological convergence on the principle of enhancing popular sector organization in technical assistance and multiservice institution building projects and programs is more recent. Although Northern NGOs began moving away from relief type operations and toward longer term institution building in the 1970s it was not until the early to mid 1980s that this change in strategic orientation was somewhat entrenched among Canadian and European NGOs, and to a lesser degree among American NGOs. This reorientation was arguably due to the increasingly visible and articulate presence of Southern NGO coalitions at conferences and Northern NGO consortia meetings, a change in the NGO funding priorities of Northern governments, and

the evolution of 'post-material values,' among Canadian and European, and some American, NGDO staff and support groups.

The final trend toward the expansion and consolidation of international coordination in policy advocacy activity is very recent, but is nonetheless identifiable. Although continental federations of European NGDOs were established in the 1960s, it was not until 1980 that ANGOC was formed as a federation of Asian and South Asian NGDOs, and not until 1987 that the African federation of FAVDO was created. While it may be too early to assess the results of the efforts of these organizations, it is significant that the international community of NGDOs was sufficiently organized by 1992 to mount and draft the 39 INGOF treaties at the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development. It is also of considerable import that the Rio Declaration was drafted, and an international policy advocacy stance adopted, on the basis of a shared identity as an agent of civil society

While this section has sought to demonstrate the extent and content of the process of change that the international community of NGDOs is undergoing, it has not attempted to assign meaning to this change. That is, it has not sought to answer the question of how this change is to be understood, or what it signifies and what it portends. At this point in the discussion, however, and by means of introducing Part II, the following observation will be offered. The changes catalogued describe the anatomy of a new transnational social movement.

PART TWO

NGDOs AND NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENT THEORY

Whereas Part One of this paper was concerned with describing the evolution and anatomy of the contemporary international NGDO community, Part Two will be concerned with interpreting the meaning of this anatomy and with demonstrating that the whole is considerably more than the sum of its parts. In considering the whole, a theoretical framework will be presented in the course of the next three chapters that allows for a conceptualization of the NGDO community as something more than a collection of non-profit, non-governmental organizations engaged in development projects and advocacy campaigns. This 'something more' involves a conceptualization of the international NGDO community as the bearer of a struggle to extend the field of political activity and to democratize new and existing public spaces on sub-national, national and international levels. In short, these chapters will be concerned with identifying the international NGDO community as one of the new social movements that have emerged in the second half of the 20th century.

In so doing, the new social movement literature will be drawn upon, as it is this literature that has engaged with a variety of contemporary movements including the women's, environmental, and peace, from a perspective which views them as meaning bearing

entities in their own right which require a mode of analysis liberated from the constraint imposed by the assumption that they 'live' only to the extent that the state and market fails. This is not to say that these movements are unaffected by state and market failure, nor to say that they do not engage with the state. However, as will become clear in the following discussion, there is more to these movements - including the NGDO movement - than a struggle over the distribution of economic and political resources, for these movements are also engaged in the recreation of civil society.

Before undertaking an examination of this literature and an application of it to NGDOs, however, a caveat is in order. The NGDO community has not been analyzed within this literature. There are no case studies nor are there theoretical perspectives which have been generated by a consideration of international NGDOs *en masse*. What follows then is a selective reading of the literature designed to locate NGDOs within it in order to establish the legitimacy of conceptualizing the community as a social movement, and, in order to explore with some analytical rigor what the NGDO movement constitutes. This is of some importance to this study, as it is arguably only on this basis that an analysis of the NGDO movement's transformative potential on development praxis at the civil society level, as well as that of the level of state and multilateral aid institutions, can be undertaken.

To this end, the following discussion will be divided into three chapters. An examination of what these movements consist of and what their existence signifies will be undertaken through recourse to three broad schools of thought within the new social movement

literature. Chapter V will deal with the resource mobilization school associated with North American social science, and chapter VI with the identity school associated with European social science.⁷⁴ Chapter VII will be concerned with the post-marxist understanding of new social movements. These competing, but to some degree complementary understandings of new social movements will be applied to the NGDO community in order to lend conceptual clarity to the term 'NGDO movement.'

⁷⁴The distinction between the resource mobilization paradigm and the identity paradigm has been drawn by Jean Cohen. See Jean L. Cohen, "Strategy or Identity: New Theoretical Paradigms and Contemporary Social Movements," Social Research, Vol 52, No 4 (Winter 1985): 663-716.

CHAPTER V

RESOURCE MOBILIZATION THEORY AND THE NGDO 'INSTRUMENTAL' MOVEMENT

The resource mobilization school of new social movement theory has produced a body of work that serves as a useful departure point for an understanding of new social movements in general and the NGDO movement in particular. This school shares an affinity with Cox's problem solving theory in that it takes the issues, the actors, and the structural constraints on action as given, and focuses instead on how the actors develop strategies and interact with their environment to pursue their interests. To the extent that the concept of civil society itself is theorized, the resource mobilization school understands it as including the economy, and as a realm of competitive, structurally unmediated self-interest within which organized groups with the capacity to mobilize intellectual and material resources engage with the state in order to effect a redistribution of political or economic resources. Within this perspective, civil society is viewed as the terrain, but not the target of collective action.⁷⁵

Within this paradigm the 'organizational-entrepreneurial' model applies economic and organizational theories to the study of social movements and focuses on two aspects of organizational analysis: the interaction of social movement organizations with their

⁷⁵Jean Cohen and Andrew Aratu, Civil Society and Political Theory (Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1992): 509.

environment, particularly the state; and the organizational infrastructure that supports social movement activity. Resource mobilization theory therefore employs a 'purposive' model of social action and explains social movements in reference to a strategic-instrumental level of action.⁷⁶

This school distinguishes between *social movement* and *social movement organization*, or, preference for change and organized action for change. A social movement is defined as "a set of opinions and beliefs in a population which represents preferences for changing some elements of the social structure and/or reward distribution of a society. A social movement organization is defined as "the complex, or formal organization which identifies its goals with the preferences of a social movement ... and attempts to implement these goals."⁷⁷ Resource mobilization theorists argue that in most cases formal or complex organizations become the 'carriers' of social movements, because informal networks, while necessary in the formative stages, cannot co-ordinate the complex challenges inherent to engagement with the state that social movements face after their emergence. As a result, the task of determining the movement's goals and program, and its strategy and tactics, tends to be carried out by formal social movement organizations, which serve as the means through which the movements achieve their ends.

⁷⁶Eduardo Canel, "New Social Movement Theory and Resource Mobilization: The Need for Integration," in William K. Carroll (ed.), Organizing Dissent: Contemporary Social Movements in Theory and Practice (Toronto: Garamond Press, 1992):.39.

⁷⁷J.D. McCarthy and M.N. Zald, "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory," American Journal of Sociology, Vol 82 (1977): 1217-1218.

This school also distinguishes between *instrumental movements* which seek to achieve a redistribution of economic or political resources through organized activity vis-a-vis the state, and *expressive movements* which seek attitudinal and value transformations and the re-creation of collective identities. This literature has on the whole, however, tended to restrict its focus to movements of institutional change that attempt to alter "the reward distribution of society,"⁷⁸ "organize previously unorganized groups against institutional elites,"⁷⁹ or "represent the interests of groups excluded from the polity."⁸⁰ Hence, the resource mobilization approach tends to highlight the strategic logic of organization aimed at pressuring the 'big structure' of the state.

Charles Tilly's work has focussed on the political sphere and the mobilization of political resources, and views collective actions as efforts by new groups - 'challengers' - to enter the political system. For him, the emergence of social movements depends on the relative openness of the political system to incorporate the interests of new groups.⁸¹ Eduardo Canel has argued, however, that while Tilly's model can be applied to contemporary exclusionary political systems it is less applicable to the study of 'modern' social movements as participants in these movement are not challengers in Tilly's terms.

⁷⁸McCarthy and Zald, "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory": 1218.

⁷⁹W. Gamson, The Strategy of Social Protest (Homewood Ill: Dorsey Press, 1968): 16-18.

⁸⁰C. Tilly, "Social Movements and National Politics," CRSO Workshop Paper #179 (Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan, 1979): 10-14.

⁸¹Charles Tilly, From Mobilization to Revolution (Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley Press, 1978): 52.

They come from well-integrated social groups that are already members of the polity. What they seek, therefore, is not entry into the polity but access to decision-making spheres to influence policy making.⁸²

The resource mobilization school argues that on the whole, movements tend to develop centralized, hierarchical organizations that invest all resources in goal attainment - generally associated with entry into the polity and/or influence over policy making. The trend, according to this school, is toward greater professionalization of structures and leadership. Leaders are typically professionals from the new middle class who possess the necessary skills to lead social movements in contemporary 'organizational' societies. They know how to deal with the state in terms of lobbying and advocacy, and can create meaningful images and symbols that capture the attention and imagination of movement followers.⁸³ Freeman augments this analysis with the suggestion that the social movement has a center and a periphery. At the center of the movement there exists a core of groups or organizations with more influence in articulating movement goals and policies. As organizations move along the spectrum from core to periphery they display decreasing levels of activity and influence in the process of policy and goal formulation.⁸⁴

⁸²Eduardo Canel, "New Social Movement Theory and Resource Mobilization: The Need for Integration," in William K. Carroll (ed.), Organizing Dissent: Contemporary Social Movements in Theory and Practice (Toronto: Garamond Press, 1992):41-42.

⁸³McCarthy and Zald, "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory:" 1222-1224.

⁸⁴J. Freeman (ed.), Social Movements of the Sixties and Seventies (New York: Longman, 1982): 9.

Of importance to this analysis of the NGDO community is this school's observation that social movements are rarely unified affairs because they are integrated by diverse social movement organizations who may be united on the definition of the problem but may nevertheless interpret the source of the problem and strategies and tactics for dealing with it differently. Zald and McCarthy have argued that it is possible for new social movement organizations to engage in "all-out war against each other" as they compete for limited resources and support.⁸⁵ Common interest, therefore, does not necessarily lead to complete co-operation on behalf of social movement organizations with regard to goal and strategy definition.

Resource Mobilization Theory and NGDOs

Resource mobilization theory does not completely capture the dynamics of the NGDO movement. It does, however, assist in analyzing the international NGDO community as a new social movement in three ways. Firstly, by distinguishing between social movement, and social movement organization, it provides a conceptual framework for a discussion of the network of linkages between Northern NGDOs, Southern NGDOs, support groups and popular organizations, and their relationship to the international aid

⁸⁵M.N. Zald and J.D. McCarthy (eds.), Social Movements in an Organizational Society (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books, 1987): 161.

regime. Secondly, this body of theory allows for the conceptualization of the NGDO community as a social movement despite the fact that not all NGDOs are engaged in projects designed around the goal of empowerment of the marginalized to challenge and change the dominant political and economic institutions of their environments. To some degree it also helps to explain why this diversity is observed. Thirdly, by distinguishing between instrumental and expressive movements, however superficially, it provides a typology which can be applied to the beginning of an analysis of the 'dual' nature of the NGDO movement.

The resource mobilization school has argued that social movements are characterized by a set of opinions and beliefs in a population which represents preferences for change, and, formal organizations which identify their goals with these preferences and act as 'carriers' of them. This broad understanding may be applied to the international NGDO community, with minor modifications. Within the international NGDO community and their support bases the 'social movement' may be conceptualized as the belief that the marginalized in the South should not become more so as a result of market-led/state-managed development strategies, whereas, the 'social movement organizations' may be conceptualized as individual NGDOs who 'carry' this belief and translate it into the growing number of technical assistance and multiservice institution building projects that are designed to reach and benefit the poorest in a given society. These NGDOs, however, also operate on the belief that they, as non-governmental, non-profit organizations of civil society have a comparative advantage over public agencies in reaching the poor,

and lobby their respective governments to either increase public subsidies for their own overseas activities (Northern NGDOs) or for recognition of the legitimacy of NGDO development initiatives (Southern NGDOs).

Northern NGDOs, however, have historically not only 'carried' this belief with regard to the needs of the poorest, and their own comparative advantage in meeting those needs, but have actively cultivated it through development education initiatives, and transmitted it to government and international organization officials in the process of government lobbying and through appearances at various government consultative meetings. Moreover, vanguard NGDOs, arguably those located at the 'center' of the movement in both the North and the South have acted to transmit the belief that market-led development strategies should not further marginalize the poorest and that NGDOs have a role to play within the aid regime in ensuring that this does not occur, to other NGDOs through inter-regional NGDO consortia meetings. Hence although the distinction between 'social movement' and social movement organizations as carriers of it is useful, the development of the 'social movement' within the NGDO community is more likely the result of a complex network of interactions between Northern NGDOs and their radicalized support bases, Southern NGDOs and popular organizations, and Northern and Southern NGDOs.

Regardless of how the relationship between the 'social movement' and the 'social movement organization' is articulated, however, Tilly's understanding of social movements as engaged in a struggle for entry into the polity, layered on top of Canel's

understanding of movements as also engaged in a struggle for influence over policy making is useful. It assists in identifying the NGDO movement as an instrumental one which has, and is, engaged in a struggle for both. This 'polity' may be identified for the purpose of this analysis as the international aid regime which national NGDOs have not only struggled to enter but have struggled to influence through lobbying national governments for recognition, both legal and financial, of the NGDO sector's role in development. Hence, the size of the NGDO sector on an international scale and its increasingly organized activities indicates that it has met with some success in inserting itself into the 'polity' constituted by the international aid regime.

As indicated in Chapter II, however, one of the factors that appears to account for the presence of the NGDO community within the aid regime, and, differences in organizational priorities, is state funding. In the case of Canadian, European, and U.S. NGDOs, home governments have recognized the legitimacy of NGDOs as development agents. The Canadian and European governments, however, have tended to channel official funding toward technical assistance and multiservice institution building NGDOs, whereas the bulk of U.S. government disbursements have been channeled toward relief oriented NGDOs. Hence, technical and multiservice institution building NGDOs are predominant in Canada and Europe, whereas in the U.S. relief agencies dominate.

Other factors do play a role in explaining this difference in orientation, particularly the preferences of private donors. Nevertheless, resource mobilization theory would suggest that these

differences are a manifestation of civil society mobilization around the aid resources made available by the state, on the state's terms. Hence the largest U.S. NGDO's are those that have successfully organized themselves into relief agencies capable of distributing large quantities of food aid, whereas the Canadian and European scene is dominated by NGDOs who have successfully organized themselves into agencies with the capacity to execute technical assistance and multiservice institution building projects. Resource mobilization theory cannot, however, account for U.S. NGDOs who have moved toward a politicized multiservice institution building orientation, beyond suggesting that it is related to the fact that government disbursements constitute smaller percentages of these NGDOs' budgets.

This deficiency notwithstanding, there is some merit in retaining this school's distinction between the social movement 'belief' and the 'organized' expression of it, as it facilitates an analysis of the international NGDO movement as one characterized by organizations which display some diversity in their strategic orientations within the international aid regime. The resource mobilization school's caution that social movements are "rarely unified affairs" as they are comprised of social movement organizations who may agree on the problem, but analyze the source and strategies for resolution differently (for many reasons - state funding included), helps to locate NGDO strategic orientations on a spectrum which may be conceptualized as spanning the range from 'progressive' to 'neo-conservative.'

Brian Smith's 1980 survey indicated that three-quarters of the overseas activity of the 125 largest European and Canadian NGDOs was directed toward technical assistance or multiservice institution building, and that five out of six Canadian agencies and sixteen out of nineteen European agencies targeted by his survey questionnaire indicated that the objective of empowerment of the marginalized to challenge and change the dominant political and economic institutions in their environments was one of the top priorities of their agencies.⁸⁶ The 1986 North-South survey indicated that forty-six percent of Canadian NGDOs attached importance to the policy advocacy activities of their agencies, and that seventy-seven percent were engaged in development education activities.⁸⁷

Read another way, however, these surveys indicate that one quarter of the largest Canadian and European NGDOs were engaged in relief activities; sixteen percent of the largest Canadian agencies and fifteen percent of the largest European agencies did not rank empowerment of the marginalized as an objective of their organizations; sixty-six percent of Canadian NGDOs attached little or no importance to policy advocacy, and; thirty-three percent of Canadian agencies did not engage in development education. Moreover, the largest American NGDOs, which account for about three-quarters of total NGDO disbursements overseas, remain oriented toward relief projects and do not prioritize empowerment of the marginalized.

⁸⁶Smith, More Than Altruism: 137-142, passim.

⁸⁷Brodhead, Bridges of Hope: 50, 66.

Broadly speaking then, there is a considerable difference between the Northern agencies located at the progressive end of the social movement continuum and those located at the non-progressive end of it. Similarly, the Concertation of Central American NGDOs, a grouping of 'progressive' NGDOs, has argued that in the case of Central America, and arguably throughout the countries of the South, a distinction may be drawn between Northern and Southern NGDOs with a popular orientation and neo-conservative NGDOs. The Concertation explains the difference in this way.

What is the fundamental difference that distinguishes an NGDO with a popular orientation from an NGDO linked to the neo-conservative strategy? Both implement small projects; they both link themselves with the most vulnerable social groups. Both even display participatory pedagogical techniques and approaches which seek to consolidate a capacity for economic self-management. In reality, what distinguishes a neo-conservative wave of NGDOs from an NGDO movement committed to promoting the leadership of popular groups lies in how they view the problem of power. In the first case, the activity of the NGDO is oriented at provoking changes in order to avoid modifications in the structure of power. In the second case, the NGDOs try to promote changes in order to achieve transformations in the relations of social forces, in a manner which favours the majority.⁸⁸

The Concertation statement indicates that NGDOs at both ends of the social movement spectrum establish links with the most vulnerable social groups. They are then linked by a 'belief' that the most vulnerable should be the groups with whom they work. They are also arguably linked by the 'belief' that the most vulnerable should not suffer as a result of, or be neglected by, market-led/state-

⁸⁸Cited in Laura MacDonald, "Globalizing Civil Society: Interpreting International NGOs in Central America," Unpublished Monograph, Carleton University, Ottawa, 1993: 29.

managed development strategies. As social movement organizations acting as the 'carriers' and executors of this belief, however, they are divided with regard to the source of the 'problem' of the most vulnerable and strategies to mitigate the problem. Hence, neo-conservative NGDOs identify the problem as material deprivation and insert themselves as development agents that act to deliver the goods and services in short supply among the poorest without, however, seeking to challenge the structures that result in deprivation. The understanding among these NGDOs is that they serve as short term 'relief agencies' until such time as market-led/state-managed development strategies begin to yield dividends. Conversely, although progressive NGDOs also insert themselves as agents of development on behalf of the marginalized, they identify the 'problem' as material deprivation resulting from a deprivation of power, and act to enhance material well being through projects designed to enhance the organizational capacity of the most vulnerable to challenge structures ~~put in place by market-led/state-managed development strategies.~~

Nonetheless, for the purpose of this study, which is ultimately concerned with assessing the NGDO movement's potential as a transformative agent in development praxis, it is important that both progressive and neo-conservative NGDOs be considered as members of the movement. For as the resource mobilization school has argued, social movements are characterized not only by 'beliefs' but also by social movement organizations who interpret the execution of these beliefs in various, and at time, contradictory ways.

Finally, the resource mobilization school has distinguished between social movements engaging in instrumental action designed to affect entry into the polity and/or influence over specific state policy outcomes to effect a redistribution of material resources, for example squatter's movements, and, expressive movements which seek to affect a generalized change in societal norms and values, for example, the environmental movement and the cultivation of a 'green' consciousness. It has argued, however, that social movements are more typically instrumental movements that attempt to affect state policy outcomes, organize previously unorganized groups against institutional elites, or represent the interests of groups excluded from the polity.

This understanding of social movements appears to broadly capture the range of activities identified in chapter II as characteristic of the evolution of the NGDO community. Instrumental activities designed to affect a change in state policy outcomes include state lobbying by Northern NGDOs to increase or maintain public subsidies for their own overseas activity, state lobbying by Southern NGDOs on behalf of their own involvement in development initiatives, and, multilateral institution lobbying by NGDOs at the international level for changes in aid and trade regimes.

Moreover, the organization of popular organizations against institutional elites would appear to be the instrumental action trademark of the progressive NGDOs, and that which distinguishes the participatory development strategy of progressive NGDOs from neo-conservative NGDOs and from state and multilateral aid agencies. It is manifested to the degree that Northern NGDOs undertake

projects either directly supporting popular organizations or work in support of Southern NGDOs engaged with popular organizations. On the surface then, the NGDO community does appear to have broadly evolved into an instrumental movement that organizes on the terrain of civil society but targets not civil society itself, but rather the larger structure of the state.

There is evidence to suggest, however, that the NGDO movement may be understood as something other than an instrumental movement, for some of these 'social movement organizations' are struggling for more than a larger slice of the development assistance pie. These organizations are contesting the 'meaning' of development which informs these institutions and the neo-conservative development model supported by them.

Therefore, the resource mobilization school of new social movement theory may be regarded as a useful departure for an analysis of the NGDO community as a social movement, but not as the last word. The tools for analysis offered by this school describe the NGDO community as an instrumental movement, concerned with organizing on the terrain of civil society and targeting the institutions of the international aid regime, including the state. These tools also allow for a categorization of NGDOs within the movement as either progressive/empowerment oriented NGDOs or neo-conservative/status quo oriented NGDOs. They cannot, however, be used to explain the reasons for this difference beyond linking it to the state/NGDO funding relationship.

While this insight is an important one, and contributes to an understanding of some of the dynamics of the NGDO movement, it

2 of/de 2

MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS
STANDARD REFERENCE MATERIAL 1010a
(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)

appears to reduce the understanding of the NGDO movement to the orthodox theories of NGDOs critiqued in the introduction to this study as blind to the dialectical relationship which exists between civil society and the state. Within this school, the dynamics of social movements in general, and the NGDO movement in particular, appear to be reducible to a response to state funding policies.

This reduction is unacceptable, as it cannot account for the progressive NGDOs within the U.S., the contestational activity that characterized European NGDOs long before the establishment of official aid programs, the overt and often critical advocacy positions adopted by Canadian NGDOs in response to aid policy, and the conscious civil society identity being expressed by both Northern and Southern neo-conservative *and* progressive NGDOs within the instrumental movement. What this school lacks therefore, are the tools necessary for an exploration of the realm of identity and contestation.

This is a deficiency within this school of analysis, for it is arguably the identification with civil society on behalf of both progressive and neo-conservative NGDOs that distinguishes the NGDO community from state and multi-lateral aid agencies, and contributes to its distinctive nature as a movement. It is also arguably a convergence around an alternative understanding of development that contributes to instrumental action on behalf of progressive NGDOs designed not necessarily to empower themselves within the aid regime but rather to empower popular organizations within the politics of the the South. The following chapter of this study will therefore explore this realm of identity, in this case imbedded in the

instrumental movement, with recourse to the identity oriented school of new social movement theory.

CHAPTER VI

IDENTITY THEORY AND THE NGDO 'EXPRESSIVE' MOVEMENT

The identity oriented school locates new social movements at the center of contemporary conflicts and stresses that the new actors struggle for collective control over the process of meaning production and are concerned with symbolic issues and the constitution of new identities. In contrast to traditional actors, for example political parties and trade unions which operate at the instrumental level of action, the new movements are identified as operating at the communicative level of action and are concerned with cultural (re)production and social integration. This school locates the creation of new meanings and the reinterpretation of norms and values at the level of social integration or civil society, and not at the level of the state. In contradistinction to resource mobilization theory, it argues that the field of social conflict has shifted from the formal political sphere to that of civil society and the cultural realm. Hence, identity theory identifies civil society as both the terrain and target of collective action. The school argues that new movements are transforming civil society by creating new spaces, free of both the structural imperatives of the state and the economy, and that it is in the context of these "liberated" spaces that new identities, and in particular, new democratic forms are formulated.

Within this school of thought new social movement organizations cease to be 'instrumental' in the sense that resource mobilization theorists employ the term. Social movement organizations are not conceived of as the means to achieve broad ends within the formal political arena. Hence, this school makes no clear distinction between the movement's goals and the means of individual social movement organizations. The organizations themselves are perceived to be an integral component of the message. The identity school argues, then, that the organizations challenge established cultural codes, and through the things they do and how they organize to do them show that an alternative is possible. Thus the distinction between instrumental and expressive action loses most, although arguably not all, of its relevance.⁸⁹

For the purpose of this study Alain Touraine's understanding of social movements merits further discussion. A central concept in Touraine's sociology of action is *historicity*, which refers to the capacity of society "to act upon itself to reshape the set of cultural models that guide social practices." It is the "set of cognitive, economic, and ethical models by means of which a collectivity set up relations with its environment - in other words, produces a culture."⁹⁰ But for Touraine a culture is more than a general framework of social relations - it is the fundamental object of historical contestations. A culture is "a stake, a set of resources and

⁸⁹Eduardo Canel, "New Social Movement Theory and Resource Mobilization: The Need for Integration," in William K. Carroll (ed.) Organizing Dissent: Contemporary Social Movements in Theory and Practice (Toronto: Garamond Press, 1992): 34.

⁹⁰Alain Touraine, Return of the Actor: Social Theory in Postindustrial Society (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988): 40.

models that social actors seek to manage, to control, and which they appropriate or whose transformation into social organization they negotiate among themselves."⁹¹ Culture then, is a product, the result of social conflict over the appropriation of historicity.

For Touraine, a social movement is therefore the action of a subject calling into question the social form of historicity. If historicity is the set of cultural models (cognitive, ethical, economic), social movements are the groups that "contend in order to give these cultural orientations a social form," to transform them into concrete forms of social organization.⁹² Hence, within Touraine's sociology of action, social movements are central to the functioning of society and the process of its creation.

Touraine, however, makes an analytical distinction between the *diachronic/state* and *synchronic/civil society* axes of a social system, or between its pattern of development and its mode of functioning. Changes from one societal type to another, which implies a radical break with the logic of the existing social system, ultimately requires an agent and a logic of action from outside the system. Such an agent, he argues, can only be the state, thus the state is the central actor at the diachronic level and movements operating on this level are not 'social' movements proper; they are either revolutionary movements or instrumental movements which engage with the state in the realm of formal politics to effect changes in the distribution of political and economic resources. In contrast to the diachronic axis, the functioning of a social system - the self-reproduction of its

⁹¹Touraine, Return of the Actor: 8.

⁹²Touraine, Return of the Actor: 42.

historicity - is located at the synchronic level of civil society and includes the conflictual generation of norms, social institutions, and cultural patterns. Touraine argues that this is the terrain where new 'social' movements operate. The state is marginal, at least conceptually, at this level because it is located along a different axis. Thus while social movements deal with the production of meaning at the synchronic level, other actors, such as instrumental movements, deal with formal politics and the state at the diachronic level.⁹³

There are differences, however, in how theorists within this school assess the linkages between the new movements and the political system. Touraine places social movements at the level of civil society and excludes them from the political realm. Movements operating at the formal political level are not social movements proper. They are either historical movements fighting for historical/revolutionary change or instrumental movements operating at 'lower' levels of social action.⁹⁴ Other theorists place social movements in an intermediary space between civil society and the state.

Claus Offe argues that new movements challenge "the boundaries of institutional politics" by tearing down the traditional dichotomies between private and public life, institutional and non-institutional action, political and civil society. In so doing they politicize civil society through practices that belong to an "intermediate sphere" between "private pursuits and concerns, on the one side, and institutional, state-sanctioned modes of politics on

⁹³Touraine, Return of the Actor: 63-70, passim.

⁹⁴ Touraine, Return of the Actor: 83-91, passim.

the other."⁹⁵ Alberto Melucci also refers to an "intermediate public space" where social movements make society hear their messages and where these messages enter the process of political articulation. The movements, however, retain their autonomy. They are not institutionalized nor do they become political parties. Instead they seek only to control a field of autonomy vis-a-vis the formal political system.⁹⁶

Finally, for Jurgen Habermas social movements operate in a sub-institutional, extra-parliamentary terrain located at "the seam between system and life world." Habermas's dualistic model of society conceptualizes the processes involved in the modernization/rationalization of the capitalist economy and state as distinct from those involved in the lifeworld or civil society. He posits that the lifeworld, or the sphere of communicatively coordinated egalitarian cultural, social and socializing institutions has been dominated by the imperatives of the requirements of capitalist growth and the technocratic process of administrative steering. Social movements, therefore, act primarily to protect the lifeworld sphere from the subsystems and imperatives of both the capitalist economy and the administrative state.⁹⁷

Regardless of where theorists within this school locate new social movements on Touraine's typology, however, they share an understanding that social movements are primarily engaged in a

⁹⁵Claus Offe, "New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics," Social Research, Vol 52, No 4 (1985): 820-823, passim.

⁹⁶Alberto Melucci, "The Symbolic Challenge of Contemporary Movements," Social Research, Vol 52, No 4 (1985): 815.

⁹⁷Jurgen Habermas, "New Social Movements," Telos, Vol 49 (1981):36.

defensive strategy to protect civil society from the rationalistic logic of both the capitalist market and the administrative state. Hence, these theorists understand new social movements as acting primarily on civil society itself, and not as strategically oriented toward the formal political realm. This school, therefore, largely refrains from theorizing the linkages between civil society and the state, and from theorizing how changes wrought within civil society affect the state/civil society relationship.

Identity Theory and NGDOs

Like resource mobilization theory, identity theory does not completely capture the dynamics of the NGDO movement. Nonetheless, unlike the resource mobilization school, identity theory emphasizes the expressive and communicative realm of social movements and identifies them as a social force which is engaged in a struggle over the meaning of contested norms and values at the level of civil society. Social movements 'are' then, to the degree that they contest meaning and identities and create and disseminate new ones.

As indicated in the last chapter, there is some evidence to indicate that the NGDO movement may be conceived of as an instrumental one operating on the diachronic axis of Touraine's typology. There is an equally compelling case to be made, however, for locating the NGDO movement on the synchronic axis and within

the realm of civil society and cultural production. In order to serve as heuristically useful in the discussion of NGDOs, however, the 'cultural' field may be limited to that of development theory and practice. Within this cultural realm the NGDO movement may be understood as one which simultaneously engages with civil society in order to reconceptualize the 'meaning' and content of development, and, acts as the expression and representation of civil society in its engagements with the state and multilateral aid institutions in contestation over the 'meaning' of development and the creation of historicity.

Students of international development are becoming aware of the emergence of a new theoretical polemic constituted within the multi-disciplinary body of research on the process of development. This polemic is signified in the literature by the concepts of 'structural adjustment,' associated with the agency of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the IBRD, and increasingly, governments of the Northern industrialized countries in their official development assistance programs, and, 'participatory development' associated with the agency of NGDOs.

The concept of structural adjustment refers to a set of specific policies adopted by governments of states undergoing 'adjustment,' but it also obliquely refers to a structure of unequal power relations between multilateral lending agencies and borrowing Southern governments.⁹⁸ The IMF, and to a lesser but still significant degree

⁹⁸ These adjustment policies include: abolition or liberalization of foreign exchange and import controls; devaluation of the exchange rates; and, domestic anti-inflationary programmes, including (a) control of bank credit and higher interest rates; (b) control of the government deficit and

the IBRD, derive their policy orientation from the tenets of neo-classical economics and their power to enforce economic adjustment programs on developing countries due to the ramifications of the debt crisis. Although the origins of the crisis are beyond the scope of this paper, it is sufficient to note that in the wake of the oil shocks of the 1970s and early 1980s developing countries were plunged into a severe balance of payment crisis, and turned *en masse* to the IMF and IBRD for financing which was extended on the condition that borrowing countries adopt the relatively standardized macro-economic structural adjustment policy packages.

It is in the context of this adjustment process that NGDO participatory development theory and practice has evolved. This NGDO alternative is structured around the perception that the debt financing offered by the IMF/IBRD under the umbrella of structural adjustment is insufficient for democratizing the distribution of power and resources equitably within Southern societies, and, is counter-productive to the autonomous creation of 'historicity' within civil society. That is, it does not nurture the creation of a civil society characterized by a plurality of self-directed, self-sustaining, relatively autonomous groups engaging in a (re)definition of what development should mean and entail within particular societies. Rather it forecloses on this process - the process of historicity - and subjugates it to the straight-jacket of homogeneous structural adjustment programs.

divestment of state owned enterprise; (c) increases in taxes and prices for public services, and abolition of consumer subsidies; (d) control of wage rises, so far as within the government's power.

It is not, however, economic growth or the existence of the state based on the capitalist model that this paradigm contests. It is rather the 'definition' of development inherent to the structural adjustment model - which equates development with market-led/state-managed economic growth only and is inattentive to the 'cultural' content of development and the struggle over historicity that should precede or at least attend the adoption of this model - that is contested. Hence the NGDO movement may be conceptualized as one which is engaged in a struggle for historicity and the stakes of the struggle may be conceived of as the meaning and content of development.

John O'Manique and David Pollock have defined development in the context of participatory development theory as "a change from within based on latent capabilities ... a flowering or unfolding," and argue that "change affected by external agents should be seen as secondary, supplementary, and complementary to the unfolding from within." In the final analysis development "is a process activated and directed from within the individual or society toward immediate objectives and ultimate goals that are, to some extent, defined by them" and to the greatest extent possible, "what is required to satisfy the needs of the people should be determined by the people themselves."⁹⁹

These theorists view economic growth, distributional equity, participation, and the expression of transcendental values, which

⁹⁹John O'Manique and David H. Pollock, "Human Values and Planning: A View from the North," Managing International Development, Vol 1, No 1 (Jan-Feb 1984): 71-76, passim.

vary from society to society and exist in "the worlds of culture, art, ideas and religion - and sometimes even in politics and other forms of social interaction"¹⁰⁰ - as the four *sine qua nons* of the participatory development process. Participation from this perspective is viewed as the decision-making of 'the people' in the economic, social and political relations of their society. They argue that there must be popular participation in the process of growth (in determining what is to be produced and how), in the process of distribution (in determining how the fruits of growth will be shared), and in the general governance and ordering of society - in short, in the production of 'culture.'¹⁰¹

This perspective is more forcefully articulated by the NGDO movement itself, and is captured in the three principles defined as central to the praxis of participatory development by the 31 NGDOs who drafted the Manila Declaration. These principles include:

1. Sovereignty resides with the people, the real social actors of positive change. Freedom and democracy are universal human aspirations. The sovereignty of the people is the foundation of democracy. The legitimate role of government is to enable the people to set and pursue their own agendas.
2. To exercise their sovereignty and assume responsibility for the development of themselves and their communities, the people must control their own resources, have access to relevant information, and have the means to hold officials of government accountable.
3. Those who would assist the people with their development must recognize that it is they who are participating in support of the people's agenda and not the reverse. The value of the outsider's contribution will be measured in

¹⁰⁰O'Manique and Pollock, "Human Values and Planning": 79.

¹⁰¹O'Manique and Pollack, "Human Values and Planning": 79.

terms of the enhanced capacity of the people to determine their own future.¹⁰²

Although not expressed in the language of identity theory, but rather in the language of the movement itself, it is clear that the Declaration's conception of 'development' is consistent with Touraine's synchronic/civil society axis. References to 'the people' may be interpreted as a reference to civil society which must be differentiated enough from the state to allow for the organization and articulation of various 'peoples' autonomous agendas. Hence, the role of Northern and Southern NGDOs is to act as agents of civil society in solidarity with the interests of civil society. While these interests do include the means to 'hold governments accountable' emphasis has been placed on the importance of the enhancement of autonomy of groups within civil society - an enhancement which would allow them to exercise a measure of control over the development of themselves and their communities.

Unlike the structural adjustment perspective, then, the participatory development perspective understands 'development' as a process which flows out of society's values, and arguably out of civil society itself, as groups within it struggle over historicity - or the cultural evolution and content of their own development. In order to promote this type of development within the context of structural adjustment, however, a strategy designed to strengthen and pluralize civil society vis-a-vis the state is required. This paper contends that there is some merit in identifying the NGDO movement

¹⁰²ANGOC, The Manila Declaration on People's Participation and Sustainable Development (Manila, Philippines, 1989): 3.

as the one transnational social movement which consciously adopts this strategy.

The 'progressive' portion of the NGDO movement discursively and practically contests the 'definition' of development acted out by the IMF/IBRD and the state through projects designed to nurture the autonomy, self-reflexivity, and democratic organization and participation of popular organizations. That is, NGDOs are engaged in a process of empowering popular organizations not only so that they, as individual groups, may gain access to political and economic resources, but in order that the space occupied by civil society as a whole may be enlarged to a degree that allows these groups to participate in the struggle over historicity, and to contest the meaning and content of development. In articulating the principles of the participatory development paradigm in this way then, the NGDO movement has declared the stakes of the struggle for development as revolving around the existence of a civil society pluralistic and autonomous enough to engage in the creation of historicity, that is the self-creation, or in Touraine's language the 'auto-gestation,' of local communities and national societies.¹⁰³

It is on the basis of this interpretation of the NGDO movement as one engaged in a contestation over the meaning of development that the movement may also be understood as an expressive one located on the synchronic/civil society axis of Touraine's typology of the sociology of action. Nonetheless, as indicated in chapter V, it is clear that progressive NGDOs also engage in instrumental action vis-

¹⁰³Alain Touraine, Return of the Actor: Social Theory in Postindustrial Society (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988): 42.

a-vis the state in the form of lobbying not only for the inclusion of NGDOs as a whole in the aid regime, but for changes in the larger structures of the aid and trade regime perceived to be inconducive to this 'auto-gestation'. Hence although Touraine has argued that movements are located on either the diachronic or synchronic axis but do not straddle both, this examination of the 'progressive' NGDO movement indicates that his sharp distinction between separate activities on the two axes is too restrictive.

This analysis of the different facets of the NGDO movement suggests then, that there is some conceptual integrity in understanding the NGDO movement as located in an intermediary space between civil society and the state. As organizations, 'progressive' NGDOs have developed the capacity to contest the meaning of development on a practical basis by undertaking technical aid and multiservice institution building projects in ways that allow them to create and defend spaces for popular organizations within civil society. At the same time they have developed the capacity to engage with the state on a discursive basis and contest the meaning of development at national and international levels through advocacy and lobbying. Hence, their message enters the process of formal political articulation, but they retain their autonomy vis-a-vis the formal political system, and, control a field of autonomy for civil society as a whole.

Neither the resource mobilization school nor the identity school of new social movement theory, however, adequately explains the dual strategic orientation of the NGDO movement, for the NGDO movement is both an instrumental and an expressive movement that

simultaneously targets civil society and the formal political realm. It is with reference to another body of theory, therefore, and a theoretical framework that can accommodate the dual logic of the NGDO movement that the concept of the NGDO movement can be more completely delineated for the purpose of this study. This post-marxist framework, developed by post-marxist theorists of new social movements, is the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER VII

POST-MARXIST THEORY AND THE NGDO 'POST-MARXIST' MOVEMENT

Post-marxist theorists, and in particular Jean Cohen and Andrew Aratu, build on Habermas's distinction between the system and the lifeworld, but critique Habermas's understanding of new social movements as essentially engaged only in a defensive project of protection of the lifeworld from the subsystems of the capitalist economy and the administrative state. Like Habermas, these theorists understand new social movements as non-class-based forms of collective action located within a civil society which is differentiated not only from the state but also from the capitalist market economy. However, these theorists understand the link between civil society and the state as revolving around the democratic project of new social movements. According to these theorists the movements alter the associational structure of civil society and create a plurality of new spaces within this sphere, *while at the same time* expanding and redemocratizing spaces that are already institutionalized within the formal political arena, and the economic realm. This involves challenging the structures that mediate between system and lifeworld. Hence the new movements simultaneously adopt a defensive strategy designed to protect, pluralize, and democratize civil society spaces, and, an offensive

posture aimed at democratizing 'receptors' within the the larger structures of the system. Thus, these theorists understand the concept of the lifeworld as a civil society that is institutionalized through sets of rights secured by struggle in the formal political arena. Conversely, they also understand the formal political arena as a site which contains receptors for the influence of civil society, which can, within limits, be added to and democratized. These theorists, then, understand movements as operating on both sides of the system/lifeworld divide.¹⁰⁴

These theorists identify social movements as both new and post-marxist for several reasons. Contemporary social movements are understood as 'new' to the degree that they display a self-understanding that abandons 'old left' totalizing ideologies and strategies in favor of a defense of civil society and a strategy of structural reform that does not seek to abolish the functioning of capitalist political and economic systems. Although the cultural model of the new actors does break with those aspects of "bourgeois industrial paternalist culture" involving inequality, domination, unimpeded growth, and patriarchy, there is, nonetheless, a stress on continuity with some elements of civil society, including its perceived differentiation from the state and economy, that are worth preserving. Within these movements then, the slogan of "society vs. the state" means the democratization of social institutions and not

¹⁰⁴Jean L. Cohen and Andrew Aratu, Civil Society and Political Theory. (Massachusetts: The MIT Press): 552.

the capture of the state and the dedifferentiation of society in the name of one total community.¹⁰⁵

Cohen has argued that unlike the old left, actors involved in the contemporary movements do not view themselves in terms of socio-economic class, nor does class background determine the collective identities of the actors or the stakes of their action. They are then, non-class actors. Moreover, contemporary actors abandon what they see as the 'productivist' cultural model of the old left as well as its modes of organization. Instead of forming unions or political parties of the socialist, social democratic, or communist type, they focus on grass-roots politics and create horizontal, often directly democratic associations that are loosely federated on national levels. Unlike the old left, they tend to prioritize the target of the social domain of 'civil society' over the economy or the state, and raise issues concerned with the democratization of structures within civil society.

On this note, Cohen argues that despite the fact that 'new left' activists and theorists were the first to focus on the democratization of civil society structures, including the university and the workshop during the 1960s and 1970s, several differences between the new left and contemporary movements remain. In the former, actors came to understand themselves as revolutionaries fighting for a total break with the institutions and culture of 'bourgeois' civil society. This meant that the concerns of those most involved in contestation during the 1960s and 1970s - students, women, professionals - were interpreted in one of two ways: either they came to be seen as

¹⁰⁵Jean L. Cohen, "Rethinking Social Movements," Berkley Journal of Sociology, Vol 28 (1983): 101-104.

bourgeois, to be subordinated to the needs of the proletariat; or they were deemed legitimate only to the extent that they could be fit into a neo-marxist theoretical framework fabricated by the new left on old left terms. In the process, the original stress on democracy and new forms of associations were sacrificed to totalizing strategic analysis.

Within Cohen's analysis the key to the understanding of new social movements is their self-limiting character. The actors do not seek an undifferentiated community through an engulfment of the state by civil society. These actors limit themselves to the defense and extension of spaces for social autonomy and struggle in the name of autonomy, plurality, and difference, without renouncing the formal egalitarian principles of modern civil society or the principles of the formally democratic state. More democracy on local levels and new democratic forms of representation or direct participation, are seen as dependent upon responsive central institutions, including parliaments and legal systems, for conflict mediation and for the representation of the unorganized.

Secondly, most contemporary actors accept the existence of the formally democratic state and the market economy, and the stakes of their struggle do not revolve around the revolutionary capture of the state. Their struggles involve a project of reforming the relations between the economy, state, and society, and, of redrawing the boundaries between public and private. Because contemporary collective actors seek to create democratic spaces and transform civil society into a social arena for the creation of new collective identities and demands they accept some form of structural differentiation and

their associations do not take on the form or connotation of a revolutionary underground. In fact, as identity theorists have argued, their organizations are not viewed by the actors as mere resources to serve the goal of mobilization into large-scale confrontations whose stakes are state power. Instead, democratically structured associations and public spaces and a plurality of types of political actors and actions within civil society, are viewed as ends in themselves.

Finally, Cohen argues that unlike the 'new left' the actors are self-limiting with regard to their own values. The efforts to open up contested cultural values and norms to discussion is not identical with an immediate attempt to realize an uncompromisable 'total vision' as the solution to social problems. Indeed, many of the actors interpret their actions as attempts to renew a democratically pluralistic political culture and to reintroduce the normative dimension of social action into political life. These contemporary movements, therefore, are characterized by "self-limiting radicalism."¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁶Jean L. Cohen, "Strategy or Identity: New Theoretical Paradigms and Contemporary Social Movements," Social Research, Vol 52, No 4 (Winter 1985): 664.

Post-Marxist NGDO Praxis

It is then, with some justification that the theory and practice of 'participatory development' as expressed and embodied by parts of the NGDO movement may be identified as post-marxist. The 'self-limiting radicalism' of post-marxist movements outlined above, including the reformist as opposed to revolutionary orientation, a concern with enhancing the differentiation between civil society and the state, and the defence and extension of spaces for the expression of social autonomy within civil society characterizes the strategic orientation of the progressive/expressive NGDO movement. So too does its non-class identity and its organization into 'loosely,' but increasingly unified, national, continental, and international NGDO federations.

This characteristic of 'self-limiting radicalism' is most concretely captured in the articulation of the three principles defined as central to the praxis of participatory development by the authors of the Manila Declaration. It is clear that the members of the NGDOs who drafted the Declaration do not envision the revolutionary overthrow of the state as part of the NGDO participatory development project. The statement emphasizes that "sovereignty resides with the people," that the "legitimate role of government is to enable the people to set and pursue their own agendas," and that "people must have the means to hold the state accountable."¹⁰⁷ The

¹⁰⁷ANGOC, The Manila Declaration on People's Participation and Sustainable Development (Manila, Philippines, 1989): 3.

statement then, argues for the enhancement of a differentiation between civil society and the state, and an enhancement of the power of civil society vis-a-vis the state, but not for the revolutionary capture of the state, or for the engulfment of the state by civil society.

It is on this basis that the NGDO movement may be interpreted as non-revolutionary on 'old left' terms, but not, however, as non-radical, for in both its instrumental and expressive 'moments' it adopts what Gramsci would term a 'counter-hegemonic' posture. This posture is pro-active to the degree that the movement discursively contests aid and trade policies within the formal political arena, and to the degree that it seeks to protect 'local/civil society' spaces from the homogenizing forces of structural adjustment and to create within those spaces, through the nurturance of popular organizations, a plurality of identities, communities and forms of organization that have the capacity to engage in the struggle for historicity. This then is the progressive NGDO movement's post-marxist strategy to combat a market-led/state-managed development process which increasingly entrenches the identity of the vulnerable majority as "the marginalized" both in terms of access to economic and formal political resources, and in terms of a lack of capacity to express and act on alternative understandings of development.

EPILOGUE TO PART TWO

Part two of this paper has been concerned with establishing the legitimacy of conceptualizing the NGDO community as one of the new post-marxist social movements which have emerged in the second half of the 20th century. To this end, concepts proposed by the resource mobilization, identity, and post-marxist schools of the new social movement literature have been drawn upon in order to explore the composition of the NGDO movement with some analytical rigor. In the course of this analysis a portrait of the NGDO movement characterized by a cleavage within the movement, and by a dual strategic logic, has emerged. This cleavage and 'dual logic' may be schematically represented as follows:

Fig. 1**THE CONTEMPORARY NGDO MOVEMENT**

Through its theoretical focus on *instrumental movements* which seek to achieve a redistribution of economic or political resources through organized lobbying and advocacy activity vis-a-vis the state, and its distinction between *social movements* and *social movement organizations*, or a preference for change and organized action for change, resource mobilization theory has provided a basis for the conceptualization of the NGDO community as an instrumental movement which operates on Touraine's diachronic axis. As such, individual NGDOs act as carriers of the belief that the marginalized should not become more so, or be passed over, by market-led/state-managed development strategies and engage in instrumental action designed to alter the apportionment of state aid budgets in favour of increased Northern and Southern NGDO funding and involvement in development initiatives designed to meet the needs of the marginalized directly. Therefore, to the degree that the NGDO movement engages with the state to effect changes in the distribution of aid budgets in its own favour, the entire community of social movement organizations may be identified as an instrumental movement that engages with the state in order to affect changes in the distribution of political and economic resources within the aid regime.

The resource mobilization school has cautioned, however, that social movements are rarely completely unified affairs, as they are integrated by social movement organizations who exhibit diversity in identifying the source of the problem around which they organize and strategies of amelioration. Therefore, while the resource mobilization school has also identified the organization of previously

unorganized groups against institutional elites as the hallmark of an instrumental movement, an examination of the NGDO community reveals that the entire community does not engage in this type of instrumental action. There exists within the movement neo-conservative NGDOs who do not share the rest of the movement's goal of empowerment of popular organizations through technical assistance and multiservice institution building projects. Thus, resource mobilization theory allows for the distinction between neo-conservative and progressive social movement organizations. It does not, however, provide the conceptual tools necessary for an exploration of this difference.

It is with recourse to identity theory and in particular to Touraine's sociology of action, that this difference can be explored and the concept of the 'NGDO movement' further refined. Identity theory allows for a distinction between expressive and non-expressive social movement organizations which operate within the realm of civil society which do, or do not, practically and discursively contest the 'meaning' of development. Within the NGDO movement the expressive/progressive organizations engage in this contestation, whereas the non-expressive/neo-conservative organizations do not.

Chapter VII has built on Touraine's sociology of action and has argued that to the degree the progressive/expressive NGDOs seek to empower popular organizations and to thereby pluralize civil society, this portion of the NGDO movement may also be understood as a proactive 'post-marxist' counter-hegemonic movement engaged in a struggle to protect and enlarge spaces within civil society from the homogenizing and foreclosing effect of market-led/state-managed

structural adjustment development policies, and, to create within those spaces a plurality of self-directed, self-sustaining groups with a capacity to engage in the struggle for historicity, or the redefinition of what development should mean and entail within particular societies.

Chapter VI also argued, however, that although Touraine's concepts of a diachronic and synchronic axis along which social movements operate serve to facilitate analysis of the NGDO movement, his understanding that movements operate in one or the other sphere, but not both, does not capture the dynamics of the NGDO movement. Chapter VII has suggested that out of the expressive NGDO movement's activities within civil society, there also flows a further round of instrumental action on Touraine's diachronic axis, through which progressive social movement organizations - which now include both NGDOs and empowered popular organizations - engage with the state with the goal of effecting changes in aid and trade regimes and national policies which reflect alternative understandings of development.

This section has suggested then that there is some merit to an understanding of the progressive/expressive NGDO movement as post-marxist theorists see them - that is as located in an intermediary space between civil society and the state with the capacity to formulate and engage in strategies of action both upwards in the realm of formal politics and downwards in the realm of civil society. Its discursive contestation of the meaning of development does enter the process of formal political articulation, but it retains its autonomy vis-a-vis the formal political system, and,

controls a field of autonomy within the aid regime for civil society as a whole.

As has become apparent in the course of this discussion, however, although new social movement theory is notable for its civil society-centric as opposed to state-centric orientation, it has largely refrained from theorizing the concept of 'civil society' itself. Resource mobilization theory views the emergence and outcomes of new social movements as contingent and open processes resulting from specific decisions, tactics, and strategies adopted by the social movement organizations themselves. Within this body of theory civil society includes the economy, and is implicitly assumed to consist of an arena of particular needs, self-interest, and divisiveness over which a largely 'neutral' state prevails. Hence, the activities of new social movements are evaluated with respect to their effects on the formal political sphere, and are deemed 'successful' to the degree that their organizations' demands are processed and institutionalized by the state.

Conversely, within identity theory civil society is largely conceived of as a 'realm of cultural freedom' or a 'space' that is free from both the state, and the economy, which results in an untenable opposition between social movements and the formal political, and economic, realms. Within this perspective, social movements are evaluated with respect to their effects on civil society, and are deemed successful to the extent that they nurture the self-expression of groups within civil society and democratize the values, norms, and institutions of civil society itself. There is, however, very

little theoretical analysis of the transformative potential of new social movements outside of the realm of civil society itself.

Post-marxist theorists of new social movements have attempted to address the state-civil relationship directly, but have largely confined their analysis to the postulate that new social movements represent the democratic project of civil society, and can reform the state/civil society relationship by acting on "receptors" located in the larger political and economic systems. What has not been theorized, however, is how the structural influences of the state and the capitalist economy might function to limit both the 'radicalization' of the movement itself, and the scope for 'receptor' reform.

Hence, although for different reasons, the body of new social movement theory as a whole tends to assume that civil society, the economy, and the state exist in largely autonomous realms, and there is little attempt to directly theorize the connections between them. This is a deficiency within the new social movement literature from the perspective of this study of the NGDO movement, as it renders the literature an inadequate basis from which to undertake an analysis of the NGDO movement's transformative potential on development praxis not only at the level of civil society, but at the level of the state and within the international aid regime as a whole. Part Three of this paper will therefore address this potential, but it will do so on the basis of Gramsci's concept of civil society.

PART THREE

THE NGDO MOVEMENT AND GRAMSCI'S THEORY OF CIVIL SOCIETY

To this point this study has been concerned with addressing the problem of knowledge about social transformations within the international aid regime. Regime has been understood to refer to "the agreed upon sets of principles, norms, rules and procedures around which actor expectations converge"¹⁰⁸ and, in this case, to have taken the form of market-led/state-managed export growth development strategies under the auspices of IMF structural adjustment lending. For the purpose of this paper the community of development actors has been confined to the state, multilateral aid institutions and the NGDO sector, and the NGDO sector itself has been chosen as the problematic around which this paper has been structured. The study has been concerned with demonstrating that one of the transformations being undergone within the community of actors is that occurring within the NGDO sector itself.

Parts One and Two of this study have therefore chronicled the historical evolution of the international NGDO community and characterized the contemporary community as one which has

¹⁰⁸Paul R. Viotti and Mark V. Kauppi, International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism (New York: MacMillan Publishing, 1987): 602.

evolved into a new transnational social movement. That is, the contemporary community of NGOs displays a post-colonial trend toward a conscious identification of itself as an organized non-class agent of civil society, and, as an organized sector within the aid regime, whose interests and agendas are separate from the state and multilateral aid organizations.

At the outset of this paper, conventional theories of NGOs were critiqued as incapable of conceiving of civil society, and the NGO sector in particular, as a force for historical change which merits analysis from a civil society-centric perspective, because of insufficient sensitivity to the dialectical, as opposed to static, relationship that exists between the market, the state, and civil society. Therefore, having theorized the NGO sector as a new transnational social moment, there remains an onus on this study to do what conventional theories have not; that is, to engage with the dialectics of this relationship, and to undertake a critical appraisal of the NGO movement's transformative potential within the aid regime.

For this reason the final part of this study will be concerned with identifying Gramsci's theory of civil society as a framework which can lend some insight to the analysis of the transformational potential of the NGO movement. Gramsci's reflections are of importance to this study, for he, alone among marxist theorists of societal transformation, identified civil society as a potential sight of counter-hegemonic struggle, and accorded the status of 'tactical importance' to non-state, non-market institutions. He did not, however, abandon marxist economic theory. He identified class

actors, and not non-class social movements, as the central actors in struggles for hegemony, and located the struggles themselves within a framework for action limited by the structural imperatives of the economic base.

Despite the fact that non-class actors were peripheral to his analysis of social change, however, his analysis is one that retains some utility for the study of non-class based counter-hegemonic struggles. Gramsci theorized the superstructure of society, composed of the state and civil society, as possessing a relatively large degree of autonomy from the production relations informing the economic base of society. As will be discussed more fully in the following chapters, Gramsci conceived of the capitalist economy as the determining factor within the superstructure, only in the last instance, and only as the parameters within which struggles for hegemony are played out. Thus the outcomes of history were not conceptualized by him as predetermined by the functioning of the economy.

History as understood by Gramsci is not the direct and unmediated result of the structural dictates of the economic base. It is rather the result of the actions of agents who struggle for hegemony, and around the praxis of counter-hegemony, in the realm of the superstructure. It is this understanding of the source of historical change that arguably allows contemporary theorists to bring Gramsci's analysis to bear on non-class actors, such as the NGDO movement, whose counter-hegemonic struggles are largely conducted within the realm of the superstructure with the goal of

reforming the state/civil society relationship at national and international levels.

In keeping with the Coxian critical theory methodological framework of this paper, however, and with Gramsci's understanding of the complex dialectic that exists between the economic base and superstructure of capitalist societies, it is imperative that such an analysis recognize that the NGDO movement operates within the systemic and structural influences of the capitalist world economy. The hegemonic praxis of the current aid regime itself, has evolved largely in response to structural tensions at this level.

Drawing on Gramsci's analysis of the source of historical change, and applying it to the international level, Cox argues that all action occurs within a framework of a world order structure which does not determine actions in any direct, mechanical way, but nonetheless, does function to impose pressures and constraints on action.¹⁰⁹ Cox further argues that the world economic crisis (in the form of the debt crisis) following the oil shock of 1973 appears as a threshold marking a transition from one world order to another.¹¹⁰ Concerned with short and medium term adjustment policies in the interests of producing a stable international financial system, the IMF, and to a lesser but significant degree, the IBRD, have played the major role among multilateral lending institutions in managing the crisis. In practice, this interest has translated into propping up the international financial system by imposing macro-economic policies -

¹⁰⁹Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States, and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory": 220.

¹¹⁰Robert W. Cox, Production, Power, and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History (New York: Columbia University Press, 1987): 400.

in the form of structural adjustment programs - on debtor countries that are a condition for IMF finance, and, promote an export-led economic adjustment that ensures debt repayment. It is then in the context of this world order structure that the identity, activities and strategies of the NGDO community are being formulated. The NGDO movement, then, may move with this structure or against it, but, to paraphrase Cox, it cannot ignore it.

Of importance from the perspective of this study, however, is the fact that it is not the existence of the capitalist economy and the formally democratic state which has attended its development, that the NGDO movement contests; it is rather, the legitimacy of confining the 'discourse of development,' and, counter-hegemonic struggle to the realm of the market and the state only, that is contested. Hence, although market-led/state-managed export growth models constitute the hegemonic praxis of the current aid regime, and as such the systemic and structural 'framework for action' that the movement struggles both *within* and *against*, the NGDO movement has targeted the institutions of civil society as the primary terrain of progressive struggle, and, the democratic reform of civil society and the state/civil society relationship at national and international levels as the stakes of struggle.

For this reason the NGDO movement's transformative potential will be critically assessed in the following chapters with reference to its own strategic framework, that is, a post-marxist framework. This appraisal then, will suspend judgement on the 'revolutionary' potential of the NGDO movement as understood on 'old left' terms. It will rather be predicated on a recognition that the NGDO movement

does in fact struggle within systemic and structural conditions that are not of its own choosing, and which do impose constraints on action, but that it has chosen to struggle in order to modify conditions constituted in the first place by the state/civil society relationship.

To this end Part Three will be divided into two chapters. Chapter VIII will be concerned with applying Gramsci's theory of the state/civil society relationship and the related concept of hegemony to an appraisal of the NGDO movement's transformative potential on the state and multilateral aid agencies which, together with NGDOs, constitute the actors within the international aid regime. Chapter IX will be concerned with applying Gramsci's theory of civil society and his thoughts on ideological transformation within the formation of counter-hegemony or 'war of position' to the NGDO movement's transformative potential within civil society itself in the countries of the South.

CHAPTER VIII

GRAMSCI AND THE STATE/CIVIL SOCIETY RELATIONSHIP

Any discussion of the body of theory produced by Antonio Gramsci must be prefaced with the observation that since his death in 1937 he has been subject to multiple and contradictory interpretations, ultimately linked to the political line of those who have claimed or disclaimed him. Gramsci's thought on the source and meaning of social transformations lends itself to various interpretations because, as Femia has noted, "although his claim to be within the Marxist tradition can be sustained, his is a Marxism which transcends crude materialism."¹¹¹ Although the economic base sets the range of possible forms of consciousness, Gramsci identified relatively free political and ideological activity as ultimately decisive in determining which alternative prevailed. The economic base cannot automatically determine this form of consciousness - it can only create a more or less favourable atmosphere for the diffusion of new forms of political and ideological struggle.

Gramsci's contribution to this discussion of the transformative potential of NGOs within the international aid regime, however, lies in his critique of attempts by liberal theory to draw a clear distinction between the state and civil society. Gramsci noted that:

¹¹¹ Joseph Femia, "Hegemony and Consciousness in the Thought of Antonio Gramsci," Political Studies, Vol 23, No 1 (1977): 32.

Naturally liberals ("economists") are for the 'State' as veilleur de nuit, and would like the historical initiative to be left to civil society and to the various forces which spring up there - with the 'State' as guardian of 'fair play' and of the rules of the game.¹¹²

Gramsci insisted, however:

.... that the general notion of the state includes elements which need to be referred back to the notion of civil society (in the sense that one might say that State = political society + civil society, in other words hegemony protected by the armour of coercion).¹¹³

To clarify this understanding of the relationship between the state and civil society Gramsci proposed that:

What we can do, for the moment, is to fix two major superstructural 'levels': the one that can be called 'civil society', that is the ensemble of organisms commonly called 'private', and that of 'political society' or 'the State'. These two levels correspond on the one hand to the function of 'hegemony' which the dominant group exercises throughout society and on the other hand to that of 'direct domination' or command exercised through the State and 'juridical' government.¹¹⁴

According to Gramsci, state power is not only maintained through the formal organizations of 'political society' composed of those public institutions - the government, courts, police, and army - which exercise 'direct dominion,' but also through the institutions of

¹¹²Quinton Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (eds.), Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci (New York: International Publishers, 1971): 262.

¹¹³Hoare and Smith (eds.), Selections from the Prison Notebooks: 262-263.

¹¹⁴Hoare and Smith (eds.), Selections from the Prison Notebooks: 12.

civil society which comprise all those private 'organisms' - schools, churches, clubs, journals, and parties - which contribute to the formation of social and political consciousness.

Civil society within Gramsci's theory is the terrain of ideas, where intellectuals, defined as all those who have an organizational role in society, succeed in creating hegemony to the extent that they extend the world view of the rulers to the ruled, and thereby secure the 'free' consent of the masses to the prevailing political and social order. Hegemony refers to political and cultural leadership, and, to the extent that the intellectuals fail to create hegemony, the rulers fall back on the state's coercive apparatus which is "constructed for all society in anticipation of moments of crisis of command ... when spontaneous consensus declines."¹¹⁵ Gramsci argued then, that a class maintains its dominance not simply through a special organization of force, but because it is able to go beyond its narrow corporative interests, and make compromises in a way which takes into account the popular and democratic demands of other classes - enabling it to present its political project as embodying universal interests rather than narrow corporate ones. For Gramsci then, the state rules simultaneously through force, and the organization of hegemony or consent, within civil society.

Gramsci argued, however, that the consolidation of a hegemonic form of class rule is possible only in modern societies which are characterized by a substantial degree of political and social

¹¹⁵ Antonio Gramsci, *Gli intellettuali e l'organizzazione della cultura* (Turin, 1966). Cited in Thomas Bates, "Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol 36, No 2, (April-June 1975): 353.

centralization and a well developed civil society. This modern condition contrasts with that of pre-revolutionary Russia where :

the State was everything, civil society was primordial and gelatinous: in the West, there was a proper relation between the State and civil society, and when the State trembled a sturdy structure of civil society was at once revealed. The State was only an outer ditch, behind which there stood a powerful system of fortresses and earth works.¹¹⁶

This distinction between non-hegemonic and hegemonic societies had immediate implications for Gramsci's analysis of socialist strategies, and as will be discussed below, for an appraisal of the NGDO movement's transformative potential. With regard to socialist strategies, however, Gramsci argued that the Leninist strategy of direct military assault on the state (the war of maneuver) was appropriate in a non-hegemonic society, since the state lacked a strong base in civil society. However, where the bourgeoisie has established hegemony, arguably the contemporary case in the West and within the aid regime itself, this approach is insufficient since state power lies not in political society alone but also in the organizations of civil society. This situation then calls for a 'war of position' in which the subordinate classes struggle to effect a counter-hegemony, or to build up a broad bloc of varied social forces unified by a common alternative conception of the world, within civil society.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶Hoare and Smith (eds.), Selections from the Prison Notebooks: p. 238.

¹¹⁷Roger Simon, Gramsci's Political Thought: An Introduction (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1982): 23-24.

The NGDO Movement and the International Aid Regime

In applying Gramsci's analysis to a critical appraisal of the NGDO movement's transformative potential on the international aid regime it is necessary to recall the conclusions of Part II, and to interpret them in light of Gramsci's theory of the modern state/civil society relationship. Part II has argued that given the fact that all social movement organizations within the NGDO movement engage in some degree of lobbying activity vis-a-vis the state on behalf of increased recognition and/or increased funding in support of NGDO development initiatives - on the basis of an identity as agents of civil society - the movement as a whole may be characterized as an instrumental one concerned with effecting a change in aid policies, and the distribution of official aid budgets, in its own favour, and in favour of community based development.

The fact that this activity is undertaken on the basis of an identity as agents of civil society means that by inserting *themselves* into the aid regime, the social movement organizations which comprise the NGDO movement have in fact inserted *civil society* into the aid regime. Hence, through these lobbying efforts the community as a whole has effected an extension of its own reach, and therefore the reach of civil society within the aid regime. The growth in the number of Northern and Southern NGDOs, as well as in the volume of funds which flowed through this sector over the 1980s, indicates that in extending the field for civil society within the aid regime, the efforts of NGDOs to create a space for themselves within it have been

effective. For the moment, however, the question that must be posed is how this insertion and expansion of civil society within the aid regime is to be interpreted and assessed, for given Gramsci's analysis of civil society, this manifestation of a 'strong' civil society may be indicative of greater state control and an entrenchment of political and cultural hegemony rather than the manifestation of counter-hegemony.

In contrast to identity theorists, this paper contends that the mere fact that the space occupied by civil society within the aid regime has been enlarged, and the number of NGDOs operating within it has grown, is meaningless in and of itself. 'Civil society' is not a space that is 'free' of the hegemony of the state, or in this case, the orthodoxy of the current model of market-led/state-managed development praxis. Civil society is rather a terrain where counter-hegemonic struggle, may, or may not, be waged. Therefore, in assessing the transformative potential of the NGDO movement and civil society vis-a-vis the hegemony of the current aid regime, the relevant question to be answered is to what extent NGDOs, as individual social movement organizations, use the space they have carved out for themselves to contest the hegemonic meaning and content of development.

As Part II has argued, although all organizations within the movement may be characterized as engaged in instrumental action vis-a-vis the state on behalf of their own participation in development, not all organizations are part of the expressive/progressive participatory development movement, which lobbies the state not just on behalf of its own involvement, but also

in order to contest the 'meaning' of development, to effect changes in aid and trade regimes, and to carry out technical aid and multi-service institution building projects with the goal of empowering popular organizations. Within the instrumental movement there are also non-expressive/neo-conservative NGDOs who do not 'challenge' the understanding of development expressed by state and multi-lateral institutions, who do not lobby for changes in aid and trade policies (beyond the redistribution of aid budgets), who do not engage in development education designed to radicalize their support bases, and, who do not prioritize empowerment of the marginalized to challenge the political and economic structures of their environments within their projects. Therefore, the organizations who occupy the civil society space within the international aid regime are not unified with regard to movement goals and strategies around 'development'. There are organizations within the movement, who 'identify' with civil society, but nonetheless compliment and reinforce the hegemonic development strategies based on export growth, and there are organizations within the movement who 'identify' with civil society and seek to construct an alternative development praxis which contests the market-led/state-managed praxis of the current regime.

The NGDO movement then, may be assessed as a force for change only to the degree that it converges around contestation of the dominant 'meaning' of development. The trends toward a Northern and Southern NGDO ideological convergence around the principle of promoting participatory development through a strategy of empowering popular organizations in the execution of both

technical assistance and multi-service institution building projects, and toward the expansion and consolidation of coordinated international policy advocacy activity around this principle over the 1980s indicates that there is some movement in this direction. Nonetheless, the formation and evolution of even national and continental federations of NGDOs will doubtlessly be characterized by struggle between expressive and non-expressive, progressive and neo-conservative NGDOs, or between those seeking to contest the dominant 'meaning' of development and those who do not.

As resource mobilization theory has suggested, the source of this struggle may be largely traced back to the state/civil society relationship itself, or in this case, the state funding/NGDO relationship. Patterns of politicization, and strategic orientations spanning relief, technical assistance, and multiservice institution building vary among the North Atlantic regions, and appear to be at least partially dependent on state funding priorities. Hence in Canada and Europe, where government funding has been channelled toward technical assistance and multiservice NGDOs, many of whom explicitly adopt empowerment goals, these types of NGDOs predominate. In contrast, where government funding has largely taken the form of food aid, and has been channelled to relief agencies, as in the U.S., relief oriented, non-politicized NGDOs are the largest members of the movement.

At this level of analysis then, the directly transformative effect of the NGDO movement on the other two actors within the international aid regime, namely the state and multi-lateral aid institutions may be assessed as uncertain as yet. While there is room

to argue that the movement has increased the space for civil society as a whole within the aid regime, and thereby the terrain from which to contest the meaning of development, there is also room to argue that this terrain is, and will continue to be, characterized by struggles within the movement itself to construct and hegemonize a participatory development perspective among the social movement organizations which comprise the movement.

Nonetheless, if there is some advance towards a convergence of the movement around the participatory development perspective, the question becomes one of where the movement's source of power to impose its alternative vision of development on the state and multilateral aid institutions comes from. The next chapter suggests that if the expressive/progressive NGDO movement has a source of power, it lies in the popular sector transformations it promotes through technical assistance and multiservice institution building projects which explicitly prioritize empowerment. To explore the transformational potential engendered by this activity, however, it is necessary to revisit Gramsci's conception of civil society and the war of position.

CHAPTER IX

GRAMSCI AND CIVIL SOCIETY REVISITED

Although Gramsci insisted that only heuristic merit lay in any distinction between civil society and the state, since civil society "is the political and cultural hegemony of a social group on the whole of society," he nonetheless also characterized civil society as a sphere composed of individual needs and organizations that had the potential for rational self-regulation.¹¹⁸ Moreover, although the concept of hegemony was developed by him to explain the process through which the state effected control over civil society, his analysis was predicated on an understanding of the existence of a dialectical relationship between the state and civil society. Hence, although he theorized the effect of the state on civil society, he also theorized the effect of civil society on the state through the concept of counter-hegemony. In so doing, he considered the conquest of power by the subordinate classes as a function of the transformation, or the 'war of position', which must first be operated in civil society.¹¹⁹

To be effective, this war of position requires not only a tactical alliance between a broad bloc of social groups, but the unification of this bloc around a shared counter-hegemonic ideology forged

¹¹⁸ Antonio Gramsci *Passato e Presente*: 164. Cited in Norberto Bobbio, "Gramsci and the Conception of Civil Society," in Chantal Mouffe (ed.), Gramsci and Marxist Theory (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979): 31.

¹¹⁹ Bobbio, "Gramsci and the Conception of Civil Society," in Mouffe (ed.), Gramsci and Marxist Theory : 37.

through a process of intellectual and moral reform that creates a common alternative conception of the world. Gramsci understood this formation as one which evolved through a process of criticism of the existing ideological complex:

This criticism makes possible a process of differentiation and change in the relative weight that the elements of the old ideologies used to possess. What was previously secondary and subordinate, or even incidental, is now taken to be primary - becomes the nucleus of a new ideological and theoretical complex.¹²⁰

Gramsci cautioned, however, that a new ideological system, could not be produced ready-made as an intellectual construction; rather, it would be built in the course of political and economic struggles, that is, in the course of inter-group engagement within civil society, and in the course of engagements with the state around questions of representation and the distribution of economic and political resources.¹²¹ Hence, like Touraine, Gramsci conceived of modern civil society as the terrain for society's struggle for historicity, and believed that modern civil society possessed the capacity to act upon itself to reshape the set of cultural models that guide social practices. Although Gramsci conceived of the proletariat as 'the actor' central to this struggle, for Touraine, and for the purpose of this study, it is new social movements who call into question the social form of historicity.

¹²⁰Hoare and Smith (eds), Selections from the Prison Notebooks: 195.

¹²¹Roger Simon, Gramsci's Political Thought: An Introduction (London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1982): 59.

The NGDO Movement and the War of Position

If "popular struggle is first of all a struggle to constitute the 'people' within its own organizations, before it is a struggle between the 'people' and officialdom,"¹²² then Gramsci's understanding of civil society as one which comprises a sphere containing the potential capacity for self-organization, or in Touraine's language, the capacity to engage in struggles over the social form of historicity, serves to alert the analyst to an alternative approach to the appraisal of the transformational potential of the NGDO movement.

This approach is a 'bottom-up' one, which conceptually isolates civil society from the state and looks within civil society for evidence of self-organization and the formation and institutionalization of an alternative world view. Cohen suggests, however, that evidence of the institutionalization of this alternative world view lies not only in the creation of popular organizations who act on it within their own organizations, and in their engagements with other popular organizations at the civil society level, but also in engagements with the state which effect a reform of the institutions of civil society itself.

From this perspective civil society is more than a just a field of operation for social movements. It also represents the institutionalization - as sets of rights - of certain associational forms and conventions for public life. Hence the institutions of civil society

¹²²Joe Foweraker, "Popular Organization and Institutional Change," in Joe Foweraker and Ann L. Craig (eds.) Popular Movements and Political Change in Mexico (Boulder: Lynne Reiner Press, 1990): 50.

provide a normative framework that condition state actions and force the state to operate within legally defined spaces and to share power with non-state elements. Where these rights are not established and institutionalized, however, arguably in much of Africa, Latin America, and South and Southeast Asia, the war of position or process of historicity may be understood as one which in the first instance takes the form of a struggle to constitute 'the people' within their own organizations. It is only after new social spaces within civil society have been reconstituted that this broader reform of civil society can be organized around. Nonetheless, "attempts to reconstitute new social spaces without some reference to the need for a broader reform of the institutions of civil society run the risk of condemning new 'people's' organizations and movements to political and cultural marginality."¹²³ Hence, the furtherance and entrenchment of democratic and participatory forms of development is to some degree bound by the nature of the institutions of civil society itself.

For the purpose of this study, civil society may be conceptualized as composed of the popular sector organizations in the South and the NGDOs which engage with them. As argued in chapter VI, this engagement is undertaken by progressive/expressive NGDOs on the basis of a 'participatory development' ideology which has emerged at the same time as the market-led/state-managed

¹²³Jean Cohen, Class and Civil Society: The Limits of Marxian Critical Theory (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1982): 227. Cited in Eduardo Canel, "New Social Movement Theory and Resource Mobilization: The Need for Integration," in William K. Carroll (ed.) Organizing Dissent: Contemporary Social Movements in Theory and Practice (Toronto: Garamond Press, 1992): 50.

structural adjustment development strategy, and in opposition to it. This counter-hegemonic ideology understands development as "a change from within based on latent capabilities" and argues that "change affected by external agents should be seen as secondary, supplementary and complementary to the unfolding from within."¹²⁴ It has been most forcefully articulated within the Manila Declaration which argues that "sovereignty resides with the people" and not with the state, that the "legitimate role of government is to enable the people to set and pursue their own agendas," and that "the value of the outsider's contribution will be measured in terms of the enhanced capacity of the people to determine their own future."¹²⁵ Those NGDOs working from this perspective have consciously adopted a strategy of contesting the dominant 'meaning' of both development and sovereignty, but have concentrated first on the empowerment of popular sector organizations in order to enable them to challenge the political, economic and cultural structures of their environments.

To the degree that these popular sector organizations adopt the principles of the participatory development ideology and act on this ideology to contest the market-led/state-managed development model of export growth through contestation of political structures that function to exclude them from the polity and/or the equitable distribution of political and economic resources, the source of the expressive/progressive NGDO movement's power to transform the aid regime of state and multi-lateral aid agencies may be judged to

¹²⁴O'Manique and Pollock, "Human Values and Planning": 71-74, *passim*.

¹²⁵ANGOC, The Manila Declaration: 3.

reside at this level. That is, to the degree that popular organizations grow in numbers and develop the organizational capacity to represent their demands on the basis of broadly based coalitions which seek an institutional insertion within the formal political realm, and struggle to effect that insertion on their own terms - those inherent to the Manila Declaration - the expressive/progressive NGDO movement may be assessed as one which has the capacity to effect a long-term change within civil society's capacity to struggle for historicity, and to reform the institutions of civil society. The movement thereby also has the long-term capacity to change the terms of the development debate vis-a-vis the state and the international development regime.

There is a danger, however, in overly romanticizing this potential, for neo-conservative NGDOs are also part of the movement, also operate within the terrain of civil society, and are also contenders in the struggle for historicity. The transformational potential of the expressive NGDO movement within civil society will also then, be dependent on prevailing over the civil society representatives of the hegemonic praxis of the international aid regime - namely, neo-conservative NGDOs within the movement. Again, however, this paper suggests that to the degree that popular organizations adopt the ideology of the participatory development paradigm, and disseminate it through linkages with other popular organizations, neo-conservative NGDO ideology and organizations will become increasingly marginalized within the movement.

This pattern of movement evolution, however, is obviously a potential pattern to be enacted over the long term. Moreover, the

effect of such a development within the civil society sector of the aid regime is one likely to be mediated by responses from state aid agencies and multilateral institutions which strive to accommodate this development in a manner that neutralizes or marginalizes its effect on the hegemonic praxis of the aid regime. Nonetheless, this appraisal of the transformative potential of the NGDO movement on the international aid regime will conclude with the observation that if the expressive portion of the NGDO movement prevails over the non-expressive one, the transformative power of the movement will flow out of the consolidation of the counter-hegemonic 'participatory development' ideology within coalitions of popular organizations who act on this alternative understanding of development to effect changes in the role of the state, the institutions of civil society, and the distribution of economic and political resources. Hence, at a strategic level of analysis, the expressive/progressive NGDO movement's effect on the hegemonic praxis of the aid regime, and the institutions of state and multilateral aid agencies, is one which flows out of struggles that take place in the first instance, within civil society itself.

EPILOGUE TO PART THREE

This paper has been concerned with theorizing the NGDO community *en masse* as constituting a potential force for change within the development praxis of the international aid regime. Hence, this paper has been concerned firstly with drawing attention to the fact that the community does not 'live' only to the extent that the state and market fails, but rather has a legitimate integrity of its own that merits analysis from a civil society-centric perspective, and secondly, with theorizing the NGDO community from this perspective as both an instrumental and expressive post-marxist transnational social movement.

The final part of this study has been concerned with conducting a critical appraisal of the NGDO movement's transformational potential on the praxis of the international aid regime dominated by state and multi-lateral aid institutions and organized around a market-led/state-managed export growth development strategy. To this end Gramsci's theory of civil society has been drawn upon in order to locate the NGDO movement within a theoretical perspective that is sensitive to the constraints on the capacity of agents of civil society to effect changes in both civil society and the state, but is nonetheless prepared to concede that such a potential does exist. The theory has therefore been identified as one which offers some guidance in detailing how such a potential is to be analyzed.

Given Gramsci's understanding that state power is maintained not only through the organization of force, but through the organization of hegemony within civil society, this paper has argued that the fact that the NGDO movement has been successful in inserting civil society into the aid regime, and expanding its reach, cannot be automatically understood as a 'victory' for participatory development praxis. The terrain of civil society itself - occupied by the NGDO sector within this regime - is characterized by a struggle between progressive and neo-conservative NGDOs, or those who contest, both practically and discursively, the dominant meaning of development, and those who do not. Hence, if the NGDO movement has a transformative potential, it cannot be conceptualized as one which will be effected simply because of the existence of an organized NGDO sector within the aid regime.

Chapter IX has argued rather, that the NGDO movement has a transformational potential only to the degree that the progressive/expressive portion of the movement prevails over the non-expressive/neo-conservative portion. This, however, will be determined through the success of the progressive portion of the movement in transmitting 'participatory development' ideology to popular sector organizations, and the degree to which these organizations act upon it to effect institutional insertions within the formal political arena, on their own terms, and in a way which transforms previously non-responsive state structures. Hence, the evolution of the NGDO movement, and its transformative impact, will be dependent on the evolution of popular sector organizations themselves, as it is only through the consolidation of popular

organizations around this alternative world view that the institutions of civil society will be transformed and neo-conservative NGDOs, and neo-conservative market-led/state-managed development strategies will be challenged.

Within the development regime then, movement towards the consolidation of NGDOs and popular sector organizations around participatory development ideology takes the form of Gramsci's war of position. This paper has not sought to speculate, however, on the outcome of this war of position. Beyond noting that the late 1980s have been characterized by some movement within the international community of NGDOs towards a convergence around the participatory development paradigm, the outcome of this convergence is as yet unclear. This paper will rather conclude with the observation that a war of position, or in Touraine's terms a 'struggle for historicity,' is being played out within the aid regime, and that a non-class actor - the NGDO movement - is a key player in this struggle.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adam, Hussein and David Brown. "Forum of African Voluntary Development Organizations: Observations of the Dakar Conference, May/June 1987." World Development Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 251-256.
- American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service (ACVAFS). Evaluation Source Book. Washington 1983.
- Annis, Sheldon. "Can Small-Scale Development be a Large-Scale Policy?: The Case of Latin America." World Development Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 129-134.
- Antrobus, Peggy. "Funding for NGOs: Issues and Options." World Development Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 95-102.
- Asian NGO Coalition (ANGOC). Democratizing Asian Development: A Commitment to Leadership. ANGOC Monograph Series No 7, Asian NGO Coalition, Manila, Philippines, 1988.
- Bates, Thomas R. "Gramsci and the Theory of Hegemony." Journal of the History of Ideas Vol 36, No 2 (April -June 1975): 351-366.
- Bobbio, Norberto. "Gramsci and the Conception of Civil Society." In Chantal Mouffe (ed.), Gramsci and Marxist Theory. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, 1979.
- Boggs, Carl. Gramsci's Marxism. London: Pluto Press, 1976.
- Boggs, Carl. Social Movements and Political Power: Emerging Forms of Radicalism in the West. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986.
- Bratton, Micheal. "The Politics of Government - NGO Relations in Africa." World Development Vol 17, No 4 (1989): 568-579.
- Brodhead, Tim and Brent Herbert-Copley. Bridges of Hope?: Canadian Voluntary Agencies and the Third World. The North-South Institute: Ottawa, 1988.

Brown, David L., and J.G. Covey. Organizing and Managing Private Development Agencies. Working Paper 128. Program on Nonprofit Organizations, Yale Institution for Social and Policy Sciences, New Haven, Connecticut, 1987.

Canadian Council For International Co-Operation. Mind if I Cut In? The Report of the CCIC Task Force on CIDA-NGO Funding Relationships, 1988.

Canadian International Development Agency. Sharing Our Future. Government of Canada, 1988.

Canadian Council for International Development Cooperation, Development Policy Unit. "Notes on "Canadian Partnership Branch: Integrating Change." Monograph (May 1993): 1-12.

Canel, Eduardo. "New Social Movement Theory and Resource Mobilization: The Need For Integration:" 26-52. In William K. Carroll (ed.). Organizing Dissent: Contemporary Social Movements in Theory and Practice. Toronto: Garamond Press, 1982.

Castells, Manuel. "High Technology, World Development and Structural Transformation: The Trends and the Debate." Alternatives Vol 6, (1986): 11-38.

Cernea, Micheal M. Nongovernmental Organizations and Local Development. World Bank Discussion Paper No. 40 (1988).

Chambers, Robert. Rural Development: Putting the Last First. New York: John Wiley and Sons Ltd., 1983.

Cohen, Jean L. and Andrew Aratu. Civil Society and Political Theory. Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1992.

Cohen, Jean L. "Rethinking Social Movements." Berkeley Journal of Sociology Vol 28, (1983): 96-127.

Cohen, Jean L. "Strategy or Identity: New Theoretical Paradigms and Contemporary Social Movements." Social Research Vol 52, No 4 (Winter 1985): 663-716.

- Cox, Robert W. "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory:" 204-255. In R. Keohane (ed.). Neorealism and its Critics. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987.
- Cox, Robert W. Production, Power, and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987.
- Davidson, Basil. "Ideology and Identity: An Approach From History." In Hamsa Alavi and Teodor Shanin (eds.) Introduction to the Sociology of 'Developing Societies'. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1982.
- Diamond, Larry, Juan J. Linz and Seymour Martin Lipset. "Democracy in Developing Countries: Facilitating and Obstructing Factors." In Raymond D. Gatil (ed.). Freedom in the World: Political Rights and Civil Liberties. New York: Freedom House, 1988.
- Druker, Peter E. Managing the Non-Profit Organization. New York: Harper Collins, 1990.
- Eder, Klaus. "The 'New Social Movements': Moral Crusades, Political Pressure Groups, or Social Movements?" Social Research Vol 52, No 4 (Winter 1985): 869-890.
- Escobar, Arturo. "Culture, Economics and Politics in Latin American Social Movement Theory and Research:" 62-85. In Arturo Escobar and Sonia E. Alvarez (eds.). The Making of Social Movements in Latin America: Identity, Strategy and Democracy. Boulder: Westview Press, 1992.
- Esteva, Gustavo. "Regenerating People's Space" Alternatives XII (1987): 125-152.
- Fernandez, Aloysius P. "NGOs in South Asia: People's Participation and Partnership. World Development Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 39-49.
- Femia, Joseph. "Hegemony and Consciousness in the Thought of Antonio Gramsci." Political Studies Vol 23, No 1 (1981): 29-48.

Frantz, Telmo Rudi. "The Role of NGOs in the Strengthening of Civil Society." World Development Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 121-127.

Freeman, J. (ed.). Social Movements of the Sixties and Seventies. New York: Longman Press, 1982.

Forsythe, David P. Humanitarian Politics: The International Committee of the Red Cross. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.

Foweraker, Joe. "Popular Organization and Institutional Change." In Joe Foweraker and Ann L. Craig (eds.). Popular Movements and Political Change in Mexico. Boulder: Lynne Reiner Press, 1990.

Gamson, W. The Strategy of Social Protest. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1968.

Garilao, Ernesto. "Indigenous NGOs as Strategic Institutions: Managing the Relationship with Government and Resource Agencies." World Development Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 113-120.

Geras, Norman. "Post-Marxism." New Left Review Vol 63, (May/June 1987): 39-82.

Habermas, Jurgen. "New Social Movements." Telos Vol 49, (1981): 33-62.

Hansmann, Henry. "Economic Theories of Non-Profit Organizations." In Powell, Walter W. (ed.). The Non-Profit Sector: A Research Handbook. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.

Hellinger, Doug. "NGOs and the Large Aid Donors: Changing the Terms of the Engagement." World Development Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 135-143.

Herbert-Copley, Brent. "Canadian NGOs: Past Trends, Future Challenges." World Development Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 21-28.

Hoare, Quintin and Geoffrey Nowell Smith (eds.). Antonio Gramsci: Selections from the Prison Notebooks. New York: International Publishers, 1971.

International Forum of NGOs and Social Movements - Commitment for the Future. Treaty on Alternative Economic Models (Treaty #7). Rio de Janeiro, 1992.

ANGOC. The Manila Declaration on People's Participation and Sustainable Development, 1989.

Jenson, Jane and Fuat Keyman. "Must We All Be 'Post-Modern'?" Studies in Political Economy Vol 31, (Spring 1990): 141-157.

Kajese, Kingston. "An Agenda of Future Tasks for International and Indigenous NGO's: Views From the South." World Development Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 79-85.

Korten, David. Getting to the 21st Century: Voluntary Action and the Global Agenda. West Hartford: Kumarian Press, 1990.

Korten, David. "The Role of Nongovernmental Organizations in Development:" 25-45. In Samuel Paul and Arturo Isreal (eds.). Nongovernmental Organizations and the World Bank: Cooperation for Development. Washington: The World Bank, 1991.

Kothari, Rajni. "Party and State in Our Times: The Rise of Non-Party Political Formation." Alternatives Vol 9, (Spring 1984): 541-564.

Kruijer, Gerald J. Development Through Liberation: Third World Problems and Solutions. Hampshire: MacMillan Education Ltd., 1987.

Landim, Leilah. "Non-Governmental Organizations in Latin America." World Development Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 26-35.

Lemaesquier, Thierry. "Prospects for Development Education: Some Strategic Issues Facing European NGOs." World Development Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 189-200.

- Lissner, Jorgan. The Politics of Altruism: A Study of the Political Behaviour of Voluntary Development Agencies. Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 1977.
- Macdonald, Laura. "Globalizing Civil Society: Interpreting International NGOs in Central America." Unpublished Monograph, Carleton University, Ottawa, 1993.
- Magnussen, Warren and Rob Walker. "De-Centering the State." Studies in Political Economy Vol 26, (Summer 1988): 37-71.
- McCarthy, J.D. and M.N. Zald. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." American Journal of Sociology Vol 82, (1977): 1212-1230.
- McCarthy, J.D. and M.N. Zald (eds.). Social Movements in an Organizational Society. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1987.
- Mecham, Lloyd J. Church and State in Latin America: A History of Politico-Ecclesiastical Relations. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1966.
- Melucci, Alberto. Nomads of the Present: Social Movements and Individual Needs in Contemporary Society. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989.
- Melucci, Alberto. "The Symbolic Challenge of Contemporary Movements." Social Research Vol 52, No 4 (1985): 810-833.
- Minear, Larry. "The Other Missions of NGOs: Education and Advocacy." World Development Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 201-211
- Mouffe, Chantal. Hegemony and Ideology in Gramsci. In Chantal Mouffe (ed.). Gramsci and Marxist Theory. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd, 1979.
- Mouffe, Chantal. "Hegemony and New Political Subjects: Toward a New Concept of Democracy:" 89-104. In Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds.). Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1981.

- Murphy, Brian K. "Canadian NGO's and the Politics of Participation." In Jamie Swift and Brian Tomlinson (eds.). Conflicts of Interest: Canada and the Third World. Toronto: Between the Lines, 1991.
- Nightingale, Benedict. Charities. London: Allen Press, 1988.
- Nyoni, Sithembiso. "Indigenous NGOs: Liberation, Self-Reliance and Development." World Development Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 49-58.
- Offe, Claus. "New Social Movements: Challenging the Boundaries of Institutional Politics." Social Research Vol 52, No 4 (Winter 1985): 817-868.
- Offe, Claus. "The Separation of Form and Content in Liberal Democracy." Studies in Political Economy Vol 3, (Spring 1980): 5-16.
- O'Manique, John and David H. Pollock. "Human Values and Planning: A View From the North." Managing International Development Vol 1, No 1 (Jan-Feb 1984): 69-86.
- Padron, Mario. "NGDOs and Grassroots Development in Latin America." Paper presented at the XIII International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association (LASA) session on non-profit organizations (PVOs) and grassroots development in Latin America. Boston, Massachusetts: October 1986.
- Padron, Mario. "Non-Governmental Development Organizations: From Development Aid to Development Cooperation." World Development Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 68-77.
- Paul, Samuel and Arturo Isreal (eds.). Nongovernmental Organizations and the World Bank. Washington: The World Bank, 1991.
- Poulton, Robin and Michael Harris. Putting People First: Voluntary Organizations and Third World Organizations. London: MacMillan Publishers Ltd., 1988.
- Ramanathan, K. V. Management Control in Nonprofit Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1982.

For Whose Benefit? Report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade on Canada's Official Development Assistance Policies and Programs. May 1987.

Showstack-Sassoon, Anne. **Gramsci's Politics.** Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1980.

Simon, Roger. **Gramsci's Political Thought: An Introduction.** London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1982.

Smith, Brian H. **More Than Altruism: The Politics of Private Foreign Aid.** Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1990.

Sosono, Adi. "NGO Roles and Social Movements in Developing Democracy: The South-East Asian Experiences," **New Asian Vision** Vol 6, No 1 (1989): 14-26.

Stremlau, Carolyn. "NGO Coordinating Bodies in Africa, Asia and Latin America." **World Development** Vol 15, (1987) Supplement: 211-224.

Tendler, Judith. **Turning Voluntary Agencies into Development Agencies.** Program Evaluation Discussion Paper 12. Washington D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development, 1984.

Tilly, Charles. "Social Movements and National Politics." CRSO Workshop Paper #179. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1979.

Touraine, Alain. **Return of the Actor: Social Theory in Postindustrial Society.** Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

Turner, Ralph H. "Collective Behaviour and Resource Mobilization as Approaches to Social Movements: Issues and Continuities." **Research in Social Movements, Conflict, and Change** Vol 4, (1981): 1-24.

United Nations Development Programme. **Human Development Report** 1993.

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development: Popular Participation Program. Inquiry into Participation - A Research Approach. Geneva: May 1979. UNRISD/79/c.14.

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development: Popular Participation Program. Participation: The View From Above - An Issue Paper for a Global Sub-Debate, 1983. UNRISD/83/c.31.

United Nations Research Institute for Social Development: Popular Participation Program. Social Movements and the State, 1983. UNRISD/83/C.33.

Van Der Heijden, Hendrik. "The Reconciliation of NGO Autonomy, Program Integrity and Operational Effectiveness with Accountability to Donors." World Development Vol 15 (1987) Supplement: 103-112.

Van Til, Jon. Mapping the Third Sector: Voluntarism in a Changing Social Economy. New York: The Foundation Center, 1988.

Viotti, Paul R. and Mark V. Kauppi. International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism. New York: MacMillan Publishing, 1987.

Weisbrod, B. A. The Nonprofit Economy. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988.

END

2 0-0 7-9 4

FIN