

The Opposition

A Minor Field Study of the Peruvian Civil Society and its
Relationship with the State

Sofie Habram

Abstract

In 2006 a new law in Peru was proposed by the government, compelling civil society organizations to work for the same development goals as the government, which basically meant to account for their funding, and if it was not in line with the goals of the government, organizations would be fined or suspended. I have conducted a minor field study in Peru and investigated the relationship between the state and the civil society and how the civil society perceives that this relationship has affected their work and progress. A theoretical framework that looks at civil society in terms of four democracy-building abilities, as a counterforce, educator, agenda setter and source for new political alternatives, has been applied to my interviews. My interviews have pointed me to the conclusion that the fragile relationship between the state and civil society does not allow for civil society's democracy-building abilities to manifest fully. The parts of civil society that are mainly affected are organizations within sectors of environment, human rights, indigenous rights and gender equality. Parts of the Peruvian civil society's work and progress are being hindered by the relationship between the state and civil society and civil society has rather come to be the states' opposition.

Key words: Peru, civil society, state, democratization, Minor Field Study

Words: 9950

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) and the Department of Political Science at Lund University for granting me the scholarship and thereby the possibility to travel to Peru and conduct a minor field study. I like to express my deepest gratitude to Kristina Margård, at the Department of Political Science at Lund University, for her remarkable advice and support throughout the process. I would like to deeply thank Magnus Hallbåter, at Diakonia's field office in Lima, my contact person in Peru, for providing me with both contacts and useful advice. Foremost, I would like to thank everyone that participated in my interviews and taking the time to tell me their important and captivating stories about civil society in Peru.

List of Acronyms

AIDESEP	Interethnic Association for the Development of the Peruvian Rainforest
ANC	National Association of Organizations
APCI	Peru's International Cooperation Agency
APRA	American Popular Revolutionary Alliance
APRODEH	Association for Human Rights
CEDAL	Rights and Development Center
CENCA	Institute of Urban Development
CIED	Center for Research, Education and Development
CONACAMI	National Confederation of Peruvian Communities Affected by Mining
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DESCO	Center for the Study and Promotion of Development
IDL	Legal Defense Institute
PROETICA	Peruvian Sector of Transparency International
Sida	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Research Question and Purpose	2
1.1.1	Delimitations	2
2	Method and Material.....	3
2.1	Philosophy of Social Science.....	3
2.2	Qualitative Method.....	3
2.3	Qualitative Interviews	4
2.3.1	Selection of Interviewees	4
2.3.2	The Structure of the Interviews	5
2.3.3	The number of Interviews	5
2.3.4	Validity and Reliability in Qualitative Interviews.....	5
2.4	Ethical Dilemmas	6
2.5	Comments to the Interviews	6
3	Theoretical Framework.....	7
3.1	Civil Society.....	7
3.1.1	Defining Civil Society	8
3.1.2	Civil Society and Democracy.....	8
3.2	Civil Society and the State.....	9
3.2.1	Civil Society as a Counterpart.....	10
3.2.2	Civil Society as an Agenda Setter	10
3.2.3	Civil Society as an Educator	11
3.2.4	Civil society as a Source for new Political Alternatives.....	11
3.2.5	Contextual Approach	12
4	Political Background	13
4.1	Peruvian Political Background.....	13
5	Analysis	15
5.1	The Strength of the Peruvian Civil Society	15
5.2	Peruvian Civil Society and the State	16
5.2.1	Peruvian Civil Society as a Counterpart	16
5.2.2	Peruvian Civil Society as an Agenda Setter.....	18
5.2.3	Peruvian Civil Society as an Educator.....	20
5.2.4	Peruvian Civil Society as a Source for New Political Alternatives.....	21
6	Summary and Conclusion	24
6.1	Summary.....	24
6.2	Conclusion	24
6.3	Suggestion for Future Research	25

7	References	26
8	Interviews.....	28
9	Appendix.....	29
9.1	Interview Guide.....	29
9.1.1	Presentation	29
9.1.2	Questionnaire.....	29

1 Introduction

In 2000, the political climate in Peru changed, a transition to a more democratic Peru was set off after a long period of elements of authoritarian rule in the country (Nyberg et al 2010 pp.30-31, 52). Much of it had to do with newly elected president Alejandro Toledo government's achievements and work towards consolidating the democracy in Peru (Nyberg et al 2010 pp.54-55). A truth and reconciliation commission was established into recognize the human rights violations during the civil war between 1980 and 2000 (Burt 2007 pp.2-3). Furthermore, focus was put on reducing poverty, and a decentralization reform was initiated (Nyberg et. al. 2010, pp.30-31).

In the presidential elections 2006 Alan García became president. In December 2006, only eight months after García was elected, a new law on his demand was signed, obligating all civil society organizations within the country to register with the government agency APCI, forcing the civil society in Peru to follow and work for the same development goals as the government (Parodi Luna 2009 pp.55-56). What this basically meant was that all organizations needed to not only report for the origin of their funding, but also to show how they use their money, and if this was not within the lines of the government goals of development, organizations would be fined or even suspended (Dizard 2007 pp.6-7). According to different independent sources like Freedom House and the Swedish aid agency Diakonia, the law implied a very anti-civil society government agenda, where the government has altered civil society organizations working conditions and at the same time distanced themselves from the organizations in the country (Löfving et. al. 2008 pp.88-91, Dizard 2007 pp.6-7).

The core fundaments of the law were suspended by the Peruvian Constitutional Court in late 2007 (Freedom House, 2011-09-09) but the relationship between the state and the civil society remains fragile. There has been an ongoing resentment from the state towards the civil society (Ibid.). Governmental forces are in the process of trying to reinstate the core elements of the 2006's original law proposition and attempting to control civil society rights and diminish their autonomy (Parodi Luna 2009 pp.55).

With the governmental agenda in mind, I conducted a field study in Peru and looked at the relationship between the government and the civil society, and investigated how the civil society perceived that they are affected by this relationship.

1.1 Research Question and Purpose

In many Latin American countries civil society had an important role to play in the recovery and deepening of democracy, building and strengthening democratic institutions, being a central actor in the process (Feinberg, Waisman and Zamosc 2006 pp.1-4). With the governmental agenda in mind, the purpose of my study is to look at the relationship between the government and the civil society, how the civil society perceives that they are affected by this relationship from the government.

With this in mind, the central question that I seek to study is:

- How has the relationship between the state and civil society in Peru affected the work and progress of civil society organizations?

1.1.1 Delimitations

I have limited my study to see what has happened in Peru after the end of Fujimori's rule in 2000, and how civil society perceives the development of the governmental policies since then. I conducted a qualitative field study in Peru and I interviewed 13 different representatives from various fields within civil society, and two Peruvian political scientists. The interviews were carried out before the current president Ollanta Humala was appointed president in 2011. I am interested to see how these organizations perceive that the work and progress of civil society organizations are being affected by the relationship with the state, both generally and internally. I will apply a theoretical framework that presupposes civil society having four democracy-building abilities and I will base my analysis on the interviewees' answers. I am interested of my interviewees' perception applied onto the Peruvian context and I am not interested in making generalized assumptions that can be applied to an international context. I am interested in analyzing if this relationship could have had any effects on the deepening of the Peruvian democracy, as civil society can have democracy building abilities (Boussard 2003 pp.89-96).

2 Method and Material

I have investigated the relationship between the state and civil society by doing a field study in Peru. I used a qualitative method of approach, and interviewed 13 civil society organization representatives and two political scientists, and therefore my main source of material will be qualitative interviews.

In this methodological framework I will look into the different aspects and potential obstacles of using qualitative method, and particularly qualitative research method. I will also point out some important ethical dilemmas that I find of importance. I will start by looking at the philosophy of social science and discuss its controversies.

2.1 Philosophy of Social Science

When it comes to the field of social science there has been an ongoing debate about how to address the two different scientific perspectives and positions that one can take as a researcher, a distinction between a positivistic and hermeneutic scientific approach, more known as quantitative versus qualitative method (Teorell and Svensson 2002 pp.9-12). Marsh and Furlong argue that it is of absolute importance that one knows one's research position, as it will affect the theoretical and methodological choices that one will make as a researcher (2002 p.17-18). Others like Teorell and Svensson more carefully point out that this distinction is not crystal clear, as all social sciences basically asks the same type of questions and therefore do not differ that much after all (2007 p.12-13).

When it comes to the perspective in my research, my main agenda is to get an understanding of my research problem, and therefore I will be taking a more hermeneutic approach, and it will definitely affect my method, as it will be a qualitative research interview with the goal to understand my interviewees.

2.2 Qualitative Method

Qualitative method seeks to understand political phenomena by understanding personal experiences of people, and is the method of choice when the purpose of the study is to look at and understand their experiences and the significance that they give to those experiences (Devine 2002 pp. 197-199). It does not seek quantifications of phenomena (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009 p.30) and neither does it have an overly generalizing ambition (Teorell and Svensson 2007 pp.10-11).

For me it is ideal to use qualitative method as I seek to understand the relationship of civil society and state from civil society's subjective perspective and from its experiences. I am not interested in any quantification of the study, neither to generalize their experiences into law. On the other hand, I am interested to look at if one can draw any conclusion how their relationship has affected the civil society in general in Peru. But it also stops there, and I am not interested in explaining how the whole world works, it is just a case of how it can be.

2.3 Qualitative Interviews

I used qualitative research interview to gather my material. I chose to conduct qualitative interviews as it provided me with a deeper knowledge of the Peruvian civil society and my interviewees' take on it (Brinkmann, 2012-05-18).

In this section I will discuss my methodological approach: the selection of my interviewees, the number of interviews and also the structure of them. Last I will evaluate how qualitative interviews relate to the aspects of validity and reliability. The second part of my material will come from well-known scientific journals and published literature, which was critically evaluated.

2.3.1 Selection of Interviewees

I used two approaches selecting interview participants in Peru. First, through my contact person in Lima I got in touch with a first interviewee, a CSO employee, and then I used the snowball method, asking after every interview if the person has any further contacts that would be of use to me (Teorell and Svensson 2007 pp.86-87). By doing so I was able to reach the information and knowledge that I wanted within one area, or one field of civil society. It was important that I got to talk to different employees, who represent different opinions, to widen my research and knowledge. Second, after a couple of interviews within one area, I strategically chose my next interview, as it is the method to be preferred when doing qualitative research studies, as it enables you to strategically "choose to the right people" (Teorell and Svensson 2007 p.84-85). Before I conducted my interviews I looked into some organizations of interest, and I wanted to perform my interviews with organizations whose core interest and agenda are issues related to development of democracy but also with organizations that had a closer relationship with the government. I was through the snowball method able to interview one government representative, an employee at APCI. I felt it was important to hear what "the other side" had to say. However, after the interview I concluded that I could not guarantee validity of the interviewee's responses, which forced me not to include it into the essay. The interviewee essentially did not answer my questions. Furthermore, I interviewed two political scientists, to provide me with some historical background of the political situation in Peru.

2.3.2 The Structure of the Interviews

When it came to the structure of the interviews I decided to carry out in-depth interviews, in Spanish, in a semi-structured manner, mainly because of its advantages working with “open-ended questions” which gave me the ability perform the interview like a “guided conversation” (Devine 2002 pp.198-199). I felt that this method was preferable since it made the interview more open and flexible, and made the interviewees able to express themselves more elaborately, guided by my questions.

I felt it was of meaning that the interviewee’s relation to me, and how they answered the questions, was detailed and reliable and that the interviewee could feel relaxed during the interview, and that my interpretation of their answers corresponded to the actual meaning of them (Teorell and Svensson 2007 pp.89-90).

2.3.3 The number of Interviews

When working with in-depth interviews a small sample of interviewees are appropriate (Devine 2002 pp.198-199). I conducted 13 interviews with civil society organizations and two Peruvian political scientists. I tried to get in touch with more state employees but was only fortunate enough to get in touch with one. My goal was to conduct a minimum of 15 interviews and a maximum of 20, so I feel satisfied with my result of number of interviews.

2.3.4 Validity and Reliability in Qualitative Interviews

When performing qualitative interviews the question of validity and reliability arises. Validity concerns the question that one is actually measuring what one is intended to measure, and reliability implies the absence of unsystematic measuring faults (Teorell and Svensson 2007 pp.5-59). Applying this onto a qualitative interview context, validity can be interpreted as “the accuracy between the responses and the reality the responses were intended” and reliability can be interpreted as “a consistency of approach” when conducting the interviews (Gomm 2004 pp.152-153). When it came to validity I related to this in my study by evaluating the interviewees’ answers after the interview, and asked if their answers lied within a possible reality. When it came to reliability, I used a scheduled, but open structure of my interviews, in such way that my interviewees answered basically the same questions. I did not expect to receive the exact same answers from the interviewees.

2.4 Ethical Dilemmas

Ethical dilemmas are of immense importance when conducting interviews and therefore must be dealt with already from the beginning of the research process (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009 p.62). There are four fields that need to be ethically evaluated: informed consent, confidentiality, consequences, and the role of the researcher (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009 p.68). First, informed consent means that the interviewees are informed about the study's main purpose, structure, and also about problems that might arise if participating (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009 pp.70-71). As my interviews dealt with a somewhat sensitive topic, I needed the interviewee's fullest approval of participating. Second, confidentiality regards the fact that private information that will be attained from the interviewees will not be made public, and the question of what information is made public needs to be addressed (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009 pp.72-73). I dealt with this aspect by asking the interviewees if they wanted to be anonymous, while notifying them of the purpose of the study, and most important respecting their wishes. Third, consequences regard the fact that one need to evaluate the risks of the interviewee's participation and see if they outweigh the benefits (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009 pp.73-74). I considered possible risks of participating, and how much of risk it is for them to participate. Last, the role of the researcher is maybe the most central of the four, and it entails the interviewer's integrity and efforts to deal with the moral issues that are central in the research process (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009 pp.74-75). I believe that it was vital that I was prepared for issues and ethical dilemmas that might occur in the process and I felt that I was so. There is always going to be issues to deal with, but by being prepared for the possibilities of problems that I can think of could occur, and open for those that would happen anyway, unable to predict, I think got me far.

2.5 Comments to the Interviews

Because of the somewhat sensitive issues discussed in some part of the interviews, I have after a lot of consideration decided that I will not quote anyone directly even though I will present a complete list of interviewees. This is due to that I find the insurance to the interviewees' anonymity the most important. A part of the interviewees did not want to be quoted, some not with approval first, but all of them did mind to be a part of the essay in a larger context, and therefore as I still want to credit everyone I interviewed, I will make all the quotes in the analysis part of the essay anonymous. I have considered not using quotes at all, but as I find it very important to highlight some of the aspects that were brought to my attention, and thereby quoting them by their words exactly.

3 Theoretical Framework

As I have investigated the civil society in Peru, I will in this section present my theoretical framework concerning civil society, which I will apply in my analytical presentation. I will start with an introduction with a definition of the concept of civil society and further how the concept relates to democracy. I will in this section point out why civil society is of relevance and how it relates to the democratic development in a country. Furthermore, I will present the theoretical framework that will include four theoretical dimensions that I will use when looking at the civil society in Peru and particularly in its relationship with the state.

3.1 Civil Society

A lot of scholars agree upon the fact that the modern concept of civil society has become to some extent an all-inclusive and very general concept (Boussard 2003 pp.72-73, Pearce 1997 pp.80-81, Edwards 2009 p.3). The idea of civil society has the last three decades risen in popularity; while the concept itself has developed into numerous different takes and meanings, with different fallouts, leaving some people to say that the concept explains everything and nothing at the same time (Boussard 1998 p.149, Edwards, 2009 pp.2-5). The idea of civil society is not a modern concept, it has roots way back to the antiques, where philosophers in a normative way discussed how “the good society should be shaped”, how society and the citizens should behave (Edwards 2009 pp.5-6). But in order to use civil society today as an analytical concept one must try to avoid this normative idea of civil society, with the obvious caution not to be overly limited in the definition and excluding parts of civil society that should not be disregarded (Boussard 1998 p.153). By using civil society as a modern analytical tool we are able to understand democratic development and political change, as long as we establish an analytical approach and separate it from further concepts (Boussard 2003 pp.72-73, Mouzelis 1995 p.225).

Edwards recognizes that there are three separate schools of thought regarding the concept of civil society; “civil society as a public sphere, civil society as the good society and civil society as associational life” (2009 pp.10-13). Civil society as the public sphere is seen as a place where deliberation, association and institutional collaboration occurs, a collective place for debate and space for the public’s opinions (Edwards 2009 pp.63-65). Civil society as the good society is seen as the society that we want to achieve, as a normative goal (Edwards 2009 pp.45-50). Civil society as associational life, the most common way of seeing

civil society, is seen as the sphere of society that is independent from the state and voluntary; however, different scholars disagree on whom is part of the associational life (Edwards 2009 pp.19-26).

With this in mind I will narrow my definition of civil society to be able to use it as a strong analytical tool, by defining and looking at it from a democratic theory perspective, interpreting civil society as associational life. I acknowledge that limiting the concept and definition of civil society will affect my analysis and conclusions.

3.1.1 Defining Civil Society

Civil society is a general concept in the way that it does not have one distinct definition and many scholars disagree on how one should define it (Edwards 2009 pp.2-6). I will apply a definition from democratic theory, or as Edwards would put it, civil society as associational life (2009 p.19). I will use Diamond's definition of civil society, as it is the definition, which in my opinion, brings clarity to the concept.

Diamond defines civil society as being "*the realm of organized social life that is open, voluntary, self-generating, at least partially self supporting, autonomous from the state, and bound by a legal order or set of shared rules*" (1999 p.221). Diamond further points out that civil society does not include parts of the society that focuses on "inward-looking" activities, that concerns family and private matters; neither does it include the economic society, that has profit-making ends; nor the political society, as the political society has state-controlling aspirations (Ibid.). To avoid "conceptual stretching" when defining civil society it is best to apply as few defining attributes as possible, we get a broader definition, and can apply civil society to more cases (Boussard 2003 pp.26-29, pp.80-84).

Civil society distinguishes itself in five ways. First, civil society is for the public, by the public. Second, civil society is autonomous from the state. It is not independent from the state, as it has some kind of relationship with it. Third, civil society represents pluralism and diversity. Forth, civil society represents different interest, in comparison with political parties that rather represents a set of ideals. And fifth and last, civil society is separated from the concept of civic community. Civil society is not a concept that guarantees civic behavior as it might be an arena for undemocratic behavior (Diamond 1999 pp.222-226).

3.1.2 Civil Society and Democracy

To be able to answer the question why civil society is important it is significant to look at how the concept relates to democracy. In the following part I will look further into how these relate to each other and try to point out why civil society matters.

When defining democracy in a minimalist manner, civil society becomes a non-relevant concept (Chandhoke 1995 pp.163-165). However, when defining

democracy in a broader way the significance of civil society increases (Feinberg, Waisman and Zamosc 2006 pp.1-4). A democracy that is defined as a high-quality democracy will consequently demand a strong and vibrant civil society, as “organized social life” functions as a foundation for the potentials of democracy to be strong and resilient (Feinberg, Waisman and Zamosc 2006 pp.1-2). The strength of civil society is often related to democracy in a country (Clayton 1996 pp.7-10), as the strength of democracy in a country can be seen as a result of the strength of its civil society (Grugel 2002 p.114).

Civil society can have democracy-building abilities beyond the transition to democracy (e.g. Boussard 2003 pp.89-96, Diamond 1999 p.260, Chandhoke 1995 p.9). It can for example work as a supplement to political parties. It can increase the political participation, and it can educate citizens in democracy. Furthermore, it can deepen democracy on a more local level, and it can monitor the political representatives and hold state accountable (Diamond 1999 pp.22, 243-250). How and if these democracy-building abilities come forth at all depend mainly on how civil society itself is shaped and structured in a country (Boussard 2003 pp.89-91, Chandhoke 1995 pp.11-13).

It is not enough to talk about the strength of the civil society; we have to define what we mean by it. An undemocratic strong civil society might as well turn the society undemocratic (Boussard 2003 p.87-91). It is therefore of significance to look upon the qualities that a civil society must possess in order to uphold democratic-building abilities. If these conditions are met, then we can start talking about civil society as a democracy-building factor. It is also important to be careful pointing to a causal relationship between democracy and civil society, where the one is directly dependent of the other (Burt 2007 p.3), even though they can benefit from each other’s existence (Boussard 1998 pp.168-169).

In order for a civil society to be strong, and thereby have democratic-building abilities, five attributes are needed to be met. First, civil society has to be “self-governed”, meaning that civil society organizations have an internal level of democracy. Second, the goals and methods of the majority of the groups in civil society cannot be undemocratic. Third, that the organizations are institutionalized and that there exists established procedures that constitute the agenda of civil society groups. Fourth, that civil society is pluralistic and allows for competition within the society, and does not exclude any group. Fifth, that civil society is dense, and consists of numerous organizations (Diamond 1999 pp.227-233).

3.2 Civil Society and the State

By looking at the relationship between the state and civil society one can bring clarity to understand civil society’s role, and its democracy-building and democracy-deepening potential (Boussard 2003 pp.91-93). As I have previously pointed out, civil society can have democracy-building abilities, and now I will point to how these abilities can emerge in the relationship between the state and civil society. One of the factors why civil society is important in and why it has

democratic-building abilities has to do with its relationship to the state and what role that civil society plays (Chandhoke 1995 p.9-10).

If civil society has democratic-abilities they can come forth in the following four ways: first as a counterpart, second as an agenda setter, third as an educator, and fourth as a source for new political alternatives (Boussard 2003 pp.101-107). The state and civil society both have parts in these dimensions and I will now present a theoretical framework that consist of these four democracy-building abilities and further show how the state interplays in this relationship with civil society.

3.2.1 Civil Society as a Counterpart

Civil society acting as a counterpart is widely mentioned in the civil society and democratization literature and points to the same conclusion, that civil society can have an important role acting as a counterpart to the state, and by doing so holds the state accountable and thereby provide to a democratic society (e.g. Chandhoke 1995; Diamond 1999; Boussard 2003; Rosenblum and Lesch 2011; Clayton 1996). The more vibrant and democratic civil society is, the more accountable it can hold the state, as a passive civil society will not make the state listen to its demands (Chandhoke 1995 p.10). To hold the state accountable indicates that the state officials and government are kept responsible for their actions and performance (Fowler 1996 p.19). This means in concrete terms that civil society acts as both an advisor and as a monitor towards state agencies (Boussard 2003 pp.104-105).

Holding the state accountable is especially important in fragile democracies, where there can be a lack of horizontal accountability, for example like a weak judicial system and central bank (Diamond 1999 pp.239-242). There can be strong corrupt forces that immobilize these institutions of “horizontal accountability” to act on their own and civil society thereby acts towards implementing policies against this behavior (*Ibid.*).

The state’s role in the relationship of civil society acting as counterpart is to here provide and allow the framework for where civil society can act and function (Chandhoke 1995 pp.46-47, 71-73). Furthermore, the state has an important role to cooperate with civil society, as a partnership with civil society can increase both regime performance and legitimacy (Boussard 2003 pp.104-105).

3.2.2 Civil Society as an Agenda Setter

Civil society can function as an agenda setter, where it raises awareness to democratic shortfalls that exist in the society (Boussard 2003 p.102-103). Civil society can draw attention to these democratic issues, which the state does not put attention to, and contribute to the political institutionalization of the society. Civil society as an agenda setter will also raise the public’s opinion by bringing these kinds of problems to the table (*Ibid.*).

The function of civil society as an agenda setter can emerge in a variety of ways, for example it can demand transparency and reforms (*Ibid.*). It can involve matters such as representing interest and voices that are generally and historically underrepresented in the society, like indigenous minorities and women (Diamond 1999 pp.243-244). Additionally, civil society can work towards establishing policies and putting attention to sensitive topics as for example human rights (Diamond 1999 p.247). Furthermore, civil society can have an important function as an agenda setter to fight against clientelistic structures that commonly exist in fragile democracies, and speak for those that cannot speak for themselves (Diamond 1999 p.244).

The state's role in the relationship with civil society acting as an agenda setter is to allow the necessary space and framework for where these democratic shortfalls can be brought up to attention (Chandhoke 1995 pp.247-248).

3.2.3 Civil Society as an Educator

Civil society can function as an educator, where it informs people about the democratic system and its principles, about people's rights, and puts people's trust into the democratic system (Boussard 2003 pp.103-104). Civil society can thereby promote democratic behavior and principles (*Ibid.*).

Civil society can for example work as an educator by implementing various school projects where citizen at a young age get to learn about their democratic rights, and how to relate to democracy, which in turn will change the way they relate to issues like authoritarian voices and clientelistic structures (Diamond 1999 pp.242-243). Furthermore, civil society can also provide education of democratic behavior for the state and state officials (Boussard 2003 pp.103-104). Only through participating in civil society organizations people also tend to develop knowledge about their democratic rights and obligations in the society (Boussard 2003 pp.103-104).

The state is not only civil society's counterpart as it checks and control the state, civil society can also be a complement to the state in promoting democracy by educating citizens about their democratic rights and obligations and thereby has a dual, supplemental role towards the state (Diamond 1999 p.243).

3.2.4 Civil society as a Source for new Political Alternatives

Civil society can act as a source for new political alternatives, where it can provide a base for better representation in the society (Boussard 2003 p.105-107). As some newly established democracies can lack democratic leaders and opponents, civil society can for example transform into political society and bring established democratic leaders into public office, or even emerge into political parties (*Ibid.*). They can train and provide these new political and make them acknowledge democratic essentials such as transparency and accountability (Diamond 1999 p.245). In fragile democracies this is something that can be

important, where civil society stands against authoritarian voices that still have access to power, and where civil society can provide them democratic leaders and officials to run for public office (Hadenius, Ugglå 1996 p.1622). In many cases there are large amounts of knowledge accumulated in civil society organizations regarding issues such as rural development, and where civil society can provide the expertise in building up welfare services for the society (Boussard 2003 pp.105-107).

The state's role in the relationship with civil society as a new source for political alternatives is here to provide the society with the political framework, enabling new political forces to be implemented (Chandhoke 1995 pp.46-47).

3.2.5 Contextual Approach

As civil society emerges from the society, its structure will also depend on its own society's context and history (Jørgensen 1996 pp.43-44) and it is therefore of importance to highlight how the Peruvian context differs from the traditional one. The conceptualization and definitions added to the concept of civil society are very much colored by the fact that the concept was developed by different competing explanations looking at western societies and their means of becoming nation states (Fowler 1996 p.13). There are theories stating that after the transition to democracy, the activity of civil society organizations declines and the civil society structure transforms (Grugel 2002 p.112-113). Other theorist point to the importance of civil society after the transition to democracy, arguing that civil society's function alters from the transition period, but still has important democracy-building and deepening abilities (Boussard 2003 pp.97-100) especially as a transition to democracy rarely leads to flawless democracy (Boussard 2003 p.48). I will argue that civil society becomes a precondition in looking at a Peruvian context, for the deepening of democracy (Diamond 1999 p.232).

4 Political Background

To understand the current situation in Peru I believe it is important to comprehend the political background that to a large extent shaped the political decisions that were made in the country, and furthermore highlight the role of civil society in the country's political history.

4.1 Peruvian Political Background

Peru's political background consists of an uneven and unstable path towards democracy. The Peruvian political context is dominated with oligarchic rule and political instability, with the military mainly ruling the country (Cotler 1995 pp.324, 327). From 1968 until 1980 the political climate in Peru slowly changed, the state was strengthened and for example the presence of social movements and organizations was also increased (Cotler 1995 pp.333). Civil society organizations and the working class joined together in 1977 to fight towards the re-democratization of the country, there was a general strike and added political pressure on the government (Cotler 1995 pp.334-336). The military had no choice but to agree to call for elections, the transition to democracy was initiated, a new constitution was promulgated 1979, and the presidential elections were thereafter held in 1980 (Ibid.).

After the elections people anticipated a possible change for Peru, a country where much of its past had been concerned with both social and ethnic fragmentation and without any direct democratic institution to further consolidate democracy (Crabtree 2010 pp.357-358). But ever since Peru re-democratized, the Peruvian society and civil society had several obstacles working against them and the democratization in the country (Burt 2007 pp.2-14). In 1980 the terrorist group “Sendero Luminoso” (Shining Path) initiated a series of attacks, and civil war became a fact (García Calderón 2001 pp.47-49). The terrorist constituted the voice of poor Andean peasants, and they came to spread fear and violence all over the country (Ibid.). Civil society got caught in the middle of the civil war between the government and the terrorist group (Burt 2007 pp.4-13). Both the government and terrorists accused civil society groups of being in opposition to them and many people active in the Peruvian civil society were terrorized, harassed, and some of them even killed (Ibid.).

The two decades that followed after the democratization in 1980 were crammed with political and democratic instability (Burt 2007 pp.4-13). Peru reached a low when Alberto Fujimori was elected to office in 1990 (Burt 2007 pp.7-12). Fujimori got extraordinary powers from the congress, granted military

powers, violated human rights and suspended the constitution (Cotler 1995 p.348-351).

After Fujimori's removal in 2000 the political climate in Peru changed, as a transition to a more democratic Peru was set off with Alejandro Toledo as newly elected president (McClintock 2006 pp.96-98.). Government cooperation with the civil society increased (Dizard,2011-10-09), a truth and reconciliation commission was established for recognizing the human rights violations during Fujimori's presidency, focus was put on reducing poverty, and a decentralization reform was initiated (Nyberg et. al. 2010, pp. 30-31). However, my interviewees have all indicated that even though the working climate for civil society was a bit better with Toledo, especially for some areas with the civil society, there have historically always been obstacles for civil society to operate.

In the elections 2006 Alan García gained presidency and even though Peru in some aspects is developing, García has contributed to a lot of setbacks like corruption, lack of rule of law, discrimination of ethnic groups, poverty and injustice (Dizard, 2011-10-09). Furthermore, the government of García came to mean another downturn for the Peruvian civil society. The government proposed and approved a new law in 2006 that would restrict the civil society from functioning autonomously. García and his government showed little tolerance with the civil society, as they have had to face both harassment and hostility from the government since then (Freedom House, 2011-09-09).

5 Analysis

In my analysis I will present the results from my interviews with the Peruvian civil society. I will apply my interviews with the Peruvian civil society in the analysis onto my theoretical framework, which contains four dimensions of democracy building-abilities. I will show how the state and civil society in Peru relates to each other by looking at these four dimensions from a Peruvian context. I will start with a deeper look into the strength of the current Peruvian civil society, to investigate its democracy-building potential.

5.1 The Strength of the Peruvian Civil Society

In this section I will review my interviews and evaluate the strength of civil society in Peru. As it is hard to generalize only looking at 13 organizations, when Peru has over 2000 civil society organizations (Interview CSO-2, 2011), I will evaluate my interviewees' personal and general idea of civil society in Peru.

Burt draws the conclusion that the Peruvian civil society is "weak and fragmented" mainly because the Peruvian civil society is repressed, subject to state clientelism and state intimidation (2007 pp.241-242). Furthermore, Burt argues that Peru lacks democratic structures that assures given democratic principles, like rule of law, which undermines the strength of civil society (*Ibid.*).

My interviews talks about civil society in general in Peru in terms of being well-organized, coordinated, and accountable. They agree that when it comes to important issues civil society join forces, like they did in 2006 when the government wanted to impose laws that would regulate the civil society.

We speak loud and clear from various sectors of civil society. This type of law of 2006 was aimed at us, to try to bound and restrict the field of criticism and expression. [...] It was in direct violation of the constitutional rights of freedom of expression and freedom of association (Interview CSO-4, 2011).

As civil society in Peru is dense, it consists with over 2000 organizations (Interview CSO-2, 2011), there are organizations that are undemocratic and unorganized, but they are not in majority (Interview CSO-3, 2011). My interviewees believed that civil society in Peru is pluralistic and does not hinder competition. All of the organizations that I talked to pointed to their own organization as being organized and democratic in the way that their methods and goals are democratic, there exists established democratic institutionalized

procedures and there is an internal level of democracy. It is impossible to generalize and draw the conclusion that all parts of civil society are strong and democratic. However, my interviewees have pointed out that civil society has on several occasions shown that when in matter of issues regarding the civil society as a whole, they work together and unite, which in both their and my point of view is a strong civil society.

5.2 Peruvian Civil Society and the State

I will in this section look at the four dimensions of civil society's democracy-building abilities in Peru and reflect upon how these emerge and analyze how they relate to the Peruvian state. I want to understand how the relationship between the state and civil society has been perceived by the civil society to affect their work and progress.

5.2.1 Peruvian Civil Society as a Counterpart

In this section I will investigate the Peruvian civil society's role as a counterpart and how the state relates to it. After analyzing my interviews I have concluded that the ability for civil society to work as a counterpart and thereby provide accountability in the democratization process is somewhat of a complex issue in Peru. All my interviewees point to the troubled relationship between the state and the civil society, something that has always existed, to different degrees in the history of the Peruvian society. My interviewees have in different ways mentioned how civil society in general in Peru is being subject to harassment by the state.

Like this government and all the other previous governments there are a lot of resistance towards the presence of civil society organization and the idea of civil society. They feel there is a competition between political parties and us [...] we do not have any chance of being voted, we are not representatives, but we have access to international funding. [...] That makes us look like a threat (Interview CSO-3, 2011).

The state in Peru does not engage in cooperation with civil society. One of the interviewees pointed to the fact that they did not have any problems working and cooperating with regional and local government concerning particular questions (Interview CSO-1, 2011). Another organization said as they were not working within the civil society sphere of human rights or environment, they did not have any clashes with the national government, but neither did they point to any cooperation with them either (Interview CSO-9, 2011). All the organizations were in agreement that the civil society organizations involved with issues regarding

human rights, the environment and indigenous rights were subject to harassment, surveillance and threats by the government.

Public officials accuse us of different things, and members in the area of [area of organization, my notation] are being under constant threat related to their involvement in [particular work of organization, my notation]. In the past we have also received threats, we had to evacuate the building several times. They send us funeral wreaths, with letters saying they are going to kill all of us. [...] In 2009 we had a celebration and a group of people came there and started knocking down things and people had to leave. On the internet for example it circulates information saying we are terrorists, and like different animations showing a soldier holding the Peruvian flag and a person in the back, dark and holding a dagger that says [name of organization, my notation], that kind of propaganda circulating (Interview CSO-6, 2011).

Almost all of my interviewees also said that the audits of APCI, the governmental agency that regulates and controls civil society organizations, were used as a political tool to intimidate organizations that were raising sensitive questions. One of my interviewees said that APCI is driven by governmental policies, they wrongly accuse specific organizations of mismanagement, make it public in the newspaper without further investigating the organization, which leads in some cases to distrust from the population (Interview CSO-8).

As pointed out in the theoretical framework for civil society to be able to be a counterpart to the state, to hold it accountable, requires a degree of cooperation from the state, as a partnership can increase both regime performance and legitimacy (Boussard 2003 pp.104-105). My interviewees believed that it was hard for many parts of civil society to establish any kind of relationship with the national government.

However, one of my interviewees believed that even though the organization in some aspects tried to create a relationship with the state, it was hard to change the way civil society thought about the state as their “corporate culture was to confront the state” (Interview CSO-7, 2011). The interviewee mentioned that it was not only the state that needed to change, but also the mentality of civil society, not only to confront the state, but this was something not easily achieved as there always been a restrained relationship between state and civil society in the Peruvian history (*Ibid.*). As the interviewee pointed out even though there are tendencies from parts of the civil society not to cooperate with the state either, and no matter whom is to blame for this hostile relationship, the conclusion that I reach after analyzing the interviewees’ responses is that cooperation between the civil society and the government is almost none-existing. My interviewees believed that to hold the state accountable, both vertically and horizontally, to make them listen to your demands, and to keep them responsible for their actions seemed to be something that is not possible to fully do as there are strong tendencies of resistance to cooperate.

The majority of my interviewees rather think that civil society in Peru has become the opposition and its role of civil society has emerged to be the voices of the political opposition (Interview CSO, 1-3,-7,9,11-12, 2011), despite the fact that they formally do not have any capacity of being elected (Diamond 1999 p.221).

The law from 2006 was not the first, it must have been the eighth, or even tenth bill, always with the same purpose. This and previous government have realized the ability of the civil society to analyze and critique. There were times in Peru we have had crisis of political representation. In this scenario we have always had the role of bringing ideas, proposals, and negotiate with the state. [...] In this context we became “the opposition”. The higher levels that are seen in the media, with higher levels of interaction with government comes from the left, while the government is right and they accuse people hiding behind the organizations, and having political agendas related to the interest of the left parties. But we do not have this capability (Interview CSO-4, 2011).

5.2.2 Peruvian Civil Society as an Agenda Setter

In this section I will investigate the Peruvian civil society’s potential as an agenda setter, and how the state relates to this dimension. All of my interviewees have worked towards implementing policies and creating plans in their area of expertise. After carrying out my interviews I noted that particular attention had been put to specific issues concerning human rights, the environment, rural development, and women rights. My interviewees believed that the Peruvian civil society represent the interests that have been generally and historically underrepresented in the Peruvian society.

But much has been done by the civil society organizations in Peru, to promote the democratization process. The branches of civil society have driven the exercise and recognition of human rights in a country like Peru. Gender rights, as well, it has been largely due to the support and resources they have received. This is in contrast to the vision of the state, with its various rulers, who were reluctant to expand margins for the exercise of human rights, women and gender issues (Interview CSO-9, 2011).

One of my interviewees also pointed to other matters that civil society has put attention to, more specifically regarding issues such as AIDS, hunger, and biodiversity, where the government has been reluctant to do or say anything (Interview CSO-8, 2011). One can from my interviewees’ responses conclude that Peruvian civil society’s has the ability to raise awareness to matters that historically there have not been put much attention to. As noted in the theoretical

framework, this way of working as an agenda setter can contribute to the political institutionalization of the country (Boussard 2003 p.102-103). However, my interviewees believe that the Peruvian state lacks implemented and established policies and a framework giving them necessary space to function. As I pointed out in the theoretical framework the state's role in the relationship with civil society as an agenda setter is to provide necessary space and framework for civil society (Chandhoke 1995 pp.247-248). Furthermore, by providing the Peruvian civil society with a framework, the state via civil society can also improve the political institutionalization of the country (Boussard 2003 pp.103-104).

My interviewees believed that civil society raises sensitive questions, and implements national policies, and tries to make their voices heard. However, my interviewees argued that in many cases they have not been given the space needed to implement policies, and when they have been able to, it has taken a lot of time and effort. And as the majority of my interviewees mentioned, when a country lacks structure it becomes an easy process for the state to revoke policies that civil society have worked towards for years.

The state does not have any policies. Each government that comes along reinvests the country. A consolidated democracy in Europe can go left or right, but there are always some guidelines that are left untouched, expressed in a national consensus. The left or the right government do not try to replace what the country has been building for years. This situation just keeps repeating itself in Peru (Interview CSO-11, 2011).

My interviewees thought that their work, or generally the work of civil society in Peru has had democratic-building abilities for the Peruvian society, they have by being agenda setters deepened the democracy in Peru, despite the lack of a framework.

The Peruvian state has never put any resources into [particular work of organization, my notation] all the resources and struggles have been fought by us. It has never been of interest for the state/government. We have been given very little money to implement programs. And we end up doing what the state should be doing. The government of Toledo enacted the law, but it was a very long progress that took a lot of years. The current government [Alan Garcia, my notation] does not really care about the opinions of the organizations. [...] The organizations have pursued them, fought in the congress, in the streets not to dispose of the programs we implemented [...] even though they are not of great quality as they are, but they were installed because we fought for them, and they can make things better (Interview CSO-1, 2011).

5.2.3 Peruvian Civil Society as an Educator

In this section I will investigate the Peruvian civil society's role as an educator. My interviewees agreed upon that to provide the citizens with knowledge of their democratic rights and core principles of democracy was an important function and aim of the Peruvian civil society. All the interviewees had various projects and programs that worked towards making citizens more democratic and more aware of their citizen rights.

We believe that people with rights are people that produce more, and we have made people more aware of their rights, and aware that they had more rights than they previously knew of. This is not enough though, we believe that we are an organization that promotes development, and restart peoples life after what happened, all the people that were killed during the war. I think we have set a pattern in the individual, and in society [...] I think it is a contribution to democracy. A part of why we have democracy depends on our work (Interview CSO-10, 2011).

One of my interviewees even thought that the main aim of the organization the interviewee worked at was to improve citizenship in Peru by educating people through various programs regarding political participation, decentralization, human rights, sexual health, rural development and political rights (Interview CSO-12, 2011).

In my theoretical framework I argued that civil society in general can function as an educator by implementing projects for pupils, and thereby provide with democratic ideals at a young age (Diamond 1999 pp.242-243). According to my interviewees' responses, they believed that civil society worked as complement to the state, as they had projects that more in an indirect way affect democracy and promotes democratic behavior from a young age. One of my interviewee particularly pointed that they in some parts of the country educate teachers, and can make citizens at a young age relate to democratic principles and making them aware of their rights (Interview CSO-1, 2011).

As mentioned in the theoretical framework, civil society as an educator can have potential to provide a more democratic society (Boussard 2003 pp.105-107). However, there was concern raised among my interviewees regarding the lack of structures, continuity and long term objectives with both the state as well as civil society. My interviewees considered that many of the projects that the Peruvian civil society are concerned with only has short term goals, mainly because of economic and structural issues, and thereby lacks the potential to institutionalize democratic ideals completely. One of my interviewees pointed to the problem that occurs when people are educated to combat corruption but then this knowledge is not implemented into society after the project is finished (Interview CSO-11, 2011). Furthermore, the interviewee argued that state does not provide the civil society with structures and institutions (*Ibid.*). If civil society is to be a

complement to the state in an educational matter, civil society is needed to be allowed a framework and space to function (Chandhoke 1995 pp.247-248).

So the government changed, and automatically we started to have constant deterioration and now we are nothing at all transparent. Why are we wasting so much money on training staff in state transparency? We train 40 people. How thoughtful! What will these people do when they are done? Will there be work? Oh, I do not know, I was trained. That is terrible, huge amounts of money to be invested in government reform resulting in nothing, what you have is a state with extremely high levels of corruptibility. [...] All we are achieving are short term goals. [...] In civil society in Peru there is logic of survival, just to make it another day, because if you catch a project you get one more day, but what does that give you in long term as a result? It gives you zero. The state does not provide you with any long term objectives, there is no strategic sense (Interview CSO-7, 2011).

After analyzing my interviews, I believe the conclusion one can draw is that despite of institutional and structural problems that the interviews mention, the Peruvian civil society has made a difference in terms of the projects that they have implemented. The conclusion one can draw from my interviewees is that they believe that civil society has deepened the democracy in Peru as an educator and made people more aware of their rights, even though the relationship with the state has made it harder and their goals less long-term.

Civil society organizations in Peru are still and will remain for a long period, a fundamental level of knowledge generator. Surely, there is no one you can speak with, that has greater authority and relevance to the development in the country. That is great value, well obviously the way they affected the democratization process (Interview CSO-5, 2011).

5.2.4 Peruvian Civil Society as a Source for New Political Alternatives

In this section I will investigate the Peruvian civil society as source for new political alternatives and show how the state relates to this relationship. A majority of my interviewees pointed to the many deficits in how the political system is constructed, and how many ministers and public officials lack the knowledge necessary to run their office. One of my interviewees said that political leaders get appointed to office not based on their knowledge or expertise, but because of whom they are connected to, and in some cases do not know anything about the topic they are subject to (Interview CSO-1, 2011). In my theoretical framework I acknowledge how civil society organizations can become part of the political society by transforming into political leaders (Diamond 1999 p.245). My interviewees believed it was significant for civil society in Peru to therefore to put

resources into training new democratic leaders and educating them because of the authoritarian structures that still existed in the society.

We have to generate demand against the very poor supply of public officials. We have weak institutions. The public employee is generally uniformed and mediocre, and little encouragement is put into making things better. Our priority is to train members of civil society and public official [...] we are building a [...] network, building leaders across the country. We have contact points in the whole country. We have training programs here in Lima, in monitoring programs, in information programs, to strengthen them as leaders (Interview CSO-3, 2011).

Another problem that my interviewees brought to my attention is how the political party system in Peru is very weak, and there is no real opposition to the government forces. Furthermore, they all believed that civil society in Peru has somewhat become the political opposition. There is however a clear distinction that one should acknowledge between the civil society and the political society, and that is that the civil society does not aspire any formal power (Diamond 1999 p.221). Parts of civil society can however transform into political parties or bring democratic leaders within the civil society sphere into power (Boussard 2003 pp.105-107).

There is a big problem in Peru and it is the lack of political parties. The only thing that is organized is the civil society [...] the civil society is the defender of human rights, has an agenda on environmental and climate change, and has a clear understanding of the economic model, but this kind of sector or people does not exist in state or political parties. The problem with the political parties that exist, like APRA, is corruption, lack of transparency and competition. [...] They only put their own party members into political offices. The president has ministers that have no idea of the subject which they work with. [...] But we have launched a national network of leaders; especially on the local and regional level (Interview CSO-1, 2011).

The state's role in Peru becomes in this context to enable new forces and leaders into the political sphere (Chandhoke 1999 pp.46-47). One of my interviewees raised concerns that as there is a lack of formal structures, the resources that civil society puts into training new democratic leaders get lost, because there is strong tendencies for the political rules not to recognize the potential and knowledge that civil society carries (Interview CSO-7, 2011).

It is a big obstacle that we have had for a very long time, that of how to turn to the political discourse with ideas and programs, but without the parties that can channel it. It is very educational to see how much knowledge the organizations generate that ends up into nothing. [...]

One can only launch pilots, young pilots, thousands of them, but since there is no way to channel that into more consistent programs implemented by the state, all knowledge is lost (Interview CSO-9, 2011).

6 Summary and Conclusion

In this section I will summarize my analysis and answer my research question how the relationship between civil society and the state in Peru affected the progress and work of the civil society. I will also look at possible future research of interest after concluding my thesis.

6.1 Summary

In my analysis I looked at four democracy-building abilities that the Peruvian civil society can have. First, I looked at the Peruvian civil society as a counterpart and there I concluded that the Peruvian civil society believes it has had a hard time keeping the state accountable as the civil society is by different means being subject to exclusion. Instead of working with the state, holding it accountable, it is in opposition with it. Second, I looked at the Peruvian civil society as an agenda setter and there I concluded that there are strong forces within civil society that have raised attention to sensitive issues for example like human rights, despite the lack of political structures and a framework. Third, I looked at the Peruvian civil society as educator and there I concluded that the Peruvian civil society has educated the Peruvian citizens, improved citizenship and raised awareness of citizens' democratic rights, despite a lack of institutions and a framework. Last, I looked at the Peruvian civil society as a source for new political alternatives and there I concluded that the Peruvian civil society believes to have put resources and training into being a source of new political alternatives, even though the Peruvian civil society is hindered as it lacks formal structures, and thereby resources get lost as they are not implemented into the political society.

6.2 Conclusion

From my interviews with civil society in Peru, and the application of them in my theoretical framework has made me draw the conclusion that civil society is in a constant conflict with the state, and state forces are trying to hinder the work and progress of civil society by different means, direct as well as indirect. They cannot stop civil society and the democratic-building abilities that it brings, even though they "bother them and waste their time", time that could be put into doing other things. My conclusion is that this fragile relationship between state and civil

society will continue as the institutional structures in Peru are weak; there are still traces of elitist structures, which were such a big part of the Peruvian state history. Furthermore, as the Peruvian society lack an implemented, institutionalized political structure and a framework that regulates implemented policies, the deepening of the democracy in Peru in one way or another depends much on elected government at the time. As one of my interviewees pointed out, “the country reinvents itself every time there is a change of leader”.

Furthermore, I draw the conclusion that civil society has the potential to further deepen democracy in Peru, and has done so to some extent already. However, they must be given the framework or political space to do so, especially regarding human rights, gender equality, indigenous rights and environmental issues. In some areas civil society has the framework and space necessary but there is still a strong tendency to work against the civil society, and not to approve of the idea of the civil society. To answer my research question, I believe that the relationship between the state and civil society is affecting the civil society negatively and thereby in some aspects hindering its democracy-building potential to further deepen democracy.

6.3 Suggestion for Future Research

I would find it of interest to return to Peru to follow how the political climate has changed both now with the current president Ollanta Humala, and also in the more remote future to see if there are any changes in how civil society perceives its relationship with the state, and what changes civil society has potentially brought.

Finally, I believe my research of the Peruvian civil society and its perceptions of the relationship with the state can provide and contribute to the research concerning state and civil society relationships and show what consequences a fragile relationship can bring and how civil society can informally become the political opposition.

7 References

- Boussard, Caroline, 1998. "Civil samhälle och demokratisering", pp.148-169 in Hydén, Göran (ed.), *Demokratisering i tredje världen*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Boussard, Caroline, 2003. *Creating Democracy – Civil Society in Post-Transition Honduras*. Lund: Department of Political Science, Lund University.
- Brinkmann, Svend, 2008. "Interviewing", pp. 471-473 in Given, Lisa M. (ed.), *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Burt, Jo-Marie, 2007. *Political Violence and the Authoritarian State in Peru. Silencing Civil Society*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chandhoke, Neera, 1995. *State and Civil Society – Explorations in Political Theory*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Cotler, Julio, 1995. "Political Parties and the Problem of Democratic Consolidation in Peru", pp.323-353 in Mainwright, Scott – Scully, Timothy R. (ed.), *Building Democratic Institutions - Party Systems in Latin America*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Clayton, Andrew 1996. *NGOs, Civil Society, and the State: Building Democracy in Transitional Societies*. Oxford: INTRAC
- Crabtree, John, 2010. "Democracy without Parties? Some lessons from Peru", *Journal of Latin American Studies* vol. 42, n.2, pp.357-382.
- Diamond, Larry, 1999. *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidation*. Baltimore & London: John Hopkins University Press.
- Dizard, Jake, 2007. "Peru – countries at the crossroads" <http://www.freedomhouse.org/uploads/ccr/country-7252-8.pdf>. 9th of September 2011.
- Divine, Fiona, 2002. "Qualitative methods", pp.197-215 in Marsh, David – Stoker, Gerry (ed.), *Theory and method in political science 2*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Edwards, Michael, 2009. *Civil Society*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Feinberg, Richard – Waisman, Carlos H. – Zamosc, Leon, 2006. *Civil Society and Democracy in Latin America*. New York: Palgrave Macmillian.
- Fowler, Alan, 1996. "Strengthening Civil Society in Transitions Economies – from concept to strategy: Mapping an Exit in a Maze of Mirrors", pp. 12-33 in Clayton, Andrew (ed.), *NGOs, Civil Society, and the State: Building Democracy in Transitional Societies*. Oxford: INTRAC.
- Freedom House, 2010. "Country Report Peru 2010" <http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2010/peru>. 11th of November 2011.
- García Calderón, Ernesto, 2001. "Peru's Decade of Living Dangerously: High Anxiety in the Andes", *Journal of Democracy* vol.12, n.2, pp.46-58.
- Gomm, Roger, 2004. *Social Research Methodology. A Critical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Grugel, Jean, 2002. *Democratization: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillian.
- Hadenius, Axel – Uggla, Fredrik 1996. "Making Democracy Work, Promoting Democratic Development: What can States and Donors Do?", *World Development* vol.24, n.10, pp.1621-1639.
- Jörgensen, Lars 1996. "What are NGOs doing in Civil Society?", pp.36-55 in Clayton, Andrew (ed.), *NGOs, Civil Society, and the State: Building Democracy in Transitional Societies*. Oxford: INTRAC.
- Kvale, Steinar – Brinkmann, Svend, 2009. *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*, 2nd edition. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Löfving, Stefan et. al. 2008. "Swedish democracy promotion through NGOs in Bolivia, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Peru: outcome-oriented evaluation of Diakonia's Latin America Programme" Stockholm: Sida evaluation.
- Marsh, David – Furlong, David 2002. "Ontology and Epistemology in Political Science", pp.197-215 in Marsh, David – Stoker, Gerry (ed.), *Theory and method in political science*, 2nd edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- McClintock, Cyntia 2006. "An Unlikely Comeback in Peru", *Journal of Democracy* vol.17 n.4 pp.95-109.
- Mouzelis, Nicos, 1995. "Modernity, Late Development and Civil Society", pp. 224-249 in Hall, John (ed.), *Civil Society – Theory, History and Comparison*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Nyberg, Jocke et. al. 2010. *Stöd till sanning, rättvisa och gottgörelse - Röster om Sveriges utvecklingsssamarbete med Peru 1970-2009*. Stockholm: Sida.
- Parodi Luna, María Beatriz 2009. State supervision of NGOs in Peru, *International Journal for Not-for-Profit Law* vol.12, n.1, pp.55-66.
- Pearce, Jenny, 1997. "Civil society, the market and democracy in Latin America", *Democratization* vol.4, n.2, pp.57-83.
- Rosenblum, Nancy L. – Lesch, Charles H. T. 2011. "Civil Society and Government", pp.285-297 in Edwards, Michael (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Civil Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Teorell, Jan – Svensson, Torsten 2007. *Att fråga och att svara - Statsvetenskaplig metod*. Stockholm: Liber.

8 Interviews

Carlos Rivera Rua, CIED

Cecilia Blondet, Proetica

Diana Miloslavich Tupac, Flora Tristan

Edson Rosales Figuera, AIDESEP

Eduardo Toche, DESCO

Emmy Dekker, Transparencia

Ernesto de la Jara, IDL

Ester Alvarez, CENCA

Iris Castro, ANC

Julia Cuadros, CooperAcción

Luis Miguel Sirumbal, CEDAL

Magdiel Carrión, CONACAMI

Miguel Jugo, APRODEH

Ronaldo Ames Cobian - Professor at “La Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú”

Sinesio Lopez Jimenez - Professor at “La Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú”

9 Appendix

9.1 Interview Guide

9.1.1 Presentation

My name is Sofie Habram. I am 24 year old student from Sweden, studying at the university in Lund. My major is Political Science and I got a scholarship from Sida to come to Peru to conduct a field study. I will use the interviews in my Bachelor thesis.

The questions will take about 45 min and you are free to interrupt and stop at any time. I am going to ask questions about the work and progress possibilities of your organization, and the overall situation for civil society organizations in Peru. The material that I collect from the interviews will be used in my thesis, but your answers will still be strictly confidential, and if you want to be anonymous that is in order too. If you have any questions during or after the interview do not hesitate to ask. If you approve I will record the interview with a digital recorder, and the recording is strictly for personal usage.

9.1.2 Questionnaire

Name:

Organization:

Introductory Questions

- Q1. What year did you start working at ... ?
- Q2. What is your position at ...?
- Q3. Tell me shortly about your job assignments? What do they include?

The Organization

- Q4. What do you feel are the main aims of your organization?
- Q5. What do you feel are your most important achievements?
- Q6. How well do you think that your organization lives up to its main objectives?
- Q7. Do you feel there are any limitations or obstacles in your organizations possibilities to operate?

The Role of the Civil Society in Peru

- Q8. What role do you think civil society have in Peru?

Q9. Do you feel that most Peruvians would agree with you on that? Or are there any contradictions between how different Peruvians perceive the work of CSO?

Q10. Are there people that are negative towards the work of civil society in Peru?

- Why do you think that people are negative?

Civil Society Policies in Peru

Q11. How do you feel towards present laws regulating CSO work in Peru?

Q12. How do you feel that the present government's policies are affecting CSOs in general in Peru?

Q13. Do you think that the government empowers or limits CSO work in Peru in general?

Q14. Do you see any particular group being affected by the government policies?

Q15. Do you think your organization has in any way been affected by the current government's policies towards CSOs?

- In what way?

- Can you give me a concrete example in how this has affected you?

Q16. How did your organization respond to the law that was proposed in 2006 by the present government?

Q17. (If person has worked there longer than 2006): Have you noticed any changes in your organization's work in the period with the previous government?

Ending Questions

Q18. Do you feel that your organization is in the process of progress? Do you feel there is anything limiting your progress?

Q19. Is there anything else you would like to add?

This is the end of the interview and I would like to thank you for your time and help in answering me these questions.