

主論文の要約

(Abstract of Dissertation)

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

氏名 : BALLESTEROS Marie Donna Montesa

論文内容の要約 :

Chapter 1. Introduction

One of the oft mentioned but inadequately explained reason for why peace work has not brought the intended peace is that peace work has become technocratic. 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 valued for their ‘efficiency’ and ‘objectivity’ while sacrificing the need for a context-based and inclusive peace work. This dissertation deconstructs this critique and suggests a framework for a nuanced analysis illustrated through the case of a civil society network in the Philippines. It is guided by the research question:

How do CSOs negotiate with technocratic requirements in peace work?

sEight organizations – all part of a network in the Philippines – participated in this study. Their organizational acts were divided into administrative (how their organization is run) and the substantive (what they do for peace and how). The way organizations negotiate with technocratic practices on these aspects depend on their functional roles and regularity of their funding. On their

functional roles, six organizations are *grassroots organizations* or those who implement initiatives directly, while two organizations are *support organizations* of those that work by partnering with grassroots organizations. The support organizations and two grassroots organizations are regularly funded, two are intermittently funded, and another two are independently funded. Findings on their negotiation with technocratic practices 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 both in practice and theory. On the practical side, 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?* An issue of such importance deserves further examination if we are to improve practice. On the theoretical side, technocratic practices properly contextualized through organizations uncover a multi-layered local and points to multiple sites of agency that can overcome global-local and imposer-imposed upon analytical constraints in the literature. The results of this study will also be relevant in introducing a nuanced analysis of technocratic practices as an explanatory variable that can inform other issues in peace studies; e.g., local ownership, adaptive peace building, civil society, and aid effectiveness in peace work.

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 peace work has become technocratic. This is done by proposing an alternative interpretation of the literature on the *local turn* in peace literature. Local agency and its manifestations be taken not as an evidence for a prevalent technocratic peace work but an evidence against it. Only then can a differentiated effect of technocracy in peace work be examined. Combining peace and organizational studies is taken as a viable way of empirically analyzing the issue in a way that that reveals 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 reconciling tensions between and among three norms: (1) the norm for a civil society that is a force for good, (2) the technocratic norm for the organizational form that CSOs take, and (3) the inclusive and context-based norm for peace work. Administrative technocratic practices arise and are negotiated from the first two norms, while substantive technocratic practices are negotiated in the third norm. 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

While the literature points to the importance of source of funding, the case material reveals that regularity of funding is more influential in 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 interorganizational trust in mediating administrative technocratic practices is highlighted, as well as trust as an important indicator of progress that need to be captured.

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.

The civil society and the space it occupies in the state's social, political, and economic life are important considerations. So too, are the grassroots organizations' 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.