

報告番号	※	第	号
------	---	---	---

## 主 論 文 の 要 旨

論文題目

Negotiating Technocracy in Peace Work: The Case of a Civil Society Network in the Philippines

(平和構築活動におけるテクノクラシーについての交渉 – フィリピンの市民社会ネットワークの事例)

氏 名

BALLESTEROS Marie Donna Montesa

## 論 文 内 容 の 要 旨

### Chapter 1. Introduction

Technocracy is the framing of social problems such that they are amenable to technical solutions.

In the context of peace work, this means that what kind of peace can be built, who should do peace work, under what relationships, what initiatives to do, and how to know progress in peace work are decided by standardized criteria, methods, frameworks, and tools that are perceived to be efficient and objective.

This research aims to reconceptualize technocracy in peace work through an organizational point of view and with technocratic practices as the starting point. It questions the prevalent assertion in critical peace literature that peace work has become technocratic. Arguing for a nuanced understanding of technocracy in peace work, it seeks to overcome the limitations of the current global-local divide in the literature by asking:

**How do CSOs negotiate with technocratic intervention in peace work?**

Six grassroots organizations and two support organizations – all part of a network – participated in this study. Technocratic practices were qualitatively examined in two aspects: administrative and substantive. The administrative aspect refers to the maintenance activities of the organization, while the substantive aspect pertains to their mission and peace initiatives. Findings on their negotiation with technocratic intervention in these two aspects of practice were inductively analyzed in light of the contextual factors; namely, the norms governing CSOs in the Philippines, and the norms governing peace work.

This study is significant because, first, it touches on the core questions in peace work: *What is the problem? What to do about it? Who should do it? How do we know if we are progressing? How do we know if we succeeded?* A technocratic approach in answering these questions counters the norm of an inclusive and context-based peace work and warrants a closer examination. Second, while studies on the effectiveness of various peace initiatives abound, few tackle the organizational point of view, even though peace work is usually done through organizations. Third, the global-local divide that constrains analysis has also limited the possible options for practitioners. This research overcomes that by revealing multiple sites of agency.

## **Chapter 2. Technocracy in the Literature**

After clarifying the critique of technocracy from peacebuilding's precursors – political science,

management, and development, this chapter revisits the unquestioned assertion that technocracy has become technocratic. Arguing the need for a nuanced understanding of technocracy, it first questions the prevalent view of a technocratic peace work by proposing an alternative interpretation of the literature on the *local turn* in peace literature. Local agency and its manifestations should be taken as evidence against, rather than for, the view that peace work has become technocratic. Literature combining peace and organizational studies is taken as a viable way of empirically examining technocratic practices that reveal actors, relationships, and dynamics unforeseen by the literature on technocracy and peace.

### **Chapter 3. Negotiating Norms and Practice: The Organizational Life of CSOs in Peace Work**

This chapter argues that CSOs in peace work are balancing tensions between norms and practices on two levels: On the first level is the norm for a good civil society vs. the norm for inclusivity in peacebuilding. On the second level is the technocratic norm by virtue of being a CSO or NGO vs. the norm for inclusive and context-specific peace work. The former influences the administrative practices of organizations, while the latter touches on the substantive aspect. An analytical separation of administrative and substantive aspects of organizations is proposed, seeing that they are akin to a means-end relationship where the means uncritically precede the end. Treating them as separable can lead to new insights on how CSOs in peace work negotiate with technocratic interventions in peace work.

#### **Chapter 4. CSOs and Peace Work in the Philippines**

CSOs in the Philippines are expected to be instruments of democratization, challenge injustice, and perform social services primarily for the marginalized. They enjoy high trust ratings, and by their sheer number and institutionalization have been hailed as *advanced*. Underneath these, however, are CSOs entangled with the country's history of and the continuing waves of conflict. The blurred lines between CSOs and family, political leaders, and market actors, further makes the sector complex. This chapter argues that the administrative technocratic practices to be discussed in Chapter 5 are reinforcing the norm of a good civil society. The entrenched and competing political forces that CSOs in Mindanao have to deal with, on the other hand, makes substantive technocracy more untenable.

#### **Chapter 5. Administrative Technocracy in Peace Work**

The forms of administrative technocratic practices observed in the case are registration/accreditation requirements and eligibility criteria that tend to include and exclude who among the CSOs get to do peace work. Two sources were identified: the government and the funders. Government requirements uphold the norm of a good CSO. This regulatory environment may not be a determining factor for civil society's existence, as there are other institutional and historical factors. However, this may constrict the civic space.

The project form that most initiatives take is favorable to an easy exit for donors, a convenient way to account for accomplishments due to its time-boundedness, but also leads to the instrumentalization of grassroots organizations, as in the case of activity-based funding. Like the funding eligibility requirements by donors, it can shape relationships among CSOs through competition and cooperation.

CSOs try to negotiate with the constraints posed by administrative technocratic practices. The role of support organizations is significant in this process. The case has revealed that administrative technocratic practices can be mediated. This mediation is conditional upon trust built from the experience of working together. This is an opportunity for mediation. However, this seems to be weighed against pressure for compliance from donors.

## **Chapter 6. Substantive Technocracy in Peace Work**

The results showed a difference between support organizations and grassroots organizations.

Support organizations have a broad mission from their head organizations, which were adjusted to Mindanao's context. They do not decide what interventions to do but instead rely on what grassroots organizations want to do. As primarily developmental NGOs, they are not concerned with tools and frameworks in peace work. At the minimum, they ask for project deliverables agreed upon and supplement what GOs lack in terms of impact analysis and report writing.

Grassroots organizations' missions are rooted in the history of conflict in the communities where they operate and the experience and expertise of their founders. Their interventions depend on that expertise, and they tend to work with the same communities over time. They are knowledgeable on peace theories, frameworks, and tools, mostly from their network of organizations and institutions dealing specifically with peacebuilding. However, only three organizations use the tools and frameworks, and only one uses them critically; i.e., know their limitations and combine different tools. There was an observed difference in the way progress was seen, and the way progress was reported. Those who have donors report their progress in ways expected of them based on the reporting templates. Their reports depend on what kind of questions are asked and what kind of information is needed. Regardless of the reporting requirements, they are concerned with the kind of progress not usually seen in reports – implicit measures - which boil down to progress in the level of trust among the parties that they wish to reconcile.

## **Chapter 7. Extent and Limits of Technocratic Practices**

Consistent with the literature, the case material confirms that funding influences the spread of technocratic practices. However, this influence is only on the administrative side. On the substantive side, socio-political dynamics, organizational history, and the tendency to stick to their

expertise and the communities that they work with pose as limits to the influence of substantive technocratic practices.

Existing literature has underestimated the role of government and support organizations as sources of administrative technocratic practices, while overestimating the impact of global actors.

This case moreover deviates from the literature with its finding that technocratic practices can be mediated. The role of trust in mediating administrative technocratic practices and its importance as an indicator of progress in peace work is also worth further examination.

## **Chapter 8. Conclusion**

This research drives the academic conversation forward in the area of technocracy and peace by filling in the space between the dualities of global-local. Multiple actors - and therefore multiple sites of agency - imply that each actor in the peace work environment has the responsibility to re-examine why they set or use certain generalized criteria, methods, tools, and frameworks. When found to be counteracting valued principles of peace work, they should exercise that agency to negotiate, mediate for others as applicable, and if need be, reject, and find a good balance to competing concerns in peace work

The analytical separation of administrative and technocratic practices supported the idea that these two aspects are governed by different norms. Technocratic norm prevails in the administrative aspect, while the inclusive and context-based peacebuilding is the norm for peace

work. In the case of peace work, the administrative forms and practices were like the hammer that was decided even before it knew where to apply it to. CSOs in peace work are bound to negotiate with these two connected but separable norms. The outcome of this negotiation is not predetermined. It is always a negotiation. However, some important influences can be identified.

The civil society and space it occupies in the state's social, political, and economic life are important considerations. So too, are the organizational tendency to remain in their niche and expertise.

These are forces that make administrative technocracy untenable. On the substantive side, failure to measure what grassroots organizations find most relevant – progress in the level of trust – also points to a limitation of technocratic practices.