

**CLCE 390 / ANTH 491:
INTERNATIONAL NGOS AND GLOBALIZATION**

Spring 2013
MW, 3:30 – 4:45p
206 Stevens Building
Asst Prof Mark Schuller
mschuller@niu.edu
Office Hours – MW 2-3:20p
Or by appointment
103 Stevens Building

Review of the history of international nongovernmental organizations (INGOs) particularly changes since the advent of neoliberal globalization beginning in the late 1980s that heralded an “NGO boom.” An ethnographic examination of the political roles of INGOs and challenges negotiating multiple relationships with communities, governments, and social movements. PRQ: Junior standing or consent of instructor

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

Upon completing this course, students will:

- Have a historical understanding of the changes within INGOs, particularly since neoliberal globalization
- Sharpen their analysis of INGOs as a system and a structure
- Demonstrate a nuanced analysis of various aspects of INGOs: their work, their relationships with multiple understanding
- Assess the challenges currently facing an INGO
- Apply these theoretical, ethnographic, and historical tools in a critical analysis of a particular INGO

COURSE READINGS:

Nearly all readings are on Blackboard. There is one required reading that is available at the Bookstore:

Schuller, Mark, and Foreword by Paul Farmer
2012 Killing with Kindness: Haiti, Development Aid and NGOs New Brunswick: Rutgers
University Press.

COURSE OUTLINE:

Week 1 – Predecessors to INGOs

Monday, January 14 – introduction to course

Wednesday, January 16 – (Bornstein and Redfield 2011)

Week 2 – Types of INGOs

Monday, January 21 – Martin Luther King Jr. Day – no class

Wednesday, January 23 – (Fisher 1997)

Week 3 – The “Development” Era

Monday, January 28 – (Nelson 1995)

Wednesday, January 30 – (Ferguson 1990)

Week 4 – Globalization

Monday, February 4 – (McMichael 1996)

Wednesday, February 6 – (Petras 1997, Wallace 2003)

Week 5 – The “NGO Boom”

Monday, February 11 – (Macdonald 1995, Agg 2006)

Wednesday, February 13 – (Alvarez 1999)

Week 6 – Relationships between INGOs and States

Monday, February 18 – (Leve and Karim 2001, Kamat 2002)

Wednesday, February 20 – (Jackson 2005)

Week 7 – Governance and governmentality

Monday, February 25 – (Pierre-Louis 2011)

Wednesday, February 27 – (Sharma 2006)

Select INGO to study

Week 8 – Social Movements and INGOs

Monday, March 4 – (Keck and Sikkink 1998)

Wednesday, March 6 – (Edelman 2005)

<Spring Break>**Week 9 – Women’s NGOs**

Monday, March 18 – (Lang 2000)

Wednesday, March 20 – (Nagar 2006)

Online web discussion – Web analysis of INGO due

Week 10 – Ethnographic Understanding of NGOs

Monday, March 25 – (Lewis 1999)

Wednesday, March 27 – (Markowitz 2001, Schuller, Introduction and Chapter 1)

Media analysis of INGO

Week 11 – Challenges of legitimacy and autonomy

Monday, April 1 – (INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence 2007)

Wednesday, April 3 – (Lister 2003)

Week 12 – Relationships with beneficiary communities

Monday, April 8 – (Davis 2003)

Wednesday, April 10 – (Pattenden 2010, Schuller, Chapter 2)

Bibliography for final paper

Week 13 – Brokerage and Translation

Monday, April 15 – (Mosse and Lewis 2006)

Wednesday, April 17 – (Shrestha 2006)

Week 14 – Interrogating the Role of Intermediaries

Monday, April 22 – (Richard 2009)

Wednesday, April 24 – (Schuller 2012, chapters 3-5)

First draft of final paper

Week 15 – Facing the New Realities, New Challenges

Monday, April 29 – (Vincent 2006, Schuller, Conclusion and Afterword)

Wednesday, May 1 – (Fechter and Hindman 2011)

FINAL – MONDAY, MAY 6, 4-5:50p

STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES:

1) Briefs

Students will write 14 critical reading briefs. Students will turn in a reading response journal for **ONE** of the week’s readings. These are due **AT THE BEGINNING OF CLASS ON MONDAY. NO EXCEPTIONS.** This is designed not only to keep students reading, but also to help students gain practice at critical reading skills. The appendix on this syllabus lists 7 general reading questions. For the first three weeks, students will focus on the first 2 questions, identifying the main argument. For weeks five and six, students will answer the first 3, including understanding the logic and structure of the argument. During week seven, question 4, identifying the methodology used or implicit in the reading, will be added. During week nine, I add question 5, asking students to apply the main argument in an example. During week eleven, I add question 6. Students write a well-formulated question or critique of the work. During week thirteen, I add question 7, asking students to imagine themselves as the authors. How would students respond to the critique, or write an analysis that would not be critiqued in the same way?

Each brief is worth 5 points, for a total of 70 points possible

2) Final paper

There will be one final paper, assembling the theoretical tools in the course to analyze a particular INGO. In week 7, in consultation with me, students will identify an INGO to study. One consideration is the availability of written information (in the form of website, annual reports, issue briefings, and ideally independent scholarship). Students will first identify a problem, and search out the relevant literature and internet locations where the problem is discussed. Students should deconstruct the way that knowledge is produced about the issue selected, discussing the epistemologies and biases involved. They are expected to employ at least two alternative and distinct critical approaches learned in class to deconstruct the narrative.

During the scheduled final, students will hand in their final draft and present to the rest of the class.

Web analysis	5 points
Media analysis	5 points
Bibliography	5 points
Rough Draft	10 points
Final paper	15 points
Total	40 points possible

POLICY ON ATTENDANCE AND PARTICIPATION:

In order to help build this learning community and help contribute to the learning of others, students are expected to attend all classes and to be on time. Lateness for class will be incorporated into the final grade. Participation includes preparing for class by completing assigned readings, participating in class discussions in an informed manner, moving the class forward by asking questions or making comments, and actively completing in-class exercises. It also means that students aren't being disruptive to others' learning.

STUDENTS ARE GRANTED ONE ABSENCE WITHOUT AFFECTING THEIR GRADE. FOLLOWING THIS, EACH ABSENCE COSTS HALF A LETTER GRADE.

EVALUATION:

Your grade will be based upon weekly critiques and a final paper, divided into the discrete assignments noted above. Exam, paper, and class assignment/discussion values are as follows:

Briefs – 70 points possible

Final – 40 points possible

Notice that the total is 110 points. This is deliberate. The reasoning behind this is to offer you peace of mind that having a bad week or having an emergency will not adversely affect your grades. In addition, students who don't have a crisis can benefit from specific feedback and hence know how to improve, and to challenge themselves, without worrying about their grades. In my experience students want to be challenged, offered specific feedback and a real assessment (with the system of grading, this is how you expect to be evaluated), but are concerned about grades. Some of you will go onto law school, professional school, or graduate school. This system of free points takes care of this concern while still allowing me to offer you constructive criticism, helping you grow, learn, and develop. **This also means that there will be absolutely no exceptions to turning in late work, so there is no need to ask.**

EXTRA CREDIT:

Given the 10 extra points possible there is no need for extra credit. But students who email me by noon on Tuesday, January 15, and answer the following question: what is 1+1? will receive some extra credit.

GRADING SCALE:

A+ >96.7%
A 93.3-96.6%
A- 90-93.3%
B+ 86.7-89.9%
B 83.3-86.6%
B- 80-83.3%
C+ 76.7-79.9%
C 73.3-76.6%
C- 70-73.3%
D+ 66.7-69.9%
D 63.3-66.6%
D- 60-63.3%
F <60%

CLASS PARTICIPATION:

I am a firm believer in learning by doing, and I am also an advocate for making connections between what you are learning and the outside world. As much as possible, this will be an active discussion class. This is your chance to get the material under your skin, to try out concepts, to discuss, make arguments, listen, encourage learning, with the concepts covered in the readings.

I expect that students will come to class prepared, having read the assigned materials *in advance* and bringing these materials with you to class. I will offer some prepared discussion (“lectures”) but these will offer context and theoretical background. These will **NOT** summarize readings as I expect that you will have read them in advance. Intended for enhancement and enrichment, these will make sense if you complete the readings.

Discussion participation is not about how often you open your mouth but on how you are contributing to the learning of others. We are going to be together for fourteen weeks, building a learning community. We aren’t put on this earth alone; African American communities are central to people’s individual survival and growth, not to mention social movements for progress. So let’s keep this community in mind. Here are some tips on building this community:

1. **Respect everyone.** Look around; there are many differences that you can see (and many you can’t) - this community is diverse and inclusive.
2. **Listen, not just speak.** People can say things that you hadn’t thought of.
3. **Come to class on time.** It affects everyone when people walk in late.
4. **Do your readings.** Don’t cheat your classmates on your perspectives.
5. **Ask questions** when you don’t know something. Chances are, you aren’t the only one who is unsure of something.
6. **Be a good participant:** don’t interrupt, don’t have a private conversation, etc.
7. **Put the cell phone away:** unless there is an emergency wherein you must get a call / text, which you must let me know at the beginning of class, put away the cell phone and turn them off. It is distracting to your peers and to your professor, which takes away from other students’ learning experience.

DISABILITIES:

NIU abides by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 regarding provision of reasonable accommodations for students with documented disabilities. If you have a disability that may negatively impact your performance in this course and you may require some type of instructional and/or examination accommodation, please contact me early in the semester. If you have not already done so, you will need to register with the Center for Access-Ability Resources (CAAR), the designated office on campus to provide services and administer exams with accommodations for students with disabilities. CAAR is located on the 4th floor of the University Health Services building (753-1303). I look forward to talking with you to learn how I may be helpful in enhancing your academic success in this course.

PLAGIARISM POLICY:

Plagiarism is any use of another person’s words without giving credit to the original author. This includes the use of materials from books, magazine or journal articles, newspapers, or on-line sources. Plagiarism includes the use of others’ writing with minimal alteration of the text. Unless you specifically show what has been written by another author, you are misappropriating their work. We have a zero-tolerance policy for plagiarism. Any plagiarism will result in the loss of all points for an exam, quiz, or assignment. These cannot be made up.

COURSE BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Agg, C. (2006). Trends in Government Support for Non-Governmental Organizations: Is the “Golden Age” of the NGO Behind Us? Geneva, United Nations Research Institute on Social Development: 27.
- Alvarez, S. E. (1999). “Advocating Feminism: The Latin American Feminist NGO ‘Boom’.” *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 1(2): 181-209.
- Bornstein, E. and P. Redfield, Eds. (2011). *Forces of Compassion: Humanitarianism between Ethics and Politics*. Santa Fe, School for Advanced Research Press.
- Davis, C. (2003). “Feminist Tigers and Patriarchal Lions: Rhetorical Strategies and Instrumental Effects in the Struggle for Definition and Control over Development in Nepal.” *Meridians: feminism, race, transnationalism* 3(2): 204-249.
- Edelman, M. (2005). When Networks Don’t Work: the Rise and Fall and Rise of Civil Society Initiatives in Central America. *Social Movements: an Anthropological Reader*. J. C. Nash. Malden, MA, Blackwell Publishing: 29-45.
- Fechter, A.-M. and H. Hindman, Eds. (2011). *Inside the Everyday Lives of Aidworkers: The Challenges and Futures of Aidland*. Sterling, VA, Kumarian Press.
- Ferguson, J. (1990). *The Anti-Politics Machine: “Development,” Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. New York, Cambridge University Press.
- Fisher, W. (1997). “Doing Good? The Politics and Antipolitics of NGO Practices.” *Annual Reviews in Anthropology* 26: 439 - 464.
- INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, Ed. (2007). *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex*. Cambridge, MA, South End Press.
- Jackson, S. (2005). “The State Didn’t Even Exist”: Non-Governmentality in Kivu, Eastern DR Congo. *Between a Rock and a Hard Place: African NGOs, Donors, and the State*. J. I. T. Kelsall. Durham, N.C., Carolina Academic Press: 165-196.
- Kamat, S. (2002). *Development Hegemony: NGOs and the State in India*. Delhi, Oxford University Press.
- Keck, M. E. and K. Sikkink (1998). *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca N.Y., Cornell University Press.
- Lang, S. (2000). The NGO-ization of feminism. *Global Feminisms Since 1945*. B. G. Smith. London, Routledge: 290-304.
- Leve, L. and L. Karim (2001). “Privatizing the State: Ethnography of Development, Transnational Capital, and NGOs.” *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* 24(1): 53-58.
- Lewis, D. (1999). “Revealing, Widening, Deepening? A Review of the Existing and Potential Contribution of Anthropological Approaches to “Third-Sector” Research.” *Human Organization* 58(1): 73-81.
- Lister, S. (2003). “NGO Legitimacy: Technical Issue or Social Construct.” *Critique of Anthropology* 23(2): 175-192.
- Macdonald, L. (1995). “A Mixed Blessing: The NGO Boom in Latin America.” *NACLA Report on the Americas* 28(5): 30-35.
- Markowitz, L. (2001). “Finding the Field: Notes on the Ethnography of NGOs.” *Human Organization* 60(1): 40-46.
- McMichael, P. (1996). “Globalization: Myths and Realities.” *Rural Sociology* 61(1): 25-55.
- Mosse, D. and D. Lewis (2006). Theoretical Approaches to Brokerage and Translation in Development. *Development Brokers and Translators: The Ethnography of Aid and Agencies*. D. Lewis and D. Mosse. Bloomfield, CT, Kumarian Press: 1-26.
- Nagar, R. a. S. W. (2006). *Playing with Fire: Feminist Thought and Activism through Seven Lives in India*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- Nelson, P. J. (1995). *The World Bank and Non-governmental Organizations: the Limits of Apolitical Development*. New York, St. Martin’s Press.
- Pattenden, J. (2010). “A neoliberalisation of civil society? Self-help groups and the labouring class poor in rural South India.” *Journal of Peasant Studies* 37(3): 485-512.

- Petras, J. (1997). "Imperialism and NGOs in Latin America." *Monthly Review* **49**(7): 10-17.
- Pierre-Louis, F. (2011). "Earthquakes, Nongovernmental Organizations, and Governance in Haiti." *Journal of Black Studies* **42**(6): 186-202.
- Richard, A. (2009). "Mediating Dilemmas: Local NGOs and Rural Development in Neoliberal Mexico." *Political and Legal Anthropology Review* **32**(2): 166-194.
- Schuller, M. and Foreword by Paul Farmer (2012). *Killing with Kindness: Haiti, Development Aid and NGOs* New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press.
- Sharma, A. (2006). "Crossbreeding Institutions, Breeding Struggle: Women's Empowerment, Neoliberal Governmentality, and State (Re)Formation in India." *Cultural Anthropology* **21**(1): 60-95.
- Shrestha, C. H. (2006). "They Can't Mix Like We Can": Bracketing Differences and the Professionalization of NGOs in Nepal. *Development Brokers and Translators: The Ethnography of Aid and Agencies*. D. Lewis and D. Mosse. Bloomfield, CT, Kumarian Press: 195-216.
- Vincent, F. (2006). "NGOs, Social Movements, External Funding, and Dependency" *Development* **49**(2): 22-28.
- Wallace, T. (2003). NGO Dilemmas: Trojan Horses for Global Neoliberalism? *The Socialist Register 2004: The New Imperial Challenge*. L. Panitch and C. Leys. New York, Monthly Review Press: 202-219.

APPENDIX: CRITICAL READING QUESTIONS

- 1) What new things did you learn (*information – facts*) after you read each article/ chapter for this week? Write a list of everything you learned. Can be bullet points/ keywords, but detailed. Place page numbers next to the information.
- 2) What was the author's *main argument*? Write a short and pithy synthesis. Two to three sentences should suffice, provided they are detailed, organized, and well structured.
- 3) What was the *structure* of the study? What was the overall logic? What evidence did she/he use? In what order? You should be able to reproduce some kind of outline.
- 4) What *methods* did the author use to gain this information? (or, if not appropriate, what *assumptions* did the author make or taken-for-granted understandings did the author appeal to?)
- 5) Apply the main argument (question 2) with an *example*: explain the theory/ ideas by using them in another situation. The example needs to have sufficient detail to explain, and the link between the example and the theory needs to be clear.
- 6) AFTER ALL THIS, what questions or *critiques* do you have for the study itself? What mistakes, logical flaws, omissions, or incomplete analyses are in the argument? What information or evidence is missing?
- 7) Is it possible to do a similar study while *avoiding the same critique*? If so, how? If not, why is it not possible?