

Alternative to Development?

Exploring the intersections of Post-development theory with NGO discourse

by

Darren Major

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Program in the Department of Global Development Studies in conformity with the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

Queen's University

Kingston, Ontario, Canada

September 2015

Copyright© Darren Major, 2015

Abstract

Through an in-depth study of Canadian NGOs, my thesis explores the degree, if any, to which NGO discourse intersects with post-development theory. A growing body of post-development literature, Ferguson (1990), Matthews (2008), proposes that development goals should focus on making policy changes in the developed world while development projects themselves should be initiated at the grass-root level in the developing world. I will investigate if and how post-development theory parallels “development” practice of Canadian NGOs. To do so, I analyze five different NGOs through interviews and documents, such as published reports and studies released by the organizations in question.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my advisor, Marc Epprecht for your encouragement during the research and writing process.

Thank you to Peta, Karen and Barbara for help with all the administrative challenges.

Thank you to all the participants who made their time available to me and made this study possible

Thank you to my classmates for your support through this process.

Thank you most importantly to my parents (and sister), for giving me the opportunity to explore my academic curiosities.

Table of Contents

<i><u>Abstract</u></i>	i
<i><u>Acknowledgments</u></i>	ii
<i><u>Chapter 1: Introduction</u></i>	1
<i><u>Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework</u></i>	8
<i>Section 2.1: Literature Review NGOs</i>	8
<i>Section 2.2: Post-development theory</i>	14
<i><u>Chapter 3: Discourse and Philosophy</u></i>	30
<i>Section 3.1: Conception of “Development”</i>	30
<i>Section 3.2: Contrasting with other NGOs</i>	43
<i><u>Chapter 4: Operations</u></i>	48
<i>Section 4.1: Projects and Programs</i>	48
<i>Section 4.2: Partners and Counterparts</i>	57
<i><u>Chapter 5: Advocacy and Government</u></i>	68
<i><u>Chapter 6: Conclusion</u></i>	80
<i><u>Bibliography</u></i>	83
<i><u>Appendix A: Interview Question Guide</u></i>	87
<i><u>Appendix B: Code Log</u></i>	88
<i><u>Appendix C: GREB Approval</u></i>	90

Chapter 1: Introduction

Through an in-depth study of Canadian NGOs, this thesis explores the degree, if any, to which NGO projects can be informed by post-development theory. A growing body of post-development literature such as Ferguson (1990), Matthews (2008) and McGregor (2009), proposes that development goals should focus on making policy changes in the developed world while development projects themselves should be initiated at the grass-root level in the developing world. I will investigate if and how post-development theory informs development practice of Canadian NGOs. To do so, I analyze five different NGOs through interviews and documents, such as published reports and studies released by the organizations in question.

The first post-development theorists, such as Illich (1969), documented the un-participatory nature in which development projects were undertaken by intergovernmental and non-governmental development organizations, thereby presenting the developing world as being particularly feeble and incapable. This in turn created policy which has undermined the agency of grass-roots development projects in the developing world. More recent scholars such as Ferguson (1994), Escobar (1995), and Mathews (2008) have found that very little has seemingly changed since post development concepts first came to prominence. These scholars also take a critical stance on paternalism they find inherent in development discourse. Furthermore, new literature of NGOs and their role in global development, such as Fernando (2011) and Kane (2013), have critically analyzed NGOs as promoting negative representations of the developing world as well as reinforcing capitalist systems that cause poverty.

In contrast, this project seeks to understand the extent to which NGOs may express the grassroots, values that focus on self-determination, autonomy, and equality promoted by post-development theory (Ireland and McKinnon 2013). Drawing on the theoretical foundations of post-development theory and current NGO literature, I analyze the following NGOs:

MiningWatch Canada, Kairos Canada, Dominican-Canadian Community Development Group, Inter Pares, and Canadian Council for International Cooperation. I analyze these organizations' perception of their projects and programs, their relations with counterparts in the Global South, the concept of "development" and their view of the current government in relation to advocacy work. Given the limitations of this study, the focus is on the discourse and perceptions of these NGOs as opposed to their projects and programs. Overall, I have found that in general the five organizations in this study employ a discourse that is paralleled in post-development theory. However this study is limited to the perceptions of the organizations themselves, and therefore whether the organizations coincide with post-development theory in practice is limited.

Methodology

This study was conducted primarily through interviews of people representing, in some capacity, each of each of the five organizations. In total ten participants were interviewed. Initially I selected two organizations I personally viewed as being relevant to my research question and theoretical framework, given my past engagement with these organizations. A snowball sample was then used to recruit participants for the interviews, and include more organizations in the study.

The interviews themselves were semi-structured, with a list of leading or guiding questions that touched on the topics key to the central research question, however participants

were able to take the interview in directions they thought was relevant. (See Appendix A for list of interview questions). A recording program on my personal computer was used to record the interview with the participants' permission. From these recordings I typed transcription for two rounds of analytical coding. In the first cycle of coding I used In Vivo coding to attune myself to the respondents' language. I then used Pattern coding in the second cycle to code for themes, patterns, similarities and differences in the respondents' answers. (See Appendix B for coding list).

Given that this study has a limited number of organizations and participants, there are several limitations that must be discussed. Taking into consideration that this is such a small sample size, the findings cannot be taken to represent the wider population of non-governmental organizations. Therefore the findings are not generalizable, however the select case studies can reveal how the organizations in question view the concept of development. Thus this study only speaks to the organizations at hand, rather than the entirety of NGOs.

In addition, the research findings need to take into consideration the potential bias of the participants. The majority of the participants are members of the organizations being studied and therefore are likely to look favorably upon their organization and their work. The findings of this study can only speak to the views of the participants and therefore cannot be viewed as reflective of the actual activities of these organizations. A larger scope and sample would be needed to conduct research into the actual activities of these organizations, which would include their partners and counterparts around the world.

Furthermore, considering the participants were recruited through a snowball sample, the study is at risk of having only garnered participants and organizations with a similar point of

view. Therefore this sampling technique may have excluded opposing points of view. It is important to keep in mind here, that the scope of the project only includes the organizations in question and therefore the findings can only be attributed to these organizations.

Organizations Studied

Overall five organizations were examined during the research process. As described in the previous section the participants were selected through a snowball sample, and therefore the organizations themselves were in essence selected through the same process. Initially two organizations were selected and others were included as the sample size increased. Here I will briefly describe the organizations and their basic activities. The five organizations included are: MiningWatch Canada, The Dominican Canadian-Community Development Group (DCCD), Inter Pares, Kairos Canada, and the Canadian Council for International Co-operation (CCIC).

MiningWatch Canada could primarily be described as either an advocacy group or as an industry “watch-dog” group. According to some of its founding members MiningWatch was formed mostly out of necessity to pressure Canadian based mining companies into practicing in a more socially and environmentally responsible way, in Canada and abroad. MiningWatch works with community groups both in Canada and internationally that have either been affected by mining activities or could potentially be an area for future mining activities, in an attempt to ensure that Canadian based companies adhere to best practices that, as their website states, are “consistent with sustainable communities and ecological health.” (MiningWatch, Accessed June 24, 2015). The organization also works on public policy advocacy to reduce risks of mining activities in Canada and abroad.

The DCCD group is unique to this cluster of organizations in that they are the only organization where the Canadian members are entirely volunteers. The DCCD works singularly in Canada and the Dominican Republic. The DCCD focuses mostly on establishing connections between Canadian and Dominicans in order to establish long lasting relationships that can influence change and alleviate global inequalities. These inequalities include social, political, gender and economic disparities. The projects of the DCCD are initiated by members of the Dominican communities in which the DCCD has ties with. The DCCD then offers support to these initiatives largely through monetary donations from fundraising in Canada. The projects the DCCD help fund largely focus on agriculture, water supply, and education in various partner communities.

Similar to the DCCD, Inter Pares also engages in fundraisers to provide funding to partners or, as they prefer, counterparts in the Global South. Inter Pares is Latin for amongst equals, and therefore they emphasize “solidarity, not charity as an approach to international cooperation.” (Inter Pares, Accessed June 24, 2015). Many of their counter parts are local community based organizations that share similar goals with Inter Pares, and have had long standing relationships with their organization. Inter Pares focuses largely on issues of gender inequality, peace and reconciliation, food sovereignty and economic justice related to tax issues and corporate accountability. Inter Pares also engages in some advocacy work by meeting with Canadian policy makers to try and influence policy that affects their goals and the goals of their counterparts.

Kairos Canada is an organization of Christian churches that focus on the social teachings of the Christian religion. Specifically they focus on the social justice aspects of Christian teachings. Kairos works in both advocacy and partnerships with communities and social

movements across the globe to bring about social, ecumenical change. Kairos was established to be a permanent body, from a collation of crisis response initiatives. (Kairos, Accessed June 24, 2015).

CCIC is a coalition of organizations rather than a singular organization in and of itself. CCIC is an organization based on the membership of several organizations in the international development sector. CCIC is comprised of roughly ninety members and acts as an advocacy group for the interests of their members (composed of NGOs and other organizations such as international labour groups), primarily focused on the federal government, and international bodies such as the UNDP. The organization also engages in research in order to provide key information to their members about various topics of concern relating to international development and cooperation. (CCIC, Accessed June 24, 2015).

Structure

The remainder of the thesis is structured as follows. The next chapter will discuss my theoretical framework and the key concepts that will be used to analyze the data that has been collected. This chapter will also include a brief description of the theoretical debates surrounding NGOs and also include definitions key to this study. The second chapter will take the theoretical concepts from the previous chapter and contrast these with the views of the organizations that have been studied. Specifically this chapter will look at how the organizations view the concept of development in general, and some description of their activities. The third chapter will focus on relationships that the organizations have with their partners, how these relationships are perceived, and the importance of partnership to a post-development framework. The fourth chapter will analyze the organizations' advocacy work, and a discussion of advocacy's

importance to post-development. This chapter will also examine the difficulties that organizations' grapple with, specifically in the context of the current government.¹ The conclusion will summarize the findings and suggest avenues for further research.

¹ At the time of research/writing the Conservative party held a majority government at the federal level

Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

Section 2.1: Literature Review NGOs

This section reviews the academic literature concerning NGOs and their role in development paradigm. There is much contention in the literature over how an NGO is actually defined, and suggestions that the term has little meaning in of itself. This contention will be discussed before arriving at a definition for the purpose of this study. Following the definition will be a discussion of the theoretical debates surrounding the benefits and consequences of NGOs.

While the term non-governmental organization may seem intuitive, given that the title appears self-explanatory, the notion of non-governmental is only one aspect of what could be considered to constitute an NGO. Non-governmental would indicate that simply being an organization outside of government would constitute an NGO. As Fernando states, the United Nations' own definition of NGOs is simply that they are not governmental. (Fernando, 2011: 3). As Heins points out, the idea that NGOs are simply organizations that act outside of government creates such a breadth that the term runs risk of losing mutual exclusivity. (Heins, 2008: 16). Clark further argues that the term in fact runs the risk of losing all meaning, considering that many NGOs receive funding from government. (Clark, 1990: 34-35).

Weber warns that, "What is taken for granted, because it is intuitively obvious tend to be thought about least." (Weber, 2004: 347). Certainly the warning would apply to the term NGO, and probably explains in part the difficulty in establishing a definition of an NGO. As Heins notes, the term has not been given serious attention since it has arisen on a global scale outside of the general understanding that it is an organization outside of government. (Heins, 2008: 4). If

NGOs rely simply on the fact that they are not governmental, then this can incorporate several organizations that are not considered NGOs. As Gotz argues, relying on the non-governmental aspect of NGOs as the singular defining point would suggest that sports teams, criminal organizations and corporations could be considered NGOs. (Gotz, 2011: 185). Here the intuitiveness of the term may in fact salvage itself as a mutually exclusive concept, as it would be somewhat farfetched to suggest that Al Capone and his business ventures could be considered a part of an NGO operation. One key aspect of NGOs operations that has been accepted is the fact that they are considered not for profit organizations, and in fact the use of the term NGOs correlates with the rise of philanthropy in since the end of World War II. (Ibid: 190).

However limiting the term NGOs to non-profit organizations that exist outside of government still does not necessarily fully define what NGOs are based on their operations. If being a non-profit organization was how NGOs were defined, then there would be no need for the term NGOs and there would simply be non-profits. However NGOs might be considered a certain class of non-profit based on who they claim to represent, which can be explained through the chosen definition of an NGO for this study, which is borrowed from Heins:

“NGOs are voluntary associations that neither struggle for a share of governmental power nor have a mandate from the government or the state for their existence and activities. They stand up and speak out not for themselves but for others who are symbolically represented as innocent, oppressed, deprived, neglected, underrepresented, dispossessed, disdained, disenfranchised or forgotten. The activity on behalf of others is closely intertwined with systematically cultivating alliances across international borders.” (Heins, 2008: 19).

Heins definition outlines why an NGO might be considered as a class of non-profit organization, to the exclusion of others, by describing NGOs as organizations that aim to empower people who are not members of the organization, thus distinguishing an NGO from universities and other organizations considered non-profits.

I would argue that Heins' definition leaves out one important aspect in regards to governmental power. While there is a need to note that NGOs do not seek a share of governmental power, it should be also noted that NGOs certainly seek to influence governmental power. While Heins excludes this from his initial definition, he comments on this aspect of NGOs, indicating that the relationship NGOs have with governments is "parasitical" in that NGOs do not seek to control but only influence the government. However this also means that NGOs rely on government, for purpose, but also often for funding. (Heins, 2008: 37-38). The combination of being apart but influential in government power, and working on behalf of non-members can distinguish an NGO from advocacy groups such as the Mining Association of Canada.

Other groups such as community-based organizations or self-help groups could also be considered NGOs or non-profits. However as DeWit and Berner note, these groups are considered different from NGOs based on the fact that they operate primarily on behalf of their members. (DeWit and Berner, 2009: 940-941). Furthermore NGOs can be distinguished from something such as social movements, given that NGOs can be represented in a tangible organizational body, allowing disaffected people to contribute from a distance. (Heins, 2008: 26-27.) Given that a definition of an NGO has been established, I now turn to theoretical debates surrounding NGOs.

The literature reflects two opposing arguments as they apply to NGOs from the Global North, one that favours the current development paradigm and one that views the current development paradigm as detrimental. Those that favour the current paradigm look favourably on NGOs and those that are critical of the paradigm are subsequently critical of NGOs. Typically the favourable group, I would classify as “pro-market” given that many of the arguments sprung from this group suggest that NGOs can work within the market system to some extent and improve outcomes for the “development project.”

Arguments in favour of the development paradigm and subsequently NGOs, view such organizations as the rise of international civil society in an increasing globalized world by affecting the market. (Gotz, 2011: 190). One suggested method in which NGOs can affect the market is through boycotts. NGOs have been successful in targeting retail products through consumer campaigns to pressure retailers to demand best practices from corporations in the making of their products. (Chapman and Fischer, 2000: 155), (Gereffi et al, 2001: 63). Chapman and Fischer argue that NGOs can hold large corporations to account in instances where government regulations and laws fail to do so. NGOs can establish a third party labelling process and offer it to corporations that maintain best practices. Thus consumers make ethical choices based on such labels. (Chapman and Fischer, 2000: 163). Gereffi et al call this process third party certification and suggests it may be the only way to ensure that best practices are met within a globalized world. (Gereffi et al, 2001: 58-59). Fair trade certification can be considered such a process.

Furthermore there are arguments that governments can contract NGOs to deliver more cost effective and efficient services, particularly foreign aid. Not only can foreign aid when delivered by an NGO be considered more effective, but it is also argued that it can be less

politically tied. (Basu, 2011: 414). A new tri-partnership model between NGOs, government and private business in the delivery of services is being promoted by the World Bank as an effective development tool. (Roberts et al, 2005: 1848). Fernando notes that partnerships and contracting services promote efficiency and cost effectiveness because NGOs must compete for the contract. (Fernando, 2011: 274). It is evident that a favourable view on NGOs stems out of positive views of the development paradigm. Often this stems from the idea that NGOs can make positive changes through manipulating market forces.

However there is a considerable amount of literature that views NGOs as negative. Arguments, such as that of Townsend and Townsend suggest that NGOs are hindering development in the Global South. They argue that a new audit culture instilled in NGOs to make them more accountable only makes them accountable to donors rather than their beneficiaries. (Townsend and Townsend, 2004: 271-272). Furthermore the competition that this donor accountability has fostered only puts NGOs into a position of survival to ensure donations are secured rather than putting them to effective use. (Edwards and Hulme, 1996: 968).

A further issue relates to the contracting out of government services to NGOs. It has been argued that this reduces government responsibility to its citizens. (Townsend and Townsend, 2004: 275). Edwards and Hulme argue that allowing NGOs to deliver services traditionally supplied by government in fact severs the social contract between government and citizens. (Edwards and Hulme, 1996: 967). However, most NGOs rely heavily on government funding, as it largely contributes to their budgets. (Ibid: 962) In turn this has caused NGOs in some instances to surrender some autonomy to government in order to retain government funding. (Barry-Shaw and Jay, 2012: 54-55). Barry-Shaw and Jay point to the example of the overthrow of the democratically elected Haitian government in 2004, which Canadian NGOs were complicit in to

avoid losing their funding from the Canadian government. (Ibid: 133). Fernando echoes this point by suggesting that NGOs simply are in place to implement government policies. (Fernando, 2011: 23). This view suggests that NGOs are simply imperial tools of Western governments to impose on the rest of the world.

Other negative views of NGOs tend to focus more on critiquing the concept of development all together. These views tend to stem from a development critical point of view, and suggest that NGOs are simply perpetuating a Western idea of development that shows the Global North as superior over the Global South. Kane suggests that not only do NGOs support the current development system (specifically through international aid), but that they also are deteriorating their ability to alter the development paradigm. (Kane, 2013: 1506). Given that the development paradigm is rooted in a colonial context, (which simultaneously ignores the colonial context of poverty in the Global South), NGOs continue to use a developmental discourse that patronizes the Global South. (Ibid: 1509-1510). Heins echoes this point by arguing that NGOs rely too heavily on “universal” values that are often formed in a Northern context. (Heins, 2008: 33).

The discourse of development is often used by NGOs. In order to help secure donations and promote their image, NGOs often present themselves as heroes while they present their beneficiaries as victims. (Townsend and Townsend, 2004: 273-274). Kane gives the example of the Live 8 concert and how the NGOs involved in the program, helped perpetuate a negative view of the African continent. (Kane, 2013: 1505). However Fernando argues that the use of development discourse to raise funds is a result of NGOs placed within the capitalist development system. (Fernando, 2011: 233).

The literature regarding NGOs as tacitly supporting the current development paradigm is what largely informs this study. The dichotomy presented in this literature review in a sense oversimplifies a vast array of organizations, the dichotomy and critique is useful to this study, given that the primary purpose of this study is to discover if NGOs can present a discourse, or alternative way of operating outside of the current development paradigm. While I find that many of the observations can hold true to most NGOs I aim to study whether or not they can in fact aid in a different paradigm opposed to the current development project. In order to do this I draw on post-development theory in order to fill in the gaps in NGO literature, and discover if NGOs can be reconciled with a post-development framework. In the next section I outline the key components of post-development theory in order to analyze the NGOs selected for this study.

Section 2.2: Post-development Theory

This section outlines the theoretical framework that is used in this study. The chosen framework is Post-development Theory which takes a critical stance of the “development” paradigm. What will firstly be addressed in this section are key scholars’ views on development and the need for alternatives to the development paradigm. Secondly this section looks at how the development paradigm and discourse has been established within a colonial and Eurocentric context that distinguishes the Global North as having achieved a superior economic and political society, and subsequently presents the Global South as agentless victims of their circumstances and cultural short comings. Finally, this section addresses some key suggestions for ways forward using a Post-development critique.

Before delving into the theoretical concepts of post-development theory, a few things should be addressed and defined. Firstly, what is referred to as the development paradigm is the Post-World War II development project. The development paradigm is how issues of poverty and economic disparity came to be understood following World War II and is still largely how these issues are understood. (Escobar, 1995: 31). While the idea of development has its roots in the enlightenment, where ideas of measurable, societal progress had been debated, the concept of development as a standard of international relations took hold following WWII. (Herath, 2009: 1449-1450). Development discourse is the language, imagery and ideas that have not only been created as a result of the development paradigm, but also contribute to its sustainment. Thus Escobar argues, that it is through discourse that “development colonized reality,” in the sense that it is how relations between nations became normalized. Nations began to see themselves as either developed or underdeveloped. (Escobar, *Imagining*, 1992: 25). Development experts are those who have studied the issue or have become professionals of development practices. Finally, while development relies often on a dichotomy of developed and underdeveloped countries, this dichotomy creates a false representation, as will be shown below. However for the purpose of this study, there is a use to distinguishing between the privileged and non-privileged of the world. While this distinction does not hold any bounded geographical areas, in this study Global North and Global South will represent this distinction metaphorically.

Post-development theorists have examined development in a highly critical light. McGregor defines post-development theory as “repositioning development as a discourse in order to deconstruct and reveal power relations.” (McGregor, 2009: 1689). While some scholars and development experts look at different ways development can be achieved, post-development scholars have suggest the entire concept of development needs to be reexamined. Thus post-

development suggests “rather than alternative development, what is needed is an alternative to development.” (Escobar, *Imagining*, 1992: 27). However, to reject development does not mean that social change is not necessary. Rather, post development critically examines the conditions under which oppression and inequality have been understood through development discourse as problematic. The way in which oppression and inequality have become understood under development has not alleviated these issues, and in some cases has contributed to their escalation. (Escobar, *Reflection*, 1992: 416).

As Sally Matthews argues, the negatives that arise from development are intrinsic to the paradigm not side effects, as many development experts claim. (Matthews, 2004: 374). For example McGregor points out that the failure of some communities or countries to “develop” has generally been considered by “development experts” to be due to poor planning and poor governance. However this often oversimplifies the lack of “progress,” and avoids critical analysis of the development model, on top of ignoring more root based causes of inequality such as the adverse effects of structural adjustment. (McGregor, 2009, 1693). Development experts have attempted to seek other forms, such as community based development as a result of the failures of the development model. However post-development scholars are also critical of these new concepts. (Ibid: 1689). Escobar clarifies this by arguing that these new forms of development do not suggest a radical way of producing alternatives, but rather simply alter the discourse slightly. (Escobar, *Imagining*, 1992: 25). However finding an alternative to development is difficult given the way that discourse has been able to sustain itself. Development has taken on such meaning in western society that it seems almost natural and therefore difficult to replace. (Rist, 2003: 215). Many of the proposed alternatives to

development still rely on the core assumptions of development discourse, because there is a large web of meaning that it has created. (Ziai, 2013: 132).

Before addressing some of the key assumptions of development, and to understand issues with the development paradigm, it is important to understand the context under which it arose. Escobar points out that it is not a coincidence that the rise of development came with the decline of colonialism and the rise of the United States as a new global power. Colonialism was replaced with a new supposed humanitarian imperialism. (Escobar, 1995: 26). Blaut carries this argument and suggests that early development theory only extended colonial views with a new rhetoric. (Blaut, 1993: 28). Warah bluntly states that the rise of development was simply a continuation of colonialism but with less oppressive language. (Warah, 2010: 17). By using such language development was able to gain a certain level of legitimacy. (Rist, 2003: 75). In essence development became a way for powerful countries to maintain some control over the former (and at the time current) colonies.

The rise of the Cold War only increased the interest to spread development and have influence in the “Third World” as it would come to be known. Modernization theory as a form of development theory rose as the capitalist powers’ response to communism. It was an attempt to influence the Third World and present a way to achieve prosperity without resorting to a non-capitalist model. (Escobar, 1995: 34). However what was needed was a way to organize and understand the world in developmental terms, and thus development became a field of study and profession, which legitimized the discourse of development.

Escobar notes that the problematization of poverty occurred before the rise of development. However the idea of development extended this view to the rest of the world,

which justified intervention in poor societies because it was viewed as a social problem, which could be resolved through study and action. (Ibid: 23). Thus one of the key assumptions of development became the dichotomy of the world. Development has divided the world into the developed and the underdeveloped. (ibid: 31). Subsequent theories of development continued to rely on the assumption that the world is divided as such. (Ziai, 2013: 126). The dichotomy assumption is a base for other assumptions put forward by the development paradigm.

Distinguishing between the developed world and the undeveloped world is a necessary component of development. However it has had significant negative side effects. What is firstly assumed by the paradigm is that development is a desirable goal, something to be achieved. However little attention was given to what development was as an end point, and simply became synonymous with industrialization, mass production and consumption of material goods. (Ibid: 127). More simply put the Western nations began to see themselves as developed, and having achieved a superior standard of living compared to the rest of the world. (Escobar, 1995: 8). Furthermore the tools for achieving development were laid out by experts from the west, and purported that the tools were universally applicable. (Ibid: 25-26). However the notion that the West as being “developed” ignores many problems associated with oppression and inequality within their own countries. (Ziai, 2013: 129).

Given that the idea of development was conceived by colonial powers in the post-WWII era, the end goal of development and the tools to achieve such were based on Eurocentric ideas. (Ibid: 43). The very idea of development relies on a Eurocentric view of history, as a linear story with an endpoint to be achieved. (Rist, 2003: 44). This view suggests that because the developed countries had “developed”, they then could intervene in the undeveloped world to help them develop. (Escobar, *Imagining*, 1992: 23). Therefore the Global North in essence

created their own justification for their intervention in the Global South. The justification for their intervention relied heavily on creating development as a profession and as a study. However, it is important to recognize that development was a response to real inequalities in socioeconomic conditions. The way in which these inequalities are now understood through the discourse of development, (as a lack of industrialization or a need of foreign aid) has not aided in their alleviation. (Escobar, *Reflections*, 1992: 416).

Therefore this justification made development difficult to challenge. A western view of science and positivism was applied to social sciences in order to give development a universalized legitimacy. Social sciences such as economics and demography came to rely heavily on data sources and measurements. (Escobar, 1995: 37-38). Particularly in the focus on using a western classical conception of economics as a tool and measure for development, or industrialization, lead to the idea of economic growth, or specifically GDP as well as HDI, as a way to gauge whether a country is developing. These kinds of measures were based on western ideas of positivism, they were assumed to be universally applicable and natural. (Rist, 2003: 214). However as Scott argues, measurements do not exist in a vacuum and can be political. (Scott, 1998: 25). Thus even the measurements of development contribute to its discursive construction.

It is through the development paradigm and study of the Global South in the name of development that the South became to be understood, managed, and intervened in by the Global North. (Escobar, *Imagining*, 1992: 23-24). Development discourse produced the (people of the) Global South as an object of knowledge. (Ibid: 25). The transformation of Global South into objects of knowledge, aided in the creation of a system of relations, based on the idea of development. These relations between the Global South and Global North has become

normalized and perpetuated through development discourse, where the latter could maintain influence over the former. (Escobar, 1995: 40). However it should also be noted that some “underdeveloped” nations were complicit in the extension of the development paradigm. Through international aid and the promise of achieving industrialization, parts of the Global South have actively endorsed the development paradigm, for example by joining and supporting international institutions such as the WTO. (Rist: 2003: 79). In addition, scholars from the South have actively contributed to the rise of the development debate. For example the dependency school, while critical of the way development had taken form, still actively promoted the idea of industrialization to achieve development. (Escobar, *Imagining*, 1992: 27).

The rise in discourse and use of “scientific” tools relies heavily on a system of relations that includes development experts and institutions. Institutions, such as the United Nations, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund are able to organize the objects of development knowledge in order to sustain the normalized relations within the development paradigm, by establishing themselves as producers of development discourse. (Ibid: 40). Considering that these institutions were established, funded and managed by Western powers, it is clear that they also rely on a Eurocentric world view. The development paradigm has also created a professionalization of itself. Professionalization of development is linked closely to the institutionalization of development. Institutions and professionals of development operate within the paradigm to legitimize each other, by relying on each other to produce knowledge regarding development, and the developing world. (Ibid: 46). By being perceived as the legitimate producers of development knowledge, institutions and experts are able to decide what is a development issue, intervention or prescription, and relations. (Ibid: 44). Through the establishment of this key system of development, not only through

discourse but in some cases aggressive political tactics, (coups, assassinations, etc.), the Global North has been able to maintain a position of power over the Global South. (Forsythe, 1992: 385).

However the use of a Eurocentric view of development has been criticized of homogenizing the world into a dichotomy, when in reality there are complex differences that could not be fully understood by development experts. As Escobar argues, the Global South was observed by the experts of the North, who repackaged the culture into a single “undeveloped” group and sold it back to the South. (Ibid: 46). However there are many issues with homogenizing the various cultures into one single group. As Scott argues, dismantling a complex system of relations to isolate one variable can be dangerous. (Scott, 1998: 21). This “tunnel vision” as Scott calls it, is what development has done not only in homogenizing the entire Global South, but also in the concept of development, and thus the prescriptions that it has produced.

The tools that the development institutions suggest rely on a Eurocentric view of development and therefore have been assumed to be universally applicable. However, this view ignores the context under which the Global South has become “underdeveloped.” Blaut points out that not only did colonialism put the Global South on an unequal footing with the North, but that the North gained prosperity through colonialism. (Blaut, 1993: 2). Given that the prescriptions that the “developed” world put forth to the undeveloped world, were based on assumptions about history that ignored the context of colonialism, it is clear then why post-development theorists argue that development does not work. As Crush states, the underdeveloped world is stripped of its history and given a singular path which all cultures and societies must follow. (Crush, 1997: 8). Matthews also suggests that because the tools for

development were based on a Eurocentric model and ignored historical and cultural context, which means that they cannot be used to the expected effect in non-Eurocentric cultures.

(Matthews, 2004: 380).

One reason why such development practices continue to be implemented relates to the positivist view that development experts and institutions have of the development paradigm. Due to the fact that it takes this form, development has become difficult to confront and challenge. (Blaut, 1993: 9). Ferguson calls this effect the “anti-politics machine.” In essence, development is viewed as an apolitical, technocratic problem to be handled by development institutions. Ferguson claims that development in this sense is not an alleviation of poverty but a way for development institutions to extend bureaucratic influence. In this way, development can ignore systemic political issues that actually cause poverty, and can do so under the guise of being apolitical. (Ferguson, 1994: 180). The notion that development has been constituted as “scientific” only aids in its depoliticizing nature. While development is made to seem apolitical, consciously by some intuitions, it is more often than not a systemic effect. Ziai echoes this point and adds that because development has an appearance of being apolitical, that it ignores the actual causes of poverty, inequality and oppression and often puts blame on lack of capital wealth. (Ziai, 2013: 129). Recent examples in Canada surround the Canada Revenue Agency auditing NGOs that are known to engage in advocacy work. Specifically, the well-known NGO Oxfam had their charitable status questioned by the Canada Revenue Agency for having seemingly political goals of “preventing poverty” as opposed to “alleviating poverty”. (CBC, “Preventing Poverty,” 2014).

The way development is framed gives legitimacy to development professionals and institutions, allowing them to decide what a development issue is and how it is to be addressed.

However this often results in the exclusion of other voices, in particular those of the Global South. As Rist argues, development discourse is built on the power of legitimacy, which excludes other forms of societal improvement because they are not viewed as legitimate development practices. (Rist, 2003: 44). Large organizations such as the World Bank, IMF and the United Nations are able to produce research on development issues that tends to drown out other voices that might suggest alternatives to development. While there are other suggested models, such as dependency theory and Keynesian theories, these fail to break from the idea of development, and in ways align with development discourse given that the focus of these models still tends to ward industrialization and economic growth. (Escobar, *Imagining*, 1992: 27). More recent development models such as China's state led growth, or the developmental state can be seen as promoting similar ideas of industrialization and economic growth.

The way that the Global South has been painted by development institutions has contributed to their exclusion from debates about development. Through development discourse, development institutions have created a regime of truth about the Global South as agentless victims. (Escobar, 1995: 45-46). These tropes, as Escobar calls them, which presents the Global South as weak and undeveloped, is not natural but has been created and perpetuated by development discourse. (Ibid: 47). McGregor states that development discourse began by defining the Global South by what it lacked instead of what it had, and what it had was viewed as undesirable compared to the benchmark of the industrialized West that had been established. Furthermore no context was considered with respect to what the Global South "lacked." Much of what was lacking in the South was due largely in part to colonialism, which limited former colonies capacity to "develop" as it was understood by the North. (McGregor, 2009: 1690).

While there have been attempts to change the discourse of development to focus on more positive images rather than on the South as been painted as agentless victims in need of “saving” (Escobar, 1995: 8), negative images are still prevalent. Recent movements such as “Radi-Aid” have attempted to use humour to bring attention to social justice issues, and make light of development discourse reversing roles in their advertisements. (Cameron, 2015: 283). However arguments have been made that negative images of the South have been engrained in development discourse that it is still prevalent. Cameron and Haanstra have noted a more positive turn in development advertising to present development as sexy in the past decade. This form of development advertising has relied heavily on the use of celebrities in order to encourage people to donate or participate in development activities. The message behind his framing of development is that engaging in development will make an individual “cool” and have sex appeal. (Cameron and Haanstra, 2008: 1481). However the authors note that this image is only the reverse side of the same coin. The focus is put on Northern compassion and agency, while relying on an image of the South as lacking agency and solutions. (Ibid: 1482-1483). Parfitt explains that emphasis on Northern “help” rather than Southern “suffering” still creates a dichotomy of “developed self” and “undeveloped” other. (Parfitt, 2010: 675-677).

There are other indicators that suggest that negative images of the south are still prevalent. In a study examining youth perspectives of development, Talon and McGregor found that the Global South is still viewed as a place to be pitied and acted upon, and that these types of narratives are reflected in education on topics of development. (Talon and McGregor, 2014: 1419). Cameron and Haanstra point out that child sponsorship, which uses advertisements focusing on children being helpless, comprise the three highest public fundraising organizations in Canada. This is coupled by a study done by a British survey in which most respondents

indicated that they believed giving to charity was the best solution to global poverty. (Cameron and Haanstra, 2008: 1478-1479). Muller also notes that the involvement of celebrities in development issues also sustains a narrative of a developed self and an undeveloped other. (Muller, 2013: 471). The author further notes that celebrity involvement often causes deeper complexities of development issues to be ignored. (Ibid: 478-479). Abugre points out capital flows back to “developed” countries, reducing most of the benefit of aid, as one such complexity that is not taken into consideration by most of the public. (Abugre, 2010).

In the past few decades new ideas or ways to promote development have arisen, in continuation with traditional aid and charitable practices. However some scholars view new practices as another form of intervention. Silvey and Rankin note that development practices such as microcredit and microfinance are simply another tool for the North to use to have influence on the South. (Silvey and Rankin, 2011: 699). Microcredit can be viewed as less of state intervention, and more of an intervention of capital interests, hoping to access new markets. Hickel notes that this new focus on opening new markets as a form of development has put emphasis on women’s inclusion in development. (Hickel, 2014: 1366). Focus on women as worthy recipients of microcredit and other development projects has resurfaced as a goal in development institutions such as the World Bank and various NGOs. However the notion of empowering women of the South carries a narrative describe by Hickel as “white men saving brown women,” and further lends to perceived moral legitimacy for development institutions that focus on women. (Ibid: 1368-1369). Dogra is also critical of the focus on women’s empowerment as part of development, stating that it homogenizes women’s issues across various cultures and struggles. Furthermore it reinforces gender norms, representing women as

responsible caregivers, feminizes the South as a place to be acted upon by the North. (Dogra, 2011: 345-346.)

The paternalism that has become inherent in development discourse has allowed the Global North to construct an image of the Global South, instead of allowing the Global South to construct their own identities, given that legitimacy lies with the development intuitions of the Global North. Ferguson echoes this point, stating that outsiders establish an image of the global South that allows for intervention. (Ferguson, 1994: 176). The people of the Global South remain objects of knowledge, to be acted upon instead of acting themselves. Furthermore the lack of perceived agency of the Global South does not allow for their own autonomy in deciding how they would like “develop” if they do at all. However Ferguson argues that the denial of autonomy to the Global South is part of the paternal arrogance of development. The people of the Global South know better than anyone what their situation is, and how they would like to proceed with possible societal changes. (Ferguson, 1994: 181).

Despite the paternalism inherent in development discourse, it still persists and in some part this is due to the complicity of the Global South. Initially and to a certain extent contemporarily, members and representatives of the Global South have accepted the development paradigm in order to gain certain benefits. This has typically been in the form of international aid. (Rist: 2003: 79). With the complicity of some of the Global South, development practice and institutions continue to maintain legitimacy. NGOs are also a large part of the development paradigm. Talon and McGregor argue that NGOs in general were once radical organizations fighting against inequality. However the authors argue that in the last few decades most NGOs have lost their radical edge, becoming more apolitical, and not focusing on

issues of social justice and systemic inequality and rather focusing on short term fundraising. (Talon and McGregor, 2014: 1408).

Development has created a relationship through practice, discourse and institutions which continuously cycle and recreate their legitimacy. Development was established and continues to be based on power relations, with the Global North holding power to constitute discourse and practice and intervention in the Global South. In turn discourse, practice and institutions continue to relegate these power relations, and lend them legitimacy. (Escobar, 1995: 44). Development has taken such a hold in the way that relations between the Global North and South are regulated that it has taken on an air of naturalness. (Ibid: 47). Post-development has been criticized for not presenting viable alternatives to development, however this naturalness contributes to the difficulty in establishing or even speaking of an alternative. (Escobar, *Imagining*, 1992: 21). As Blaut argues, the ideas surrounded by Eurocentrism are continued to be believed and therefore arriving at alternatives becomes difficult. (Blaut, 1993: 10). Ziai points out one difficulty in establishing an alternative to development. Some development-critical organizations (including a few in this study) continue to rely on development institutions in order to receive funding support. (Ziai, 2012: 133). Escobar also points out that some progressive views within the institutions of development cannot translate their concerns upwards, because they rely on development discourse, and basic data used to measure “development.” (Escobar, 1995: 49).

The question remains then, what and how can alternatives be sought without reverting back to the development paradigm? Arguably the main suggestion put forward by post-development theory is to present a critical analysis of development in order to suggest a new paradigm that does not rely on a colonial/development discourse. Escobar claims that those forming a new discourse must be wary of salvaging development by relying on a similar

discourse, because it has been a strong influence in the way the world has been understood. (Escobar, *Imagining*, 1992: 26). One possible direction, that Escobar suggests is through cooperation among grass-roots groups, in the form of social movements to achieve social change. (Ibid: 27-28). Matthews echoes this point and suggests that there should be a focus on local autonomy, in deciding how to pursue desirable change in their own societies. (Matthews, 2004: 376-377). In essence, there should be an attempt to localize autonomy, and a focus on people deciding how they want their society to look, rather than have an outside vision enforced upon them by development institutions and experts. Escobar notes however, that localizing autonomy will require a certain degree of cultural relativism, in order to accept various goals and ideals. (Escobar, *Reflections*, 1992: 412).

In terms of the role of the Global North, Matthews in particular has written on the subject, combining various post-development scholars' opinions on the matter. One of the most significant points that Matthews states as necessary to finding an alternative to development, is to understand that people of the Global South have agency, and the ability to address their own issues. It is also important to recognize that knowledge sharing should not be a singular pathway, but that the Global North can gain a wealth of knowledge from the Global South. (Matthews, 2008: 1044). Another key point is to recognize that poverty and oppression do not just exist in "undeveloped countries" but exists in wealthier countries as well. Furthermore it is important to recognize that poverty and oppression do not exist in a vacuum but can be related to various actions and issues across the globe given the world's interconnectivity. (Ibid: 1038). In order to escape the development paradigm, Matthews suggests looking at Young's idea of justice versus injustice. Justice focuses on oppression rather than misdistribution and poverty, and is a solution which is more critically sensitive to the "difference" promoted by development. (Ibid: 1043).

While this is simply one option, there is a clear need to establish a new discourse that is more inclusive and less paternalistic. Matthews also looks specifically at the role the Global North could have in a post-development context. She suggests that activities in the Global North should focus on political participation to alter policies that encourage injustice. (Ibid: 1037).

Given that this study focuses on NGOs, which are concentrated in the Global North, it is these types of actions that will be the focus of the analysis. Furthermore there will be emphasis on how they view the concept of development and potential alternatives they propose. Therefore in the context of this study, post-development is used as a tool to examine how the NGOs in question, challenge or propose alternatives to the current development paradigm or Eurocentric development hegemony. The next section examines how the NGOs in question view the concept of development, and whether they see it as a viable concept.

Chapter 3: Discourse and Philosophy

Section 3.1: Conception of “Development”

This chapter will begin to analyze my research into the various NGOs that I have studied for this project. Specifically this chapter focuses on how the organizations view development as a concept as a whole. Overall the five organizations I look at have a critical understanding of development, which I contrast with post-development theory. This chapter also looks at other concepts that the organizations promote as alternatives to the idea of development. It is interesting to note that through the research process only one of the respondents had a familiarity with post-development theory. This chapter will be organized based on each individual NGO following with a comparison of all five. It should be noted that this chapter focuses much more on the organizations’ philosophies and discourse than on practice. How these ideas are put into practice will be reserved for the following chapter. The respondents’ all remain anonymous, including identifiers such as gender, in order to protect them from scrutiny. The exception is the Honourable John McKay, a Liberal MP, due to his experience with media and in order to explain his positionality in relation to this study.

I will begin by looking at the organization MiningWatch. While by their own admission MiningWatch has not had much experience in terms of the study of development, the two respondents I interviewed provided a view of development that illustrates its complexities. The first respondent indicated that through MiningWatch’s history, it has become apparent that development has no singular objective definition. The respondent indicated that communities with whom they partner and the mining industry in most cases have a different view of

development. While the industry wishes to develop a mine which they suggest can lead to a growth in the local economy in terms of capital investment and jobs, the respondent pointed to:

Statements coming out of communities, municipalities, and indigenous groups, detailing why it is that this not how they see their development, this is not the path that they want to take, to development, and it almost always has to do with an alternative vision of development, and alternative idea of what that community needs to develop. That again is hinged on values of importance to that community, which is usually related to the health of the land, and almost always has to do with water. (MiningWatch, June 24, 2014).

What is significant from this quote is recognition that development is not a completely objective term, which speaks contrary to the notion that development is a universal scientific study. Similarly the second respondent² was also critical of the notion of development as being synonymous with economic growth as measured by GDP and other measure mentioned in the previous chapter. The second respondent remarks that through MiningWatch, they have seen a negative relationship between capital investment in a country, particularly through the extractive industries, and the increase in poverty. In the respondent's opinion the investment into the economy often falls short of the promise of gained prosperity for all in the local economy. (MiningWatch, July 21, 2014).

While both respondents from MiningWatch appear to be critical of the idea of development and its connotations, they are not necessarily convinced that the concept of development lacks value. In fact the first respondent noted that the organization has struggled to be recognized as a development organization by various actors, including other NGOs, industry

² The second respondent was a founding member of MiningWatch, but no longer is a member

partners, and government bodies, both in Canada and abroad. As the respondent expressed “the industry does not take it well when we say we are a development organization.” (MiningWatch, June 24, 2014). However MiningWatch has grown to see their work as having an intersection with development since the government has begun to view extractive industries as “vehicles of development.” (Ibid).

In the view of the respondent, although the extractive industry has branded itself as a vehicle for development given its ability to provide foreign direct investment, the impacts of mining can be extremely negative in some circumstance, such as catastrophic environmental impacts. The respondent labelled these negative impacts as leading to “development deficits.”

We are often trying to balance the language that the government and the industry puts out that highlights how mining can be a vehicle for development, with a realistic look at how mining also creates development deficits, and that those deficits may in fact not be offset by the ways in which mining in a short term may contribute to development at a local level. (Ibid).

Thus the respondent indicated that development must take on a more inclusive role, and that in the opinion of MiningWatch, development should be in line with how local (and indigenous) communities perceive their own development. (Ibid). In a report published by MiningWatch, the organization is critical of the Canadian government’s recent stance on promoting the extractive industry as a development tool, in part because it involves the “removal of the right to determine what ‘development’ truly means for their regions.” (Coumons, 2011). Similarly, the second respondent also indicated how when working in development a “full scale” should be considered, which would include both the large national and international picture but as well as a focus on the local level, suggesting that macro-economic growth does not necessarily benefit the micro or

community levels. (MiningWatch, July 21, 2014). Furthermore, a report published by the organization outlines that they view mining as inconsistent with development because it is not sustainable, and only lasts until the ore runs out. (Kuyek and Coumans, 2004).

Analyzing the indications of the two respondents, there appears to be some similarities of post-development ideas within MiningWatch discourse, in terms of how they perceive the concept of development. Both respondents indicate that the organization has taken a critical approach to the concept of development, by critiquing the commonly perceived notion that development primarily focuses on economic growth in terms of capital investment as simplistic. The organization appears to take the approach that, local communities should be able to discern for themselves how to approach any form of socio-economic change. While this critique does indicate that MiningWatch has some post-development tendencies, there are also some aspects of their approach to the concept of development that do not fall in line with a post-development model. Specifically they do not entirely reject the idea of development, but rather suggest forms of different approaches to development. While the suggestion that a more grass roots or locally based approach appears to have parallels with post-development, it suggests more of an alternative form of development rather than an alternative to development.

The respondent from Kairos suggested that their organization takes a similar critical approach. However, based on the respondent's view of how Kairos operates, they appear to take a bit more of nuanced understanding of development issues and terminology than MiningWatch. The respondent describes the organization's view as such:

Kairos as an organization works through partnerships, with organizations in the Global South, and development, so I mean even the model that we employ, partnerships and

forging links between civil society and society in other countries, kind of speaks to a global development model that is going to be driven from the grassroots, and from social movements in the countries in question. So there's a lot of autonomy and self-determination that people defending their own rights that is built into our view of global development. (Kairos, August 15, 2014).

Similarly to MiningWatch, it appears that Kairos seems to focus on autonomy of local groups or as the respondent puts it “grass roots.” Furthermore the focus on social movement or “people defending their own rights” suggests that Kairos does not focus so much on economic growth but rather on partnering with groups around the world to support their struggle for rights. In fact when asked for a definition of development, the respondent did not once indicate that it had anything to do with economics.

While the respondent was not explicit in avoiding the use of the term development, there was more of a focus on the use of the term “social justice” as opposed to development. The respondent indicated that Kairos relies on a Christian interpretation of social justice, given that it is a Christian organization. However the respondent indicated that social justice seeks a “transformative change” by addressing “root causes” of inequality. Furthermore the respondent made a connection between social justice and human rights. Similarly in a report published by Kairos, the organization seems to consider development as relating to economic activity, which does not coincide with their concept of justice, given that it does not always coincide with the well-being of communities. Using the mining development of the Marlin Mine in Guatemala as an example, Kairos is critical of economic growth as being beneficial at the local level. (Warden, 2012).

Despite being primarily drawn from old ideas of Christian liberation theology, there can be some lines drawn that show parallels with post-development theory the discourse of the respondent from Kairos, as well some ideas that do not necessarily agree with the theory. As mentioned, the respondent seemed to avoid the use of the term development in favour of the term social justice. However, there was no explicit critique of development, nor a suggestion that the idea of social justice should be considered an adequate “alternative to development” as post-development theorists have suggested. Furthermore the respondent explicitly referred to Kairos’ as a development model which suggests that they are not critical of the concept in its entirety. However there is a hint of post-development critique in the way that the respondent defined development, given that there was no explicit reference to economic well-being, and rather a reference to self-determination and human rights. Furthermore, the concept of self-determination may broadly be interpreted as falling in line with post-development theory, depending on how it is actualized, (which will be discussed in the following chapter).

The DCCD takes a very similar approach to the concept of development as Kairos, but perhaps can be seen as slightly more critical of development as a concept than the latter. The first respondent from the DCCD was explicitly critical of the concept as a western idea, viewing development as “the creation of a system of ideas where there is an end point in mind and that end point is based on what is perceived as a success of the western world. So I think that the idea of global development as a concept might have some good intentions, but I think that it has a whole lot of issues as well.” (DCCD, September 21, 2014). The respondent is not only critical of development as a western concept, but also of the implication that there is an “end point” to development. Furthermore what is interesting to note, is that there is a tacit critique of the west being perceived as the bench mark for all communities or nations to strive towards. Furthermore

the first respondent was highly critical of development as a concept that promotes a top-down model of social change, in particular how powerful nations are able to influence less powerful nations, and have effects on small communities in less powerful nations. They argued that social change should have more of a “grass-roots” initiative. (Ibid). A grass-roots initiative suggests local autonomy as a key concept for the DCCD.

The second respondent from the DCCD, while not explicitly critical of the concept of development, did not necessarily have a clear definition and considered “development” too broad a concept to simply define in a few concise sentences. Furthermore the respondent indicated that there can be multiple notions of development depending on the lens that is used to define it, listing economic, and community development as examples. (DCCD, October 5, 2014). The second respondent indicated that the DCCD prefers the term social justice. However, similar to Kairos, the respondent likened social justice to human rights, particularly equality through human rights. Interestingly, the respondent did compare social justice to the concept of charity, indicating that a social justice view seeks to identify and address the root causes of inequality, while a charitable view simply addresses the results of inequality. (Ibid). Similarly, the first respondent suggested that social justice involves “disrupting a pattern” that leads to inequality, or looking at the root causes of such inequality, which can include critically analyzing inequality in Canada as well as internationally. (DCCD, September 21, 2014).

The explicit critique of the concept of development by the DCCD members suggests the organization has attempted to work outside of development discourse, thus an parallels with post-development theory can be seen. In particular the critique of the concept of charity, and their preference for the use of the term social justice suggests the group is attempting to frame discussions of social change around this new concept, instead of development. Furthermore the

focus on addressing root causes and looking for systemic changes can indicate a post-development parallel as well.

The respondent from CCIC provided what might be deemed a more politically appealing critique of development, in my view, and also offered a view of what might be considered an example of the commonsense nature that makes a concept like development self-perpetuating. On a personal note the respondent indicated that they felt the term international development was outdated, given its inherent paternalism, and that using the term is a “disservice” to NGOs, scholars and public policy makers. Rather they suggest that new discussions should focus on concepts such as international cooperation or global development cooperation to remove the inherent paternalism from the concept of development. In the respondent’s personal view, international cooperation suggests a more desirable view, one which is less top-down in theory, but indicates a “give and take” relationship between international actors. The respondent also linked terms such as social justice and global solidarity to a possible new paradigm, but indicated that these terms would probably be viewed as politically loaded in comparison to international cooperation. (CCIC, August 18, 2014).

When speaking to the organizational philosophy as a whole, the respondent referred to the concept of development as a goal in certain instances. For example the respondent refers to the CCIC Code of Ethics, which uses the term development extensively. (CCIC, Code of Ethics, 2009). The respondent also seemed to struggle with the use of the term development, when explaining that a more nuanced understanding of global relations and economic systems need to be understood in order for “true development, if you still want to call it that, to happen.” (CCIC, August 18, 2014). Another key note from the Code of Ethics describes development as “a social,

cultural, economic, and political process that leads to the fulfillment of fundamental human rights.” (CCIC, Code of Ethics, 2009).

While on a personal level the respondent was critical of the concept of development, the examination of the organization’s Code of Ethics, and the use of the term when describing the organization as a whole indicates that CCIC as a whole is not entirely using a post-development discourse. However, it is likely that the use of the term development persists within CCIC discourse for a few reasons. Firstly, CCIC is a coalition comprised of various NGOs that work internationally. While there certainly are several NGO members of CCIC that are more critical of development, such as the ones in this study, (except the DCCD, who is not a member), there are other member organizations that view the paradigm less critically. As the respondent indicated, often CCIC has to strike a balance between various groups. (CCIC, August 18, 2014). Therefore CCIC may function as a balance between these organizations. Furthermore examining the respondents own words of “true development” as noted above, suggests that the respondent would prefer another term, but is perhaps using it to maintain understanding, given that the term has achieved a level of commonsense in public discourse, while other terms have not reached that level of recognition.

The discourse put forward by the respondents from Inter Pares could be considered the most consistent with post-development theory of the NGOs involved in this study. Inter Pares focuses on issues surrounding ideas of autonomy for the Global South. The first respondent defined development as:

“ ‘Development’ is people’s self-determined ways of negotiating within their societies how they want to, I am hesitating to use the words ‘progress’ or ‘advance’, but, how they

want to realize their societies. They themselves are the people who best know the problems, best know the solutions and, more particularly, are the people who have the intrinsic right to do so. So [they] should have the right to have a say and to negotiate their solutions amongst themselves. Because everything in how a society works is the result of a negotiation.” (Inter Pares, July 2, 2014).

The third respondent also indicated that degree of autonomy for communities, specifically in the Global South is paramount for social change. (Inter Pares, August 12, 2014). Furthermore the first and third respondents analyzed the power imbalances between countries, criticizing countries such as Canada for using their influence to gain wealth from other countries, implicitly implying that a key part of Inter Pares’ philosophy includes accounting for systemic global power imbalances. The first respondent was explicit in saying that part of the organization’s philosophy is to critically analyze global systems and institutions, such as the World Trade Organization, in order to address social injustices. (IP, July 2, 2014.) The third respondent was critical of wealthy countries for wielding undue influence in global affairs pertaining to inequality, which can be seen as slightly hypocritical on the part of the Canadian government and in part Canadian society in general, given the amount of inequality in some of these countries, including Canada. (IP, August 12, 2014).

The second respondent went more in depth in terms of an explicit critique of the concept of development. Firstly the respondent opened by stating that Inter Pares does not define their work as development. This is due to the way that development has been conceptualized, as the respondent describes:

“Global development as an idea, is the idea that there are parts of the world where the people who live there have certain opportunities and systems and institutions in place which are more amenable to a better quality of life in terms of social indicators, in terms of access to health care, in terms being able to practice democracy, in terms of access to education, in terms of security. So the idea of global development is collaboration of people who live in countries where there are those enabling factors for a higher quality of life, and people who live in other countries where those factors are less present, less available, less structured or less well put together, there’s more conflict, there’s a weaker democratic system, there’s fewer services available.” (Inter Pares, July 22, 2014).

For the respondent the main issue for conceptualizing “development” in this way is that it creates and perpetuates othering, fostering an “us and them” narrative:

“but the problem with this idea of global development is that it presupposes that there are countries and groups of people and by extension nationalities and ethnic groups who have the problems figured out, and they have the solutions that you can then export to other countries to solve their problems. But that’s not the reality, and by looking at the world in an ‘us and them’ kind of way you miss out on the aspect of trying to look at how a country like Canada is complicit in the problems that a country like Haiti or a country like DRC is facing.” (Ibid).

The respondent summarizes the concept of development as a charity style system in which complicity and root causes of injustice and inequality are often ignored. (Ibid.) A paper that was published by Inter Pares, as a collaboration of all its staff members, sheds light on the organization as a whole in regards to critiquing the concept of development. Beyond unpacking

the idea of development, the report in fact recognizes that those of the Global South, “livelihoods have been destroyed by development, rather than enhanced.” (Inter Pares, “Rethinking Development, 2004: pg. 2). Furthermore the report outlines that

The profession of international socio-economic development is based in the modernist linear and cumulative notion of history, and the complex set of assumptions about “progress” that goes with it – including the bias of the “scientific” method, and the systems calculus that is used to measure and promote progress. (Ibid: pg. 5).

In terms of an alternative paradigm, all three respondents from Inter Pares indicated that the organization considers social justice as a path which must be considered. All three identified Inter Pares as a social justice organization. The second respondent explicitly downplayed the idea of Inter Pares as a development organization, “I see Inter Pares as a social justice organization, rather than an international development organization.” (Ibid.) When discussing the definition of social justice, the respondents had different but similar answers. The first respondent indicated again, that social justice is a realization of human rights. However they pressed further into describing social justice as addressing power imbalances and oppression, “Social justice is promoting the unblocking, or rather the equalization of power imbalances.” The respondent referred to power imbalances, and the intersections of various power imbalances, that have historically oppressed certain groups of people. (IP, July 2, 2014). The first respondent explained that they view human rights as a socially constructed tool to equalize power imbalances, and references a personal anecdote in which an Egyptian woman – a lawyer and economist – was now promoting the idea of the right to tax justice as part of a human rights agenda. (Ibid). The second respondent similarly defined social justice as addressing context and root causes of inequality and power imbalances, and specifically emphasized understanding the

context of inequality as key to achieving social justice. (IP, July 22, 2014). The third respondent did not go into as much detail, but indicated the importance of achieving equality, “which is not about being the same, but ensuring that everyone has a certain level of dignity.” (IP, August 12, 2014).

Inter Pares offered the most in depth critique of development and the most nuanced approach to possible alternatives to the current development discourse. All three respondents referred to the organization as a social justice organization rather than a development NGO. They were also critical of the concept of charity that they viewed as being synonymous with development in the public domain, and tend to view development as a somewhat benign form of imperialism. Instead they pressed ideas of self-determination and equality, by addressing systemic power imbalances in the world.

Some general themes emerged in the discourse of the five organizations that were studied. For the most part, all five organizations recognized problems with the commonsense concept of development. With the exception of MiningWatch, all the organizations were either critical of the concept or at least suggested that a new concept or paradigm should be sought. However, even MiningWatch expressed doubts with the way the current development narrative has been framed, particularly around the concept of development as economic growth. While there was no consensus on how a new paradigm might take shape, the concept of social justice and solidarity were recurring through all the interviews, despite varying definitions for the term, these concepts might be the building blocks around which a new discourse could be structured. Another common theme across the discourse of all five organizations was self-determination autonomy, and “grass-roots” decision making. All five organizations stressed the importance of ensuring that decisions of significance are made at the local level, which is in contrast to

development discourse which, notwithstanding rhetorical acknowledgement of partnership, has typically carried a sense of paternalism or “top-down” policies towards achieving social change. The next section examines how the organizations view themselves in comparison to other NGOs that are viewed as maintaining the development paradigm.

Section 3.2: Contrasting with other NGOs

Comparison between the five organizations of this study and various other NGOs, such as World Vision and Free the Children, that are typically perceived as less critical of the current development paradigm and promote a passive Global South narrative, was a key component of this study. It aids in distinguishing what makes these organizations different, at least from the view of the participants, from other organizations, and gives insights into how the five NGOs studied are attempting to strike a different path from the development paradigm. This section analyzes the responses of the respondents and contrasts them at the end.

The first respondent from MiningWatch did not necessarily give a direct answer to the question, but instead began breaking down the idea that “development NGOs” should be lumped into a singular category, given the various philosophical differences between some of the larger NGOs such as World Vision, Plan and Care, as opposed to some of the smaller NGOs. However the respondent did indicate that they observed that the larger NGOs were more likely to engage in public–private partnerships with extractive industries. (MiningWatch, June 24, 2014). The second respondent from MiningWatch first began to discuss the internal structure of the organization, indicating that MiningWatch does not have hierarchy, and therefore is less corporate in that regards than some larger NGOs. Externally, the second respondent viewed MiningWatch’s practice of building solidarity partnerships with communities as a key

component that differentiates them from other NGOs. The second respondent elaborated by stating that the partnerships model that MiningWatch employs is to help share knowledge between the North and South, rather than unilateral or paternalistic relationship. (MiningWatch, July 21, 2014).

Similarly, the respondent from Kairos indicated that their partnership model is what sets them apart from other organizations:

“Well I think our partnerships model that I mentioned earlier, the fact that we don’t actually have staff people that are permanently stationed in other countries delivering our program, that our program is delivered through projects that we co-fund, with partners to implement and we shape them with our partners, what the project is going to look like, what the objectives are, and we sort of come to some agreement with the partners on how we are going to work to achieve those objectives. But it is really in their hands and responding to their local contexts, that the projects are carried out, so that’s something that is particular to our model.” (Kairos, August 15, 2014).

Furthermore, the respondent listed several coalitions that Kairos had an influence in establishing, as examples of their commitment to partnerships. These coalitions ranged from Aboriginal rights here in Canada, to CSR, to international networks. (Ibid.) Similar to MiningWatch, Kairos views themselves as using a partnership model that is less paternalistic and more equitable in their dealings with actors globally.

The first respondent from DCCD mostly commented on internal structure of the DCCD as a key difference, mostly the small size of the organization and the fact that it is entirely a volunteer organization. While the respondent indicated that this can be a disadvantage in some

respects, it also gives the DCCD more manageable expectation, and allows them ensure they work strategically in terms of only making commitments on which they can follow through. The respondent also emphasized that the message that they try to impart on Canadian youth is vastly different from organizations that are more charity focused. The respondent explained that while other organizations encourage youth to travel and volunteer abroad the DCCD's message focuses more learning about how the global economy is interconnected in ways that affluence in Canada is a result, to a certain extent, of poverty in the Dominican Republic, and vice versa. (DCCD, Sept. 21, 2014).

The respondent for CCIC did not necessarily allude to the difference in philosophy so much as structure between CCIC and other NGO. One key point is that the respondent thought CCIC to be more of a civil society organization, rather than an NGO given that CCIC is larger than most NGOs and is comprised of NGOs and other organizations. The respondent mostly pointed to the fact that CCIC is a unique organization in the sector given that it is comprised of various international NGOs and advocates on their behalf. However the respondent noted some key differences in terms of how some NGOs still seem to operate through more of a charity lens when approaching the Canadian Public, given its effectiveness in raising funds, "but I think you know it's probably the way of raising funds, it's a very effective way, when you are appealing to peoples' heart strings, how can you help people and people generally want to help people." (CCIC, Aug. 18, 2014).

Similar to DCCD, the members from Inter Pares also began by differentiating themselves by the size of their organization. The first respondent firstly indicated that some larger organizations that operate within Canada also have a larger international body that gives corporate direction to their subsidiaries. However, where the respondent said that Inter Pares

differentiates most is on their focus to make transformative, systemic change, such as policy changes at the national or international level, in organizations such as the WTO. (Inter Pares, July 2, 2014). The second respondent echoed this point, stating that Inter Pares focuses on systemic and root causes of inequality and poverty, while other organizations tend to ignore such contexts at least when publically soliciting funds. Specifically the second respondent used the examples of microcredit and child sponsorship as ways in which other organizations make issues of poverty and inequality very individualistically based while ignoring the context of these issues. (Inter Pares, July, 22, 2014). Finally the third respondent from Inter Pares explained that the fact they have programs within Canada, not just abroad is rather unique. (Inter Pares, August 12, 2014).

Some of the critiques of the larger organizations made by the respondents can be supported by analyzing publications by these organizations. This is particularly the case when examining the two organizations that were asked to compare themselves. For example, World Vision's website puts a lot of emphasis on their child sponsorship program, and the work they do with children in general. (World Vision, Accessed August 10, 2015). Thus not only does World Vision emphasize their charity practices, but also present the narrative of the innocent helpless "third world" child. Similarly, Free the Children's website describes themselves as a charity organization that focuses on educating and empowering youth in North America and the UK to be "ambassadors for change" while educating communities and children in Asia, Africa and Latin America to be able to "lift themselves out of poverty." (Free the Children, Accessed August 10, 2015). Free the Children emphasizes a narrative of problems of inequality an poverty only existing outside of the western world and suggests in their language that the people of Asia,

Africa and Latin America need to be educated by western ambassadors to be able deal with issues that they are facing.

For the most part, the sheer size and structure is a common way that these organizations distinguish themselves from more well-known NGOs. However in terms of philosophies on recurring theme is partnership. A majority of the NGOs studied view the way they engage with their partners either in Canada or abroad as something that differentiates them from other NGOs. The underlying message for the NGOs that cite partnerships as a unique quality to their organizations is that they value equality with those whom they work. However it can be debated that if a majority of the organizations studied claimed that they are unique because of their relationships with their partners, then it cannot be as unique as they claim. However, the questions put to the respondents asked for differences with more publically known organizations, and it should not be surprising that these smaller NGOs would have similar philosophies. Another key theme was the critical approach to understanding systemic causes of inequality. This is another important value for these organizations. The next chapter examines how the philosophies put forward by the organizations are put into practice, in their view.

Chapter 4: Operations

This chapter examines the projects and programs of the five organizations, as well as their relationships with their partners and counterparts. As discussed in the previous chapter, all five organizations expressed a commitment or philosophy of supporting self-determination, and collaboration as opposed to a paternal top-down understanding of social change that has been a part of the development paradigm. The first section examines the projects and programs, while the second section examines relationships with partners and counterparts of the Global South.

Section 4.1: Projects and Programs

This section examines the projects of the five NGOs as described by the participants. While some of the participants go into detail with a few of the projects, for the most part they speak about them in the general sense. To begin, the respondents from MiningWatch described their activities as primarily supporting communities that are either affected by mining operations, or are considering negotiating with an extractive company. Furthermore the respondents went into detail about their advocacy work as well.

The first respondent from MiningWatch claimed that in instances where communities are considering allowing extractive companies into their region, they have asked MiningWatch for information on how they should negotiate,

There are communities that have decided that they want to give mining a shot, they want to allow a mine to come into their community potentially, but they want to know what are the things we should be asking, or what kind of conditions should we be placing on this mine, or what kind of contractual agreements can we get, how can we protect ourselves in this context, if we say yes what recourse do we have, how can we protect ourselves,

how can we hold the company to account, how can we assure that the promises they make they will actually live up to. (MiningWatch, June 24, 2014).

This is a particularly key point, as MiningWatch often gets labelled as always being opposed to Mining Activities.

The first respondent here indicates that they support communities' to ensure responsible activities are carried out. However, in cases when a community has been affected by mining practices, MiningWatch offers support to these communities in various ways. For example the first respondent explained that in some instances a community will reach out to MiningWatch to find an expert to test and provide scientific evidence of water contamination. (MiningWatch, June 24, 2014).

While supporting communities is a significant part of their work, advocacy and policy work also comprise a significant portion of MiningWatch's projects. The first respondent suggested that for the most part their advocacy and policy work revolves around providing remedy in instances where mining activities have affected communities in a negative way, such as through water or land contamination or through human rights abuses. In terms of remedy and as an example of their policy work MiningWatch was an advocate for the failed 2010 Bill C-300, which proposed a complaint mechanism that could investigate claims against Canadian companies, and recommended withholding diplomatic and financial support from companies that breached best practices and were found to have harmed impacted communities. (Ibid).

The second respondent elaborated on their advocacy work, explaining the various avenues they use to bring attention to a particular issue. For example, MiningWatch was able to bring attention to an incident in Chile where some communities member were harmed during a

protest of a project site, by informing the Canadian government opposition MPs who then brought the issue to Parliament to publically bring attention to the issue. The second respondent also indicated that they have brought media attention to certain issues and also lobbied directly to a company in attempts to change their operations. (MiningWatch, July 21, 2014). The first respondent also echoed this latter point, explaining that they have attempted to contact shareholders to influence companies. The first respondent also spoke to how part of their advocacy involves inviting members from affected communities to speak in front of media, MPs and shareholders. (MiningWatch, June 24, 2014).

One important aspect that both respondents from MiningWatch spoke of was the fact that they also work with communities and on issues in Canada. The first respondent stated that they have an entire focus area allocated to issues in Canada, which one of their five member staff manages. (Ibid). The second respondent saw this as a solidarity concept, but also a self-interest issue explaining, “anything that they can get away with overseas, they can and will be able to get away with here.” (MiningWatch, July 21, 2014). The second respondent described the importance of advocacy as attempting to address a power imbalance, given that the industry has immense resources at their disposal, and an effective lobbying force. (Ibid).

In terms of how the respondents describe their projects, there are some suggestions that MiningWatch employs some post-development ideals. Firstly, given that they focus on issues in Canada, suggests that Canada is not as “developed” as the development narrative usually suggests, but that Canada also has issues of its own. Secondly, MiningWatch has described their projects as supporting and advocating, rather than typical development projects that attempt to alleviate poverty. In particular their focus on advocacy is a break from the development paradigm, in that they are attempting to combat root causes of social injustices. The point of

advocacy in their view is an attempt to even a playing field in which there is a heavy power imbalance.

The respondent from Kairos did not expand in as much detail on their projects, as the respondents from MiningWatch. However, there are some certain similarities in the basic principles of Kairos' projects. Primarily, according to the respondent, Kairos focuses on advocacy,

Well we have a few different thematic focuses. We do programming in Canada and internationally. So we also partner with civil society organizations in Canada, some indigenous groups, some non-indigenous organizations to do advocacy in Canada, related to human rights and ecological justice issues here, and then we do the same internationally. (Kairos, August 15, 2014).

Furthermore the respondent describes almost a division of labour in terms of advocacy, between Kairos and their partners, "So there is a bit of advocacy that goes on in countries in the (Global) South by our partners. There is advocacy that goes on in Canada by Kairos and by our partners when they come to Canada." (Ibid). Similar to MiningWatch, Kairos uses advocacy methods such as speaking, or having their partners speak in front of parliamentary committees, and media outlets. However the respondent also spoke of how mobilization of Canadians to change Canadian policy, through such tactics as letter campaigns to local MPs. The respondent also indicated that in part their advocacy work is rooted in their partner's calls for policy change in Canada that they see as affecting their own context. (Ibid).

Kairos focus on advocacy for policy change, like MiningWatch, also suggests a more post-development approach to international cooperation, as it attempts to address more root causes of inequality rather than alleviation of poverty. Furthermore, Kairos admits that there are

issues of inequality and social justice in Canada as well as abroad. Also there is an emphasis on their partners leading the way on such projects which runs contrary to developmental discourse that presents members of the Global South as passive and agentless.

While the DCCD tends to focus on what may be perceived as more conventional development projects, in that they do not necessarily focus on advocacy, they do emphasize a break in development discourse of the passive Global South. Projects are started and lead by partner organizations in the Dominican and the DCCD provides financial support. For example the first respondent outlined a project they financially support that their partners initially, “purchased the track of land and started planting on it, with the objective of having an educational center for Haitian workers, predominantly male mature migrant workers, who were finding really hard time, of find any other kind of employment.” (DCCD, Sept. 21, 2014). The first respondent also outlined another project that they have supported, “We don’t support the specific project through them, we just give financial support for them to decide what to use it for, so right now they are, they do literacy, after school homework support and arts and crafts.” (Ibid).

To the respondents’ own admission, the DCCD does not engage in advocacy. As the second respondent explains, when asked if they engage in advocacy,

That’s out of our range is a good way to put it or out of our scope. Yea it’s interesting that you say that because I mean, I am proud of our volunteers, but that being said if I had more time, I put as much time as I can into this, it’s something I am passionate about, but if I had more time, for example we’ve been looking at the situation happened with the Haitian losing citizenship in the Dominican, and that was kind of covered in the media, that was something where for the first time I was like ok, this is something that is

a policy issue right, its government, its government saying these people will need to be deported or this this and this. So that was the first time I kind of felt a little bit like, is there something we should think about doing. (DCCD, October 5, 2014).

While the DCCD does not engage in formal advocacy, there is something to be said about their attempts to at least raise awareness of policy issues. Beyond the example given in the above response, the DCCD has also brought attention to policy issues relating to fair trade, migrant workers, and extractive projects in the Dominican, through social media sites such as Facebook. For example, recently the DCCD has posted several news articles and various publications condemning the Dominican government's decision to deny citizenship to children born in the Dominican to Haitian migrant workers. (DCCD Exp, Facebook, June 18, 2015).

A large thrust of the DCCD's projects surround financial support for other locally based NGOs to carry out their own projects. This practice is reflective of their discourse regarding autonomy and self-determination. Other than dealing with financial matters, the group appears to be hands off and allow their partners to determine the scope of the projects

CCIC could in a way be considered the opposite of the DCCD in regards to the projects they engage in. The respondent outlined in general the kind of work CCIC does, "So we do a lot of research, a lot of advocacy, our annual forum brought together individuals from around the world to talk about issues that are of interest to our members, we run workshops on changes to legislation that affects charities working in the sector." (CCIC, August 18, 2014). Primarily, given its mandate as a coalition of NGOs, CCIC focuses on overarching issues relating to the NGO sector, as opposed to conducting on the ground projects overseas.

The respondent stated that the goal of their advocacy was primarily in support of their members' operations,

We've done a lot of advocacy work around trying to change policies, legislation based on the experience of our members, I think our members have decades of experience in the field, they know what works, what doesn't, they've tried a lot of things, they have longstanding partnerships with organizations. So we try and sort of create a common voice, generate policies that speak to the realities of our members, and I think were a progressive voice of the sector. (Ibid).

Furthermore, the respondent indicated that they do a lot of research and publications about accountability for NGOs, such as their Code of Ethics, which was done collaboratively with their members. Additionally CCIC operate a number of working groups that have a regional or issue-related focus such as the Asia Pacific Working Group, and the Food Security Policy Group. (Ibid).

The focus on advocacy by CCIC suggests that they see a need to reform certain Canadian policies that affect their members and working groups. The focus on advocacy suggests that CCIC is looking at systemic issues that cause inequality. Furthermore their emphasis on research and dialogue is an alternative focus that is not typically considered a large aspect of the development narrative that is presented to the public. Conversely however, it may be argued that a focus on research of “development” issues only contributes to maintain the paradigm. This critique could also apply to the other organizations as well, given that with the exception of the DCCD, they also publish research reports. However, some of the reports that CCIC publishes, such as their Code of Ethics, promote the concept of development. (CCIC, Code of Ethics, 2009). On the other hand reports published by Kairos, Inter Pares and MiningWatch typically deal with issues of injustices, in particular relating to the extractive sector, such as the reports cited in the previous chapter.

Inter Pares appears to strike a balance between on the ground projects, (or programs as the respondents referred to them) and advocacy. The second respondent noted the difference that the organization sees between projects and programs, “The difference between projects and programs is that projects are a sort of one off thing, while programs are seen as more long term.” (Inter Pares, July 22, 2014). The second respondent outlined how Inter Pares primarily funds programs of their counterparts in Canada and abroad, primarily focusing on issues such as women’s rights, health issues, food sovereignty, migration, corporate accountability. One area that the respondent elaborated on, was peace building, explaining that,

So a number of the groups we work with in Latin America are supporting communities who have survived civil wars that took place in Guatemala and in Peru, and ongoing conflicts in Colombia. These groups are working to resist impunity for war criminals, seeking truth and justice and some kind of healing for communities who had family members disappeared and were never able to find them, or in some cases have been able to find the mass graves of people who were murdered by the army. (Ibid).

The third respondent described one of Inter Pares’ counterparts that works on health issues,

It’s a women’s health organization based in the Philippines, and they are amazing, because they do really interesting work at the community levels. They have at the local level, they train women within the community to be healthcare workers. So they have a couple of clinics, and they provide, mostly women’s health issues, contraception, pre and post-natal care, trying to decrease child mortality, teen pregnancy, those kind of issues. (Inter Pares, August 12, 2014).

The respondent also elaborated on this particular counterpart explaining that they also do advocacy work in the Philippines to change policies that relate to their work. (Ibid). These two

examples show how Inter Pares focuses on supporting counterparts that work in their own local context.

In addition to the programs they fund, Inter Pares also engages in advocacy. The third respondent explained that advocacy is an important part of what Inter Pares does because,

We also look at ourselves, you know we are a Canadian organization, and that's why we not only support work here in Canada, but also have a mandate to look at laws, and policies, and what our own government is doing. I also like to use the term activists, you know that we are an activist organization, that we are looking to change things about the world. (Ibid).

The first respondent elaborated on one particular advocacy issue that Inter Pares has engaged in,

In the 1990s, we participated in a campaign to get CIDA to stop providing funding to sterilization programs in Bangladesh that had become essentially forced sterilization of poor women. At that time, Canadian and other pharmaceutical companies were pushing the use of birth control methods that were dangerous for women outside of close supervision under a strong health care system. This was happening mostly in South Asia. And CIDA did stop, they looked at what was actually happening, and looked at our data, and said "yea this is very destructive, people are dying" and they stopped those programs. (Inter Pares, July 2, 2014).

The first respondent also explained that Inter Pares has been a part of other advocacy campaigns that address issues such as the extractive sector and tax justice.

Outside of their advocacy and program work, Inter Pares, like CCIC works on creating dialogue and research around particular issues. For example the first respondent explained how they were part of organizing a conference which discussed issues around tax justice. During the

conference a dialogue about the possibility of a human right to tax justice was explored. The respondent explained that this was significant because, “people thinking together and building on the rights we already agreed to, is the way that rights are constructed. All law is a social construct, and human rights are part of the legal system.” (Ibid).

Some similarities between how the projects are described across the five organizations resonate with post-development theory. Firstly focusing not only on issues of the Global South, but also of the Global North begins to deconstruct the dichotomy of a developed and undeveloped world. Secondly and in conjunction with the first point, a focus on advocacy recognizes policies in the Global North (and to a certain extent the South) result in systemic causes of inequality and must be addressed to achieve social change. Finally an emphasis on the projects and programs as a way of supporting marginalized people’s right to self-determination and navigation of their own context breaks with the development paradigm that has been criticized as being intrusive and paternalistic. In conjunction with this final point, the next section analyzes how the five organizations describe their relationships with their partners or counterparts.

Section 4.2: Partners and Counterparts

This section examines how the five organizations view their engagement with their various partners or counterparts both internationally and in Canada, and closes with a comparison and summary of all the organizations. MiningWatch has a vast array of partnerships as it works with communities from around the world. John McKay, a Liberal Member of Parliament, whom MiningWatch has worked with to propose legislation on Canadian mining activities abroad, was also interviewed for this study. He described the MiningWatch as an organization that “facilitates that bridging” of cultures that allows for connections to be made

between communities from various parts of the world, allowing them to extend a vast network. (John McKay, June 10, 2014).

The first respondent from MiningWatch re-emphasized this when describing the nature of their partnerships. The respondent described how often they will invite members of communities affected by Canadian mining companies to speak in front of parliamentary committees or to the media. When travel is not an option the respondent indicated that they still refer to the community members for their information. (MiningWatch, June 24, 2014).

Further, the first respondent from MiningWatch emphasized one important aspect when discussing their relationships with various communities abroad:

So we hear a lot about problems at various mine sites around the world, where no one has come to us and asked us to help them, and so we know that there are problems, like I know there are problems in Vietnam, I know there are problems in Laos, but no one from there has come to me and said, we need you to help us. So we don't go there. You know we essentially, one of the ways and it is quite practical in some sense but it is also part of our philosophy, and our working philosophy is that one of the ways we curtail our work but also make sure that it is ethically grounded, is we don't go into communities where we haven't been asked to help. (Ibid).

This is a key point to consider, as according to this respondent, MiningWatch avoids imposing themselves on communities, as part of their ethical guidelines. However, the respondent also noted that given this practice, in order for communities to reach out to MiningWatch, they require a large networking system. The respondent indicated that communities often become

aware of MiningWatch through other communities or regional NGOs whom they have worked with previously. (Ibid).

One significant point that the first respondent spoke of is the fact that they are able to learn from their counterparts, as much or more so than their partners learn from them, as well that they have established long-lasting relationships and still collaborate with communities and organizations that they first engaged with when MiningWatch was first established in 1999. (Ibid). MiningWatch's second respondent also emphasized this point, reflecting on MiningWatch's early connections with communities in South America that the members of the community were far more organized, had more sophisticated plans, analysis and networks, than the members of his group from Canada. The respondent recalled how amazed they were at the amount they were able to learn from the communities they had been working with: "I was like wow I am such an amateur on this and I learned a lot, it really helped me understand the planning and programing and strategy and stuff like that." (MiningWatch, July 21, 2014).

The second respondent also indicated that there is an extreme importance in networking. The respondent explained that having access to reliable information networks is what makes MiningWatch function as effectively as it does, and it was in part out of necessity that a network model was established. It appears that networking is key to establishing reliable partnerships that MiningWatch envisions, as the respondent explains,

I think it's most interesting and dynamic and network theory suggests why that is, you know it really does work to maximize resources and information so you can move as quickly as you can, and not have some big organization try and shoulder all the weight on behalf of other people. Its more about how do you quickly work together with these

strengths and I think as a result is that very explicit practical network node model as opposed to the institutional model. (Ibid)

Thus MiningWatch appears to rely on a network of organizations and communities, each with their own resources and strength in order to work effectively and achieve a shared goal. As the second respondent further suggested when MiningWatch was established there was a shared interest in collaborating between communities and other organizations. (Ibid).

There are three key points which MiningWatch emphasizes as part of their working partnerships with members of the Global South that can be seen as having post-development related aspects. Firstly, given that they do not attempt to impose themselves on communities that they have not been asked to engage with suggests a respect for autonomy and a more grass roots approach. Secondly, they suggest that they attempt to invite community members to speak for themselves in a Canadian context, as much as possible, by inviting them to come speak in front of media, parliament, and the public during advocacy campaigns. Focusing on inviting members of the Global South to speak for themselves in front of a Canadian public also points towards an avoidance of paternalism, and appears counter to the common development narrative of professionals from the Global North going to the Global South. Finally their emphasis on networking, learning and sharing info suggests MiningWatch looks for a more horizontal, rather than vertical communication and information exchange model.

Kairos, similarly to MiningWatch emphasizes a network-partnership model, however it appears to be more focused on building partnerships with other organizations, and social movements rather than geographic communities, which may simply be due to a difference in *raison d'être* between the two organizations. The respondent from Kairos firstly emphasized the

almost methodical nature in which they enter partnerships with NGOs and social movements from around the world. The respondent explained how Kairos focuses on making long lasting relationships, so they only enter into partnerships once Kairos and the other organization or movement have explored the idea of establishing a partnership and decided that they have a similar goal relating to social change. Kairos' partners then suggest the best direction towards achieving that goal, and Kairos will then fund or cofund these projects. Thus the respondent sees Kairos as more of a support for movements and organizations trying to achieve social change in their own context. (Kairos, August 15, 2014).

In addition Kairos also invites members of partner organizations operating in the Global South to be a part of their advocacy campaigns in Canada,

So we might invite partners to appear before standing committees on parliament hill or we might arrange meetings with the editorial board or major newspapers in Canada so they can help get their message out. We have organized speaking tours across the country for our partners, we've invited them to important UN meetings and accompanied them to important UN meetings to advocate. (Ibid).

Thus to a certain extent it appears that Kairos attempts to make it possible for their partners to advocate in a Canadian context, on their own behalf regarding issues of Canadian policy.

The key point to consider when analyzing Kairos' vision of their partnership through a post-development lens is their focus on autonomy of their partners. The respondent emphasized the fact that they view themselves as supporting partner initiatives. Further, in regards to their advocacy campaigns in Canada (or internationally), there is an emphasis on inviting partners to come to Canada, and speak for themselves regarding their context. While this focus on support

and autonomy does seem to avoid the paternalistic nature in which post-development theory has criticized the development project, there is one caveat that could be examined in Kairos' concept of partnership. Given that Kairos funds and cofunds projects with their partners, it would not be unreasonable to question if this allows them certain leverage in their partnerships. At the minimum, Kairos would have certain accounting standards that they would have to impose on their partner organizations. It does beg the question of how Kairos resists temptation to use their undoing as leverage, and thus take away from their partners' self-determined goals, to which the respondent did not allude.

DCCD's explain their partnerships in a similar manner as Kairos, although they seem to work singularly with other community organizations rather than with broader social movements. The second respondent indicated that in fact the organization was built based on friendships and partnerships that had been established between community leaders from the Dominican Republic visiting Canada and inviting the founding members of the DCCD to come and learn in the Dominican. (DCCD, Oct. 5, 2014). The initial partnership model that the DCCD maintains focuses on having their partners take the lead on their projects. As the first respondent from the DCCD explained, "So all the initiatives that come out of there are started by (our) partners and led by (our) partners, and put into practice by (our) partners, and supported financially by us." (DCCD, Sept. 29, 2014). Furthermore, the respondent emphasized the importance of dialogue with their partners, using the example of lead members from partner organizations attending the DCCD annual general meeting to discuss the direction of the organization. (Ibid).

The first respondent also referred to the value that their members place on what they can learn from their partners. In fact the respondent stressed the fact that they are able to learn from their partners about various topics relating to the projects, including much broader and complex

issues such as climate change, as a primary benefit for the DCCD partnering with organizations from the Global South. (ibid). The second respondent also emphasized that their partners have allowed them to network and establish new partnerships with various other organizations. (DCCD, Oct. 5, 2014).

Similar to Kairos, DCCD seems to put emphasis on their partner organizations taking the lead on various projects. Furthermore there seems to be recognition that their partners have a deeper understanding of the context under which the projects are established, and that the DCCD benefits from what they can learn from their partners. These points indicate parallels with post-development concepts. However, like Kairos, DCCD is the primary funder of their projects, therefore the question of implicit power can also be raised.

CCIC, because it is a coalition of several Canadian based NGOs, does not necessarily have similar partnerships to that of the other organizations in this study. However, they do rely on a system of networking with their member organizations, to work on their advocacy projects. The respondent from CCIC explained how they have established networks with various other coalition organizations such as the Up for Debate. Furthermore their networking emphasis is also important to the various fora, meetings, and focus groups that the CCIC hosts. The respondent also gave an example of one of their members to explain the value of networking. The organization had come to the end of a grant from the Canadian government, but one of their partners in Cuba began funding them because of the value they saw in the work they were doing around biodiversity. (CCIC, Aug. 18, 2014).

Inter Pares has similar ideas to the other organizations in this study, however they preferred to refer to them as counterparts, as they consider it a more egalitarian term. The third respondent explained,

We did a bit of an analysis around partnership, and what partnership means, and that partnerships can be unequal, but if you say counterparts, it kind of means that there is more of an understanding that someone is doing something in their context and you are doing something in your context. Not that you are doing the same thing, but that you're kind of complimenting each other. (Inter Pares, Aug. 12, 2014).

The first respondent emphasized the need for long term partnerships and shared ideas of power imbalances,

"We build programming trajectories around long term relationships. That's essentially our methodology. We find people and organizations in Canada and in developing countries, that agree or share our analysis that power and power structures, and differentials in power structures, not just between North and South but also gender, race, power class, etc, are the root cause of poverty and injustice. This is what we are set up to address."

The third respondent also indicated that long term partnerships are a goal in of themselves for their programming. The third respondent described how their partnerships are largely with local activist groups that address social justice issues in their own context, and that the issues they work on are largely driven by their counterparts. (Inter Pares, Aug. 12, 2014).

The first respondent described how networking is of particular importance to Inter Pares. The respondent explained how Inter Pares has not only worked with various organizations such

as Third World Network Africa, but also have helped establish, or chair other organizations such as Canadians for Tax Fairness, Mining Watch, and The Canary Research Institute. The respondent further explained how MiningWatch was established through networking with organizations both In Canada and abroad that had issues with Canadian based companies. (Inter Pares, July 2, 2014). The second respondent explained that Inter Pares focuses on working with locally based groups abroad but “making ties with issues in Canada,” thus analyzing for interconnectedness. (Inter Pares, July 22, 2014). Furthermore their networking has allowed Inter Pares to learn a great deal about issues relating to extractives and taxation, in particular. (Inter Pares, July 2, 2014). The second respondent reiterated the importance of tapping into their networks to learn on issues, and how networking with partners allows for an exchange of information that allows for differing perspectives on several issues. The second respondent explained that “we probably learn more from our counterparts then they necessarily learn from us. We don’t come in as the experts, but we engage with our counterparts on issues that are important to them and issues that are important to us.” (Inter Pares, July 22, 2014).

While Inter Pares provides funding to their counterparts as part of their programming, the second respondent spoke about how they do not see that as creating an unequal footing,

The role that money plays in our work is the fact that housands of Canadians who donate money to Inter Pares wish to support the important work that our counterparts doing overseas. So we are just connecting people in Canada interested in an issue and people elsewhere working on that issue. (Ibid).

The respondent emphasized in this case that they attempt to maintain equality in all of their relationships. Furthermore, the respondent explained that, like other organizations in this study,

Inter Pares creates opportunities for members from their counterpart organizations to speak to the Canadian media and to parliamentary committees, so that they are with their own voice rather than Inter Pares speaking for them. (Ibid).

Inter Pares appears to parallel concepts of post-development theory in their partnership model given that they emphasize ensuring their counterparts take the lead in their programs, and invite them to speak for themselves during their advocacy campaigns. Furthermore Inter Pres has stressed that they are able to learn from their counterparts as opposed to them acting as the “experts” from the North teaching the people of the South. Where Inter Pares sets itself apart from the other organizations in this study is that they have addressed the potential unequal relationship that can be created by being the primary funders of a program.

Overall the five organizations have a few key aspects in their partnerships that seem to fit with post-development theory. Firstly the organizations all emphasize the importance of autonomy by ensuring that their partners take the lead on the projects, and accommodating their partners to speak for themselves when possible. This is a break from the development paradigm that has typically shown the Global South as lacking agency and capability to address their own issues. Secondly all the organizations stress the importance of networking as not only establishing partnerships, but also as a way to share resources and information, and to also learn from their partners. The importance of networking also shows a break from the development paradigm which has perpetuated a top-down model of development and a narrative of an enlightened North teaching the South. Networking attempts to achieve a more egalitarian or two-way nature in exchanging ideas. The next chapter will show how the organizations have dealt with advocacy in terms of their relationship with the Canadian government.

Chapter 5: Advocacy and Government

This chapter analyzes the relations that the organizations have with the government, in particular the current Conservative government. For the most part this section looks at how the government funds and defunds organizations as a form of discipline, but also as a way to influence the discourse of development. This chapter examines the role of advocacy and the government in the context of Ferguson's anti-politics machine.

To begin this chapter I return to the interview with Liberal MP John McKay, who was has tabled legislation relating to development assistance, and also the failed Bill C-300³. He has also been critical of the current government's relationship with NGOs. In Particular he focused on MiningWatch,

Yea, I mean, I think they are suffering under this government, there is no question about that, because this government doesn't like inconvenient facts. And MiningWatch is just a chalk block of inconvenient facts. So because the government doesn't collect facts about mining impacts, and because they are ideological children, who are focused on their business development at all cost, and I mean all cost and any cost, then an organization like MiningWatch is to be shunned. (John McKay, June 10, 2014).

Furthermore Mr. McKay emphasized MiningWatch's role as an advocacy organization,

Their voice is clearly an unwelcome voice in government circles and it's probably unwelcome in business circle, because no business, no category of business has been more coddled than the mining industry. And they joy in the glow of having a government

³ Private members bill that proposed financial and diplomatic support be withdrawn from Mining Companies that did not meet set out environmental and human rights standards when acting abroad

that is a cheerleader rather than a regulator. So I mean, MiningWatch's irritant quotient is magnified by speaking truth to power. (Ibid).

Mr. McKay also spoke to the way that the current government has addressed NGOs in general, particularly those that receive government funding,

You know as soon as you put your hand out to the government you are compromised. I think a lot of them, you know having been kicked in the arse, are now standing up on their own, and realizing to believe what they really believe in, that they are going to have to be self-funded. And that brings with it a certain grievance, that filling out these stupid applications and justifying yourself to the government of Canada for whatever it is your justifying yourself for will get you meagre crumbs. (Ibid).

What John McKay suggests here, in ways can be seen as similar to Ferguson's anti-politics machine. While Ferguson views development as an extension of bureaucratic power to take issues out of the political realm, McKay suggests that NGOs in some cases are wary of speaking out on certain issues because they may lose funding from the government. In these instances it appears that it is more of a conscious effort to keep NGOs from speaking on political issues. The rest of the chapter analyzes this from the NGOs perspective.

MiningWatch does not receive any government grants, and as such it could be seen to have the one of the less turbulent relationships with the government, despite its heavy focus on advocacy. The first respondent from MiningWatch emphasized that much of the back and forth that they have had with the government has related to the implementation of an independent ombudsman that would monitor complaints in regards to Canadian based extractive companies. As the respondent noted, the implementation of such an ombudsman was part of a Round-table

process in 2006, but the government was slow to respond, continually telling MiningWatch to wait,

The government of Canada suddenly responded to the roundtable report with its 2009 recommendations called, building the Canadian advantage. So we then had two competing models or ideas, about how this remedy issue should be addressed, of course building the Canadian advantage framework was a lot broader, in fact it didn't deal with remedy, well it did, it created a CSR counsellor⁴. So rather than the ombudsman that we had actually collectively agreed was necessary, we got something called the CSR counsellor under this remedy basket, and then there were the other pieces that were in the CSR strategy of the government of Canada. (MiningWatch, June 24, 2014).

However the respondent noted that they find the CSR counsellor largely ineffective given that they cannot investigate complaints without permission from the company in question. (Ibid).

The respondent was also critical of how the government is engaging with other NGOs, in particular its new emphasis on partnering with private sector,

We are extremely uncomfortable with the partnerships that they're now engaging in with the mining industry, as part of the government's policy of linking up, partnering development NGOs with the extractive sector. We are really concerned about that development. We are concerned that these large development NGOS are engaging in these partnerships. We feel that the government's policy is a policy of promoting and protecting the interests of the extractive sector, and buying into the industry's own branding of itself as a branding development vehicle. (Ibid).

⁴ Corporate Social Responsibility Counsellor was the body put in place by the government in response to the 2007 Roundtables Report on Corporate accountability

The respondent shed light on how these partnerships are intended to operate,

The big development NGOs have taken positions that are in alignment with what the government of Canada right now wants big development NGOs to do, which is to be willing to directly partner with mining companies at the project level. So engaging in CSR projects at the project level where the mining company kicks in some money, the government of Canada kicks in some official development assistance and the NGO kicks in some money or services. (Ibid).

The respondent was also critical of these relationships in that they almost provide a self-justification, in that by providing companies with partnerships with development NGOs and official development assistance, they are perpetuating the discourse that paints extractive companies as a development vehicle. Labelling extractive companies as development vehicles also gives the companies leverage when attempting to attain land development rights. Furthermore, the respondent suggested that development NGOs that partner with extractive companies do so to gain access to government funding, and that NGOs that have come out against what they see as the negative effects of mining have been cut off from government funding. (Ibid).

The push to have development NGOs partnered with mining companies can be seen, as the government disciplining NGOs to align with their particular goals. In a way it can be interpreted as an attempt to keep NGOs from political activities such as advocacy, and is reflective of Ferguson's anti-politics machine. However, as the second respondent from MiningWatch points out,

The development NGOs that think they are non-political are ripping themselves away, and it's a question of how close are you to what is accepted, mainstream, interaction and activities versus a commitment to a change. So they are (MiningWatch) more radical in the sense of what some people would say wider groups of problems and focus more, not on how do we treat the problem within the status quo, well that's part of it, how do we sort of look at minor modifications but they have really focused on root problems and unflinchingly at the number of impacts that are there, and those are really tough stances to take sometimes.

Here it is apparent that the respondent is critical of the notion that NGOs and development in general can be taken out of the context of being political, if they only engage in minor, government sanctioned projects.

The respondent from Kairos was also critical of what has been called a “government chill” of organizations that engage in advocacy on the side of social change,

There has been a lot of attention lately around the advocacy that is done by charitable organizations in Canada, many are being audited by revenue Canada to see if their advocacy is within the appropriate limits that are set for charities, and Kairos is undergoing such an audit. So there is also, it is sort of a unique time in that there is a bit of chill around charities engaging in advocacy right now, and there is a sort of uncertainty about how Canadian revenue agency is going to enforce the rules, it's not very clear, and I think through this process of the audit, and getting their conclusions it can become clearer for what they are actually looking for. But yea tis fair to say that the

government has put a lot of pressure on charities that are engaged in advocacy. (Kairos, August 15, 2014).

The respondent further expanded to explain Kairos' point of view that advocacy is a legitimate strategy for NGOs to engage in, in order to bring about long-standing change that they seek.

(Ibid).

The respondent from Kairos also spoke to the relationship that the organization has had with the government, being one of the organizations that have lost government funding as a result of a ministerial decision,

We were sort of famously and the first to have our proposal turned down by the minister, and it came to light later on, that it had been recommended for approval by CIDA officials, but that it was the political level that the decision was made not, to insert the famous word not into the document, and I mean the basis for why it was turned down has never really come to light. I mean it's never really been fully clarified why we were turned down. Although given the kind of trend we have seen of the government polarizing that kind of picking out certain groups as enemies, to not be engaged with. We see the kind of trends where thinking is going on at that level. But there was no actual reason that was given, because in fact the CIDA officials said that the projects we were proposing did fit the development objectives of the government and that our past work received praise in the CIDA evaluations that were conducted.(Ibid).

While the official explanation never came to light, it has been speculated, (and even admitted by certain government MPs), that Kairos lost their funding because of a critical stance that Kairos advocates in regards to Israeli actions in the West Bank. (CBC. Kairos Funding, 2011). The

respondent also explained that they have the impression that several organizations are now nervous and more cautious when challenging or advocating on issues, in case they lose their funding. (Ibid).

The DCCD outlined how they only once applied for government funding, but were not successful in obtaining those funds. When asked why they thought they might not have been successful, the first respondent suggested, “my only guess would be that they have priorities that maybe our project or that proposals that organization just didn’t fit under that given time.” They also suggested that they assumed that the Dominican was not necessarily a country of focus for the government at the time. (DCCD, September 21, 2014). However the respondents both indicated that for the most part the DCCD was fairly separated from the Canadian government outside of being filed as a registered non-profit.

The member from CCIC began to explain how the organization has had to downsize because, like Kairos, they also lost their government grant,

We have become a much smaller team in recent years because, the government felt that it shouldn’t support organizations who were doing advocacy and generating policies and positions that were contrary to positions of the government, so we were defunded in 2010. So we went down about a third of the size of what we used to be. (CCIC, August 18, 2014).

While the respondent said that they had limited resources due to the lack of funding, there was a “silver lining” in that CCIC now is more attentive to their members, and could focus more on advocacy relatively free from fear of reprisal. (Ibid). The respondent continued by stating that

they consider advocacy a key component and useful to international cooperation. Furthermore they expressed that non-profits are entitled to engage in advocacy, however,

But under the current government, organizations that are perceived to do any form of advocacy get punished, because the government again, doesn't like organizations that speak out against them. There's been, we have read in the news, an increasing number of audits, especially of environmental organizations, but now development organizations, looking at their political activity, or their advocacy activity, of their members etc. this is to try and have, this has essentially created a chill effect within the community, to do any form of advocacy because people are afraid of getting audited, in the worst case scenario you could lose your charitable status. (Ibid).

In light of government cutting back on funding for NGOs, the respondent also explained how this may have lead into the new focus on partnering with the private sector.

I think in a lot of cases it was the initiative of organizations themselves. I think the context for groups has been in 2011 and 2012 saw a decline in aid resources. In Canada, you know we put out a report in June, essentially the government hasn't put out new funding for civil society organizations, or hadn't put out new funding in three years. A lot of organizations who had received long term funding from the government, suddenly found themselves without money. In some circumstances they had an opportunity to adapt and in a lot of circumstances the funding pipeline got completely turned off. A lot of our members have put in place revenue diversification strategies. they're trying to go to the public for increasing sources of funding or foundations etc. but the private sector was also one group that had finances that saw themselves playing a role in development so, I

think groups explored opportunities and potentials for partnering with private sector companies. (Ibid).

This observation is particularly significant considering MiningWatch's observation of the new phenomena of partnering NGOs with private sector companies. As MiningWatch indicated, there has been a large push from the government to have NGOs partner with the private sector, and as such it could be speculated that cutting back on ODA funding is a part of this strategy in light of this response from the member of CCIC. On the DFAITD website, there is a clear indication that the Government of Canada is supporting NGOs that are partnering with extractive companies. (DFAITD, Accessed August 12, 2015).

One striking difference between the member of CCIC and the member from MiningWatch is that the CCIC respondent seemed less critical and more optimistic about partnering with the private sector,

These things take a long time to develop, good partnerships that are going to function well that are going to generate good impacts that you're going to be able to demonstrate impacts etc. I think a lot of that got crunched in terms of time, so these partnerships, this is again my own personal reflection, these partnerships probably happened quicker than maybe some groups would have allowed, or would have like." (Ibid).

While the tone is a bit skeptical in that the respondent is worried that these partnerships were rushed, they also suggest that time could reveal these partnerships to have a positive impact.

Inter Pares still receives government grants, and is able to engage in advocacy, however, some of their members admitted that it is not always an easy balance. The first respondent

particularly was critical of the role that Canada has played on the international stage during the past decade,

In the last how many years, since 2006 Canada has played a much more destructive role. Both in global development terms, because the way our aid and also trade, international affairs, refugee policies, the whole gambit of policies that affect Canada behaves in the world, has become very destructive. The way the aid budget has been distorted to be very exclusively and almost solely for the purpose of promoting individual, private interests, Canadian based corporations, that's been very destructive as well. (Inter Pares, July 2, 2014).

In regards to their relationship with the government, the first respondent indicated that they have had a bit of creative tension with the government in the past, but that good results were able to come from this tension,

So over time there's been actually a very interesting and, in many ways, progressive tension between Canadian NGOs and the Canadian government, through CIDA, through External Affairs. Currently that doesn't, and this is not specific to international development agencies, this government doesn't engage with civil society. (Ibid).

The first respondent cited examples such as the issue of sterilization in Bangladesh mentioned in the previous chapter, as a past tension that yielded good results. The second respondent spoke to the difficulties in balancing advocacy and government funding under the current government, reflecting on CCIC,

I worked at CCIC, I was there when they lost their CIDA funding, and they never pursued CIDA funding since, though they do get funding from IDRC. But CCIC at that time said,

let's make a strategic choice not to pursue CIDA funding so that we can be a more independent voice. (Inter Pares, July 22, 2014).

In terms of their experience at Inter Pares, the second respondent explained the difficulties in some of the decisions they have to make regarding advocacy,

As long as all those threats are hanging over our heads, then NGOs will just speak out less and less, do advocacy less and less, and not be doing the important role of speaking truth to power. So that's a problem, and that's real, and that's something that we do actually have conversations about in staff meetings. (Ibid).

The second respondent went on to explain how they have expressed reservations of attaching their name to publications that may draw political attention. (Ibid). The third respondent asked to have the recorder shut off when initially asked about their relationship with the government, in order to describe some tensions that they have had. However, after they indicated that Inter Pares has focused on being strategic about what and how they advocate in recent years, when asked if they had ever downplayed an issue to avoid causing tension with the government. (Inter Pares, August 12, 2014).

All of the organizations have recognized that advocacy is an important aspect for NGOs to engage. For the most part there seems to be a consensus that advocacy is essential in addressing root causes of inequality. In addition, there is a general sense that the government is disciplining organizations that advocate certain positions by withdrawing funding. Another method which was not addressed by the respondents but has drawn some attention is tax rebates.

Organizations that are registered as “charities⁵” are granted tax rebates to their donors. However, currently the CRA is reviewing certain organizations charitable status if they use language that is deemed “political” such as Oxfam for having ‘preventing poverty’ as one of their stated goals. (CBC, “Preventing Poverty,” 2014). This disciplining speaks to Ferguson’s anti-politics machine analysis, which suggests that government attempt to use a discourse of development to depoliticize certain issues. In this context however, the government has attempted to shut out NGOs of the realm of development to depoliticize discourse. Furthermore, in regards to MiningWatch’s analysis of the extractive industry, the government is trying to bring resource extraction into the realm of development in order to depoliticize the issue.

⁵ Charity is the Government of Canada’s language. The organizations in this study are registered as charities with the CRA, however as indicated in chapter 2, they are critical of charitable models of partnership.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

The initial goal of this study was to explore how NGOs could operationalize a post-development model, or rather if there were certain NGOs that were able to break from the development paradigm. However, it appears that what was discovered instead was the post-development theory in part has parallels with the way certain NGOs promote a discourse outside of the development paradigm, and also put this discourse into practice.

The five NGOs that were a part of this study are employing a different discourse than the traditional development narrative. For the most part they are critical of the term development, viewing it as outdated. Instead they suggest other terms, such as solidarity, social justice and international cooperation. They also focus on representing a more equal relationship between the Global North and Global South, which is also a break from the traditional development narrative that represents the Global South as having no agency and are incapable of addressing their own issues. The intersections between the discourse of the NGOs and Post-development can be outlined in three key points.

Firstly, the five organizations view their projects as being initiated by their partners and counterparts in the Global South. This emphasis puts a focus on autonomy and self-determination at the project level. This focus is a break from the development paradigm that has been criticized as being “top-down” and paternalistic, and rather support communities and partners in their own context. Particularly key to this point is that the NGOs describe themselves in more of a supporting role when it comes to their projects. In contrast to NGOs that employ partnership rhetoric, the NGOs in this study put particular focus on having only a supporting role in the projects or program. In particular, their role is limited to providing funding, information

that their partners may not have access to, and using their leverage as Canadian NGOs in a Canadian context to advocate in conjuncture with their partners. The NGOs in this study have all expressed that the projects are large in part established and run by their partners. The emphasis on only supporting local initiatives intersects with post-development theory in that it post-development criticizes the development paradigm for promoting the Global North as superior saviors of a passive and agentless Global South.

Secondly, four of the five organizations engage in some form of advocacy, and all of them recognize the importance of advocacy, with the fifth lacking resources to engage in such activities. They express advocacy as a way to achieve policy change, and address root causes of inequality. Advocacy activities intersect with post-development theory in that contrary to the development paradigm, which is largely influenced by a charitable notion of development, the context of inequality relates in part to the policies of the Global North, which sustain structural inequalities. Therefore there is recognition in both post-development theory and these five NGOs that advocacy is needed to address the systemic causes and context of inequality.

Finally, amongst the organizations that engage in advocacy, they agreed that the current government is disciplining organizations that engage in advocacy by cutting funding to organizations they deem to hold controversial views. This disciplining effort is viewed as a way to keep development in the realm of “not political.” While the lack of formerly held resources has caused new problems for these NGOs to grapple with, they also express a new found ability to freely speak out and advocate against government action that they might disapprove. This aspect in particular draws on Ferguson’s anti-politics machine, which views development as a bureaucratic extension of power over the “underdeveloped,” and in effect the removes certain issues from the realm of “political” and into the realm of development. However in the context

of this project, the depoliticalization of certain issues is a conscious effort by the current government to stifle debate by labelling these issues as being outside the realm of “development.”

It is important to keep in mind that the organizations that took part in this study make up a very small fraction of a vast sector of NGOs that engage in international activities. Therefore this study is not exhaustive in the sense that the conclusions can only be applied to the organizations in this study. However it does shed light on some key aspects of the sector, and provide examples of the parallels that post-development theory has with NGOs. It is also important to keep in mind that the descriptions of the organizations and their projects are the views of their members only, and that an in-depth or first-hand analysis of their projects may bring differing views to light.

While this study cannot draw any grand conclusions of the world of NGOs it can shed light on and suggest further research. One significant area would be to examine the work of these organizations with a firsthand look at their operations, analyzing how their partners and counterparts view these relationships, and also including a study of larger NGOs. Furthermore this study could lead to further research regarding a post-development model for NGOs to follow. Currently there is no concrete model, framework or formula for such organizations to follow. While this study has analyzed the way that post-development theory has parallels with certain organizations, further studies could aim to formulate a model for organizations to follow.

Bibliography

- Abugre, Charles. "Robbing the Poor to Feed the Rich" in *Pambazuka News* (485), 2010
 Barry-Shaw, N and D.O Jay. *Paved with Good Intentions: Canada's development NGOs from idealism to imperialism*. Fernwood Publishing: 2012
- Basu, M. "Non-State Actors in the Development Aid World a Seen from the South" in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Non-State Actors* edited by Bob Reinalda, pg. 405-418. Ashgate Publishing: 2011
- Blaut, James. 'History Inside Out' in his *The Colonizer's Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History*. New York: Guilford Press. 1993: pp. 1-49.
- Cameron, John D. "Can Poverty be Funny? The Serious use of Humour as a Strategic Public Engagement for Global Justice" *Third World Quarterly* 36(2), 2015: pg. 274-290
- Cameron, John D. and Anna Haanstra. "Development Made Sexy: How it Happened and What it Means" *Third World Quarterly* 29(8), 2008: pg. 1475-1489
- Canadian Council for International Cooperation. "About Us" *CCIC*.
http://www.ccic.ca/about/index_e.php (Accessed June 24, 2015).
- Canadian Council for International Cooperation. *Code of Ethics and Operational Standards*. CCIC: 2009
- CBC, "Preventing poverty not a valid goal for tax purposes CRA tells Oxfam" CBC-
<http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/preventing-poverty-not-a-valid-goal-for-tax-purposes-cra-tells-oxfam-canada-1.2717774> July 24, 2014
- CBC. "Timeline: Oda and the Kairos Funding" CBC. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/timeline-oda-and-the-kairos-funding-1.1027221> Feb. 15, 2011
- Chapman, J. and T Fischer. "The Effectiveness of NGO campaigning: lessons from practice." *Development in Practice* 10, 2000: pg. 151-165
- Clark, J. *Democratizing Development: the Role of Voluntary Organizations*. Kumarian Press: 1990
- Coumans, Catherine. *Whose Development? Mining, Local Resistance and Development Agendas*. MiningWatch: 2011
 Crush, Jonathan. *Power of Development*. New York and London: Routledge: 1997
- DCCD Exp. In *Facebook* (Group Page): (Accessed June 18, 2015).
- De Wit and E. Berner. "Progressive Patronage? Municipalities, NGOs, CBOs and the Limits to Slum Dwellers' Empowerment." *Development and Change* 40(5), 2009: pg. 927-947

- Department of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Development, "Minister Oda Announces Initiatives to Increase the Benefits of Natural Resource Management for People In Africa and South America" DFAITD. <http://www.acdi-cida.gc.ca/acdi-cida/acdi-cida.nsf/eng/CAR-929105317-KGD> (Accessed August 12, 2015).
- Dogra, Nandita. "The Mixed Metaphor of 'Third World Woman': Gendered Representations of by Intentional Development NGOs" *Third World Quarterly* 32(2), 2011: pg. 333-348
- Edwards, M. and D. Hulme. "Too close for comfort? The impact of official aid on Nongovernmental organizations." *World Development* 24(6), 1996: pg. 961-973
- Escobar, Arturo. "Imagining a Post-Development Era? Critical Thought, Development and Social Movements" *Social Text* 10(2), 1992: pg. 20-56
- Escobar, Arturo. "Reflections on Development" *Futures* 24(5), 1992: pg. 411-436
- Escobar, Arturo. *Encountering Development the Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press: 1995
- Ferguson, James. 'The Anti-Politics Machine: 'Development' and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho.' *The Ecologist*: 24(5): 1994 pp. 176-181.
- Fernando, J. *The Political Economy of NGOs: State Formation in Sri Lanka and Bangladesh*. Pluto Press: 2011
- Forsythe, David P. "Democracy War and Covert Action" *Journal of Peace Research* 29(4), 1992: pg. 385-395
- Free the Children. "Who We Are." Free the Children: <http://www.freethechildren.com/about-us/> (Accessed August 10, 2015).
- Gereffi, G. R Garcia-Johnson and E. Sasser. "The NGO-industrial complex." *Foreign Policy* 125, 2001: pg. 56-65
- Gotz, N. "Civil Society and NGO: Far from Unproblematic Concepts" in *The Ashgate Research Companion to Non-State Actors* edited by Bob Reinalda, pg. 185-196. Ashgate Publishing: 2011
- Heins, V. *Nongovernmental Organizations in International Society: Struggles over Recognition*. Palgrave MacMillan: 2008
- Herath, Dhammika. "The Discourse of Development: Has it Reached Maturity?" *Third World Quarterly* 30(8), 2009: pg. 1449-1464
- Hickel, Jason. "The 'Girl Effect': Liberalism, Empowerment and the Contradictions of Development" *Third World Quarterly* 35(8), 2014: pg. 1355-1373

- Illich, Ivan. *To Hell With Good Intentions*. 1996. http://www.swaraj.org/illich_hell.htm (Accessed January 4, 2015).
- Inter Pares, "About Us" *Inter Pares*. <https://www.interpares.ca/content/about-us> (Accessed June 24, 2015).
- Inter Pares. *Rethinking Development: Promoting Global Justice into the 21st Century*. Inter Pares: 2004
- Ireland, Philip and Katherine McKinnon. "Strategic localism for an uncertain world: A postdevelopment approach to climate change adaptation" *Geoforum* 47, 2013: pg. 158-166
- Kairos Canada, "Who We Are" *Kairos Canada*. <http://www.kairoscanada.org/who-we-are/> (Accessed June 24, 2015).
- Kane, Molly. "International NGOs and the Aid Industry: Constraints on International Solidarity," *Third World Quarterly* 34(8), 2013: pg. 1505-1515
- Kuyek, Joan and Catherine Coumans. *No Rock Unturned: Revitalizing the Economies of Mining Dependent Communities*. MiningWatch: 2004
- Matthews, Sally. 'The Role of the Privileged in Responding to Poverty: Perspectives Emerging from the Post-Development Debate.' *Third World Quarterly* 29(6) 2008 pp. 1035-1049
- Matthews, Sally. "Post-development Theory and the Question of Alternatives: a View from Africa" *Third World Quarterly* 25(2), 2004: pg. 373-384
- McGregor, A. 'New Possibilities? Shifts in Post-development Theory and Practice' *Geography Compass* 3(5) 2009. pp. 1688-1702
- MiningWatch, "About Us" *MiningWatch*. <http://www.miningwatch.ca/about-us-1> (Accessed June 24, 2015).
- Muller, Tanja R. "The Long Shadow of Band-Aid Humanitarianism: Revisiting the Dynamics Between Famine and Celebrity" *Third World Quarterly* 34(3), 2013: pg. 470-484
- Pratt, Trevor. "Towards a Post-Structuralist Development Ethics? Alterity or the Same?" *Third World Quarterly* 31(5), 2010: pg. 675-692
- Rist, Gilbert. *The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith*. New York: Zed Books: 1997
- Roberts, S, J.P Jones and O Frohling. "NGOs and the Globalization of Managerialism: A Research Framework." *World Development* 33(11), 2005: pg. 1845-1864

- Scott, James C. "Nature and Space" in *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale Press, 1998
- Silvey, Rachel and Katherine. "Development Geography: Critical Development Studies and Political Geographic Imaginaries" *Progress in Human Geography* 35(5), 2011: pg. 696-704
- Talon, Rachel A.M. and Andrew McGregor. "Pitying the Third World: Towards More Progressive Emotional Responses to Development Education in School" *Third World Quarterly* 35(8), 2014: pg. 1406-1422
- Townsend, J.T. and A.R Townsend. "Accountability, motivation and practice: NGOs North and South." *Social and Cultural Geography* 5(2), 2004: pg. 271-284
- Warah, Ransa. "The Development Myth" *African Business* 350, 2009: pg. 16-21
- Warden, Rachel. *Whose Development? Reflections on My Visit to the Marlin Mine and Meeting with Community Members*. Kairos Canada: 2012
- Weber, M. *The Essential Weber Reader: A Reader* edited by San Whimster. Routledge: 2004
- World Vision. "Home Page." World Vision:
http://www.worldvision.ca/?gclid=CL6ey_37wscCFQUOaQod6TINfQ (Accessed August 10, 2015).
- Ziai, Aram. "The Discourse of Development and why the Concept Should be Abandoned." *Development in Practice* 23(1), 2013: pg. 123-136

Appendix A

Interview Question Guide

Project Title: Post Development and NGOs

Researcher: Darren Major

In your own words what is Global Development and what is Canada's role? (can answer separately or together)

What kind of projects does your organization conduct?

How would you define your organization? (What label? NGO? Lobby? Development?)

How have you attempted to alter Canadian policies to possibly affect international development?

What changes would you like to see to Canadian development policy, or policy in general?

What makes you different from other organizations (development organizations?)

How do you engage with your beneficiaries? What is the relationship with them in your mind?

Appendix B

CODE LOG

There are some overlaps between codes, this is a broad list from my first round of coding to keep track of the ones used, the second round narrowed the list down

- Partnerships as development model
- Grassroots and social movements
- Autonomy and self determination
- Competing interests in Canada
- Projects/problems in Canada and internationally
- Advocacy and Change in policies
- Exchange of information between groups
- social justice/social change/ long term root cause of problems
- No developed or underdeveloped dichotomy
- Critique of conception of development
- Difference with other organizations
- Projects implemented by those in global south
- Funding and cofounding
- Issues with extractive sector
- Government chill
- Competing vision of development
- Ferguson- development as “objective” removed form political
- Private sector
- development in relation to CSR
- media
- development deficit
- power imbalances- between north and south- or effects there of- siphoning of money back to the north
- remedy
- capacity issues

- human rights- as a form of development
- transformative change
- interconnectedness- can include people, systems, or issues
- internal structure
- solidarity
- north is complicit
- issues with NGO label
- context (to understanding inequality and oppression)

Appendix C: GREB Approval



April 17, 2014

Mr. Darren Major
Master's Student
Department of Global Development Studies
Queen's University
Kingston, ON, K7L 3N6

GREB Ref #: GDEVS-030-14; Romeo # 6012292
Title: "GDEVS-030-14 Post-Development Frameworks and NGOs"

Dear Mr. Major:

The General Research Ethics Board (GREB), by means of a delegated board review, has cleared your proposal entitled "**GDEVS-030-14 Post-Development Frameworks and NGOs**" for ethical compliance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (TCPS) and Queen's ethics policies. In accordance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (article D.1.6) and Senate Terms of Reference (article G), your project has been cleared for one year. At the end of each year, the GREB will ask if your project has been completed and if not, what changes have occurred or will occur in the next year.

You are reminded of your obligation to advise the GREB, with a copy to your unit REB, of any adverse event(s) that occur during this one year period (access this form at https://eservices.queensu.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GREB Adverse Event Report). An adverse event includes, but is not limited to, a complaint, a change or unexpected event that alters the level of risk for the researcher or participants or situation that requires a substantial change in approach to a participant(s). You are also advised that all adverse events must be reported to the GREB within 48 hours.

You are also reminded that all changes that might affect human participants must be cleared by the GREB. For example you must report changes to the level of risk, applicant characteristics, and implementation of new procedures. To make an amendment, access the application at https://eservices.queensu.ca/romeo_researcher/ and click Events - GREB Amendment to Approved Study Form. These changes will automatically be sent to the Ethics Coordinator, Gail Irving, at the Office of Research Services or irvingg@queensu.ca for further review and clearance by the GREB or GREB Chair.

On behalf of the General Research Ethics Board, I wish you continued success in your research.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joan Stevenson".

Joan Stevenson, Ph.D.
Chair
General Research Ethics Board

c: Dr. Marc Epprecht, Faculty Supervisor
Dr. Susanne Soederberg, Chair, Unit REB
Ms. Barbra Brousseau, Dept. Admin.