

Construction of the discourse Local Ownership in World Development Reports between 1978 to 2011

a thesis on the relation between theory and discourse in peace
building

Abstract

In the transforming world of peace building, the framework that formulates how peace best could be achieved is shaped by various theories and discourses. During the recent years, the discourse of local ownership has gained ground and peace theories supporting increased local participation and ownership has become more widely acknowledged. The World Development Report, published annually by the World Bank, has in the past primarily been formulated in line with the liberal peace building tradition but has, over time, come to adopt a more hybrid peace building approach where local ownership has a more prominent role. However, there is still a discrepancy between major factors in the discourse of local ownership in the report and the hybrid peace theory indicating that the incorporation of local ownership discourse in the World Development Reports not is as substantial as it is portrayed. The dominance of the liberal peace building theory still very much underlie the values that is presented in the report and in order to break such discursive dominance, a clearer definition of the local ownership concept is key.

Keywords: local ownership, World Bank, discourse analysis, peace building, World Development Report, peace theory

Index

1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Aim	2
1.2 Research question	2
1.3 Limitation and selection.....	2
1.4 Disposition	3
2 The emergence of local ownership	4
2.1 What is the meaning of ownership?.....	5
2.2 Who are the locals?.....	5
3 The World Bank as an international peace- building actor.....	7
4 Method	8
4.1 Critical discourse analysis.....	8
4.2 Strengths and weaknesses in critical discourse analysis.....	10
5 Theory	11
5.1 Liberal peace theory.....	11
5.2 Hybrid peace theory	13
5.3 Peace-building from below	14
5.4 Operationalisation of the theories	15
6 Analysis	17
6.1 World Development Report 1978.....	17
6.2 World Development Report 1999-2000	19
6.3 World Development Report 2011	23
7 Conclusion	26
8 Recommendations.....	28
9 References.....	30

Lunds universitet
Statsvetenskapliga institutionen

FKV K01
Vt 2012
Handledare: Lisa Strömbom

1 Introduction

'Local ownership' is the current catch phrase of many international agencies working with peace-building and development cooperation, searching for promoting legitimacy and enhancing the sustainability in peace building (Chesterman 2007:3f). While the increased popularity of the term very well might reflect the growing consensus in research promoting a more holistic and a more locally driven approach to peace building, there is less agreement in how the term is translated into practice. There is also less consensus in how it is used as a tool in promoting the agenda in which development and peace-building actors frame their solutions and advocate for their strategies towards transforming conflicts into peace.

The framing of peace-building has unmistakably transformed during the recent decades and the reconfigurations of buzzwords, local ownership being one, has come to play an increasingly prominent role, used in the service of peace building actors to strive for consensus and carrying with them a considerable performative power (Cornwall, Brock 2005:1043f). A substantial amount of the strategies and policies that has been used in peace building processes in the past has received critique for its standardized form, labelled as the "liberal peace building consensus" (Richmond 2008:1f).

As a backdrop to such criticism, there has been a shift from promoting what sometimes has been referred to as the "McDonaldization" of peace, meaning a pre-packed, ready-to-go, one-size-fits-all model to a more culture sensitive and individualized strategy for building peace (Schmeidl 2009:69). The term 'local ownership' has very much emerged in that shift, formulating the bridge between local and international, steering away from seeing these two elements as antagonists (ibid. 2009:70). However, as initially mentioned, how local ownership has been more specifically understood and implemented varies; some stating that it is the local actors who should drive the process, others mean that the externally initiated process should be about "winning [local] acquiescence for externally generated policies" (Bendix, Stanley 2008:95).

The World Bank, a key financial institution influencing not only the international development arena but also playing an increasingly important role in peace-building, has positioned itself as a institution drawing to a large extent on liberal values. However, in the recent years the discourse conveyed by the Bank has transformed, responding perhaps to the increased criticism towards the liberal

peace-building tradition and the hardships that the operations that was implemented under the name of liberal peace-building in the early 1990s experienced (Heathershaw 2008:607). If, however, there truly is an emergent transformation in the discourse conveyed by the World Bank remains unanswered. Unpacking the World Banks local ownership discourse and how it uses the term 'local ownership' in its World Development Reports is therefore key if a clearer understanding of the underlying values that defines the Banks actions is to be made visible.

1.1 Aim

The aim of the thesis is to establish how the local ownership discourse is constructed in three World Development Reports and how the discourse has changed from the end of the 1970s until 2011 in relation to peace building theories.

1.2 Research question

How is the discourse of local ownership constructed in the World Development Reports between 1979 and 2011?

1.3 Limitation and selection

Although the thesis aims to analyse how the World Bank construct the discourse of local ownership, it does not aim to do so by including a vast amount of data but is instead aimed at looking qualitatively at the World Development Reports (henceforth referred to as WDR) published 1979, 2000 and 2011. By analysing the three reports and then comparing the discourses that emerges from each report, generalisations are made regarding potential shifts and alterations in the World Banks use of local ownership discourse. It is not the thesis aim to make a comprehensive analysis of the local ownership discourse and how it is

constructed in the WDRs. Rather, the thesis aims at answering the research question by selecting three reports in order to establish if and how the discourse has altered over time and how such alterations corresponds to the discourse in three chosen peace theories. The selection of data was made in accordance to a strategic selection that allows the researcher to choose material based on suitability for answering the research question (Teorell, Svensson 2007:84). The reports were chosen partly on the basis of the time span between them and partly because of their content. In the reports, the chapter mostly relevant to the thesis addressing local ownership was selected as the material of analysis. The three peace theories were chosen on the basis of their impact and their distinctively different perception of local ownership. This thesis will not, due to constraints in extent and time, address how the texts are consumed or further elaborate on the social practice which is something that can be done when conducting a discourse analysis but will shortly address the contextual factors that can have influenced the discourse and its content.

1.4 Disposition

The first part of the thesis addresses the emergence of the term 'local ownership'. It seems crucial to unpack the notion of 'local ownership' in order to form the basis for understanding the complex interactions in post-conflict peace building and the potential tensions between external involvement and local ownership. A short background to the World Bank as an international peace-building actor continues.

The second part of the paper focus of the methodological and theoretical approaches that will be the tools of and form the framework guiding the analysis.

The third part of the paper contains the analysis where the World Bank reports is looked upon through the lenses of liberal peace theory, hybrid peace theory and from a bottom-up peace building approach together with the tools of critical discourse analysis.

The final part of the paper contains the recommendations and suggestions building on the results of the analysis that has been presented.

2 The emergence of local ownership

The term 'local ownership' has become more prominent in policies and strategies in post-war settings during the last decades (Donais 2009:4f). Local ownership is, by some, seen as yet another buzzword which has influenced the rapidly growing multi-billion dollar aid industry and is intertwined with a notion of “moral authority that makes them almost unimpeachable” and, simultaneously, as “precise as a blunt axe” with the immense variety of connotation and meanings that is connected with the term (Ambro 2006:1f).

Liberal peace and peace building from below, which both, together with hybrid peace, will be further eluded upon in the theory part of the thesis are two pillars within the peace-building tradition which emphasise different ways of transforming war-torn areas into peaceful regions and the concept of local ownership is, within these views, differently contextualised (Donais 2009:5ff). Whereas local ownership in the liberal tradition is seen more as allowing choices from a fixed range of possibilities, the peace building from below-approach sees local ownership more as the process in which to

...nurture and create the political, economic and social space within which indigenous actors can identify, develop, and employ the resources necessary to build a peaceful, just and prosperous society (Donais 2009:6).

Timothy Donais expresses that it very well might be the case that the concept of local ownership epitomise the very core of what differ in the two peace theory perspectives; that they inevitably clash in their view of outsider and insiders struggle for authority in peace building (ibid. 2009:7).

However, by leaving the term 'local ownership' for now and instead focus on the two words; 'local' and 'ownership', my aim is to enable a more well rounded understanding about the concept and by doing so trying to entangle the essence of the concept.

2.1 What is the meaning of ownership?

In Collins dictionary, the term 'ownership' is articulated as 'the legal right of possession' while it is in Webster defined as 'lawful claim or title' and in Oxford English Dictionary as 'property, proprietorship, dominion' (Bendix, Stanley 2008:94f). In line with how the concept is discussed by Daniel Bendix and Ruth Stanley, ownership is linked with the ability to “modify, amend and withdraw specific (...) measures freely and without constraint” (ibid. 2008:95). When used in the context of peace-building in conflict-ridden states, Simon Chesterman highlights that six interpretations of the term can be distinguished; “responsiveness, consultation, participation, accountability, control and sovereignty” (2009:3). And, according to Timothy Donais, questions regarding “who decides, who controls, who implements, and who evaluates” is key (2008:3).

While being formally adopted in the rhetoric of peace-building by the OECD and the World Bank in the mid 1990s, the term had been used by various actors far earlier as for example by the Swedish International Development Agency, SIDA, who has used comparable terms since the 1980s (Chesterman 2009:3, 22).

2.2 Who are the locals?

The rural population, the upper class urban population, the lower class urban population, representatives of civil society. When referring to the locals, any one of these groups (or all four, or yet another one) can be the definition of the locals.

One specific distinction often being made however is between “internationals” and “locals”, meaning that within what is perceived in the group of local actors both government representatives, civil society activists and a local rural individual can be included, lumping together diverse groups into a quite uniform group (Wilén, Chapaux 2011:535). In a peace-building context, it is often the local elites that is favoured when it comes to referring to the locals as a group to be included and participate, having a “specific set of Western credentials, such as education and English language proficiency” (ibid. 2011:535).

Another distinction that can be made is between “insiders” and “outsiders”, referring to insiders as the ones who has access to political and economic power and the ones who do not (Mobekk 2010:233). When constructing the “locals” in this way, the divide between a local and a non-local is not based on 'us and them'

Lunds universitet
Statsvetenskapliga institutionen

FKV K01
VT 2012

Handledare: Lisa Strömbom

or 'internal and external' but more on the 'haves and the have nots' (ibid.
2010:234).

3 The World Bank as an international peace- building actor

The World Bank's role in peace-building and working in a post-conflict setting has primarily been that of a facilitator for state-building in which other national actors can regain their function of delivering core services to the population. Through the World Bank's Post-Conflict Unit and Fragile States Group the Bank seeks to take on a more comprehensive approach than that of a "mere post-conflict reconstruction" (Call, Cousens 2008:9, 11, Sande Lie 2008:10). This is expressed to be done by rebuilding "social capital, empower and provide voice to communities, and generally rebuild the social fabric torn apart by violent conflicts" (World Bank 2003:iv).

The alterations that has transformed the operational policies guiding the work of the Bank in emergencies and conflicts has been a part of the changed approach in which the Bank to a greater extent work with issues relevant to the security-development nexus (Sande Lie 2008:4). The Bank never acts as an implementing agency itself, thereby always partnering up with other institutions and agencies in its operations. Worth noting is that the reputation of the Bank is weak in regards to how such collaboration has been managed with criticism raised expressing the Bank's tendency to view itself as a the "international community's supreme development agency" (ibid. 2008:20). However, despite the criticism raised the World Bank's position in the international development arena is powerful and expressed to be "nearly hegemonic" (ibid. 2008:6).

4 Method

The methodological framework that is used to analyse the World Development reports in this paper adheres to the analytical model of Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth, CDA). The discourse analysis can serve as both a theoretical approach but also a methodological tool with no clear division between theory and method (Jorgensen Winther, Philips 2000:10).

Emanating from thinkers such as Karl Marx and his idea of social theory, the roots of CDA lies within critical linguistics and emphasises both the socially constituted and socially constitutive structures that affirms, reproduces and consolidates the way the world is understood (Talbot, Atkinson & Atkinson 2003:36).

4.1 Critical discourse analysis

Discourse is defined by Stuart Hall as the production of knowledge through language (Hall 1997). A discourse can also be expressed as “a flow of ideas that are connected to each other” (Riggins 1997:2). Hence, a discourse is a patterned way of talking about and understanding the world and it is those patterns that are the focus in discourse analysis (Jorgensen, Winther Philips 2000:7,28).

Quentin Skinner (1989) express that “it is true that our social practices help us to bestow meaning on our social vocabulary. But it is equally true that our social vocabulary helps to constitute the character of those practices” (1989:22). Words is understood as constructed carriers of meanings. It is therefore not only the textual content that will be included in the analysis but also extra linguistic social variables that took part in shaping the discourse as well as the institutional frame of specific contexts of situations (Wodak, Krzyzanowski 2008:2ff).

The ontology of discourse analysis is constructionist, it is inductive rather than deductive and subjective with a high degree of reflexivity where the author is seen as part of the process when analysing the material (Hardy, Harley & Phillips 2004).

4.1.1 Analysis of text

In accordance with Norman Faircloughs description of how to conduct a discourse analysis of text the linguistic aspects of the texts, such as choice of words, grammar and metaphors being used, is to be included (Bergström, Boréus 2005:87).

Choice of words can refer to how certain words create meaning in a text and how the understanding of certain words might differ depending on who is reading or writing the text. Analysing the usage of metaphors is linked to what kind of association the actor wishes to create in relation to such metaphors. Also the modality, meaning if what is being presented is expressed as an established fact, an opinion or a question, is taken into account in the analysis (ibid. 2005:87f).

4.1.2 Discursive practice

The dimension of the analysis of discursive practice involves the processes regarding production, consumption and distribution of text. This can be done through looking into who is the author of the text, who has chosen the wording, who's point of view is being presented and how the process in which the reader understands the text functions (Fairclough 1992). I will not elaborate on these parts of the CDA but will include intertextuality and inter-discursive features in the analysis, meaning analysing what can be found in the report that links it to other texts and discourses (Jorgensen, Philips 2000).

4.1.3 Social practice

Fairclough emphasise the importance of putting the texts into a larger context and thereby looking at the conditions in which the discourse that is being analysed finds itself in. The third dimension of Faircloughs three-dimensional model therefore focuses on the social practice, meaning the structures that influences a text and it is on this stage a contextualization of the discourses are made and the discourse is seen in relation to the structures in which they exists (Fairclough 1992, 2003; Bergström, Boréus 2005:90f).

4.1.4 Tools for analysis

The methodological tools that has been used in the analysis are

1. **nodes**, referring to the word that other words are arranged around, thereby giving the surrounding words their meaning.
2. **chains of equivalence** which is strings of words which put together raise a certain meaning
3. **intertextuality**, which is the link that one text and discourse relates to other texts and discourses.
4. **modality**, meaning the evaluation of the truth or certainty of an utterance.

4.2 Strengths and weaknesses in critical discourse analysis

One articulated aim with discourse analysis is to take explicit position in order to “understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality” (van Dijk 1996:352). As such, it does not aim to be a neutral method of analysis but rather embraces the subjectivity that the constructed reality is perceived as and allows the researcher to conduct the analysis in line with his subjectivity as long as there is clarity in the choices being done and thoroughness in the selection, reading and categorization in all level of analysis (Winther Jorgensen, Phillips 2000:70). Awareness regarding the own pre-conceptions and expectations in the research that is conducted is key, as well as taking into account the own ideological standpoint and opinions. Intersubjectivity and the importance of working towards establishing a distance between the material that you are to analyse and not letting the personal opinions cloud the analysis is vital. By including quotes, being strict in referring and keeping oneself to the chosen theoretical framework helps increasing the validity in the analysis (Bergström, Boréus 2005:353).

And, if unattainable to eradicate own biases in this paper, my aim is to make mine as clear and visible as possible.

5 Theory

To write about peace thinking is to write about everything and nothing; (...) the closer one approaches it the more does it recede – and it is frighteningly important (Galtung 1967:6).

Peace theories make it possible to better understand and analyse conflicts and ways of reaching peace.

Different angles, ideological preconceptions and normative agendas shape and re-shape the theories and rhetoric and buzzwords can be used in peace-building strategies to enhance the popularity of a certain approach. Depending on current trends, different theories are, continuously, gaining and losing ground amongst scholars. Currently the liberal peace theory has lost ground while the concept of hybrid-peace has gained momentum in the international community (Richmond 2011:8ff).

The question is if such a shift of popularity in peace-building theory also can be seen in the discourse and rhetoric surrounding 'local ownership'. Has the 'local ownership' discourse changed in line with such a popularity-shift and has the understanding and meaning of 'local ownership' as the World Bank uses it changed?

In order to analyse if the discourse has changed three theoretical peace theory approaches is presented and a CDA is then conducted within the theoretical framework of the liberal peace theory, the hybrid peace theory and the peace-building from below-approach when analysing the material.

5.1 Liberal peace theory

Liberal peace theory is based on the conception that strong states with strong institutions, backed up by democracy and a free market is more peaceful than

other, non-liberal states. Key features and values emphasised in the theory is a strong judicial system and a centralised state-governance.

Such factors are, amongst researchers within the liberal peace theory tradition, seen as vital aspects for establishing peacefulness in interstate relations as well as contributing to a state of peacefulness also within nation-states (Newman, Paris, Richmond 2009:11f; Doyle 1986:1151ff).

Liberal peace theory has very much dominated the peace building tradition and guided the work that has been conducted in the international community when it comes to peace building operations and peace interventions (ibid. 2010:391). However, during the recent years critique against the liberal peace theory has emerged bringing about a change in the previous consensus surrounding the benefits of liberal peace building.

The critique that has been raised against the liberal peace theory is the lack of adaptation to local contexts where the implementation of liberal and equal rights, market economy and centralisation of states can be troublesome to implement in societies that already is divided by ethnic, economic and political fractions (Richmond 2011:118ff). Also, the definition of peace and freedom is brought fourth as contested subjects by those opposing liberal peace theory (Spiro 1994:76).

The allocation of power and resources and who becomes the recipient and in control of such powers is important variables in the liberal peace theory (Richmond 2006:300).

Peace building in Bosnia and Kosovo are two examples of a liberal peace building approach where a conservative, unilateral, state-led peace guided the work where the work was levelled more at a higher level rather than at national or local level, something that afterwards has received a substantial amount of critique (ibid. 2006:300).

In Kosovo, external actors decided upon Kosovo's constitution, its economic vision and its international status. Internal actors did not decide upon the reallocation of ownership over resources freely but the decisions was taken at a higher level and enforced militarily. And, despite of international declarations stating that the governance of Kosovo should be conducted with respect to ethnic, cultural, religious and linguistic identities, international institutions and national agencies determined the development and decided the agenda (Pugh 2005:25). The peace building process became characterised by resistance rather than collaboration between international and domestic parties (Pugh 2002:473f).

Despite the current downfall in popularity for the liberal peace, the theory is still highly influential in the international community and amongst scholars

highlighting the causal relation between democracy, alliances, international organizations and peaceful interstate relations (Oneal, Russett, Oneal 2001:439f).

5.2 Hybrid peace theory

Hybrid theory sees peace building as development processes in which both exogenous and indigenous forces are to be included and taken into account.

The notion of hybridity can be hard to capture since it stems from a relativity from which clear definitions is hard to make and are in a constant process of fluidity. Hybridity does not favour neatly packaged narratives in which binary combinations such as western versus non-western or modern versus traditional is used but is rather to be defined and understood “as the ongoing condition of all human cultures, which contain no zones of purity” (Mac Ginty 2010:397f). The actors and structures is within the hybrid peace theory, regardless if it is the 'locals', the 'international', grass root movements or international corporations, to be seen as composites stemming from adaptation and social negotiation processes. Four key elements is expressed to have great importance in hybrid peace;

the compliance powers of the liberal peace, the incentive powers of the liberal peace; the ability of local actors to resist, ignore or subvert the liberal peace; and the ability of local actors to formulate and maintain alternatives to the liberal peace(ibid 2010:298).

Whereas the liberal peace theorists includes rhetoric concerning 'partnership' and 'local ownership' in their peace building strategy the hybrid peace supporters sees this as merely a mask of power-relations in which the design, funding, execution etc. still is conducted according to Western norms. Hybrid peace theory works in the interface between the most effective elements of local and external actors, steering away from the classical Western “peace idiom” and instead focuses on the interplay between multiple actors, actions and reactions that together creates peace (ibid 2010:404ff). When pointing out successful peace-building processes within the hybrid peace genre Somaliland can be used as an example. Involving clan-leaders, building on customary institutions and entrusting councils with important roles in building a new political order while, at the same time,

embedding such process within a western type of statehood proved to be a recipe for success (Boege, Brown, Clements, Nolan 2008:11).

On the other side of the hybrid-peace coin, looking at the approach when it has been less successful, East Timor stands out as a not so prosperous example. By not sufficiently enough addressing all levels and groups of its population, some groups became marginalised in the peace building process and the rebuilding of the institutions were not enough sensitive towards already existing customary values (ibid. 2008:11f).

5.3 Peace-building from below

The emergence of steering away from viewing outsiders as experts and importing ideas from external actors started growing in the 1990s, making way for local capacities and knowledge (Miall Ramsbotham, Woodhouse 2005:74).

One of the key figures within the peace building from below-approach is John Paul Lederach who, although recognising the importance of an integrated approach towards building peace, emphasises the importance of 'bottom-up' processes (Lederach 1997). Peace-building should, in this approach, seek to address underlying cultural relational and structural conflict roots and the emphasis should be placed upon strengthen indigenous practices (Miall, Ramsbotham, Woodhouse 2011:249; 267f).

Recognising the highly varying contextual factors and huge range of spectrum of violent conflicts and regions, peace-building from below emphasises the need for building knowledge within specific contexts steering away from viewing peace building as a set of abstract principles (Pearce 1997:440). A key feature within the peace-building from below-approach is that peace usually is regarded as more than absence of violence and that the approach therefore includes strategies such as promotion of sustainable development, awareness-raising, humans rights education and support for post-conflict communities within their toolkit of strategies (ibid. 2011:14ff).

Critique that is raised against the theory states that peace-building from below is a slow process, taking long time to implement. This critique is responded to by the supporters of the approach emphasising that, whilst the process might be slower, the foundation for peace that is being laid is more stable and sustainable (Pearce 1997:453).

El Salvador can stand as an example where the peasant and workers were mobilised to play important roles during the war but the very same strengths not became mobilised in the peace-building process, thereby not managing to transform the “from below”-approach that existed during the war into the peace building process.

However, worth mentioning is also the success stories in which peace-building from below has emerged as a prosperous way of building peace, as in the case of Popular Feminine Organisation, OFP, also in Colombia. The OFP worked taking on the perspective of the women who had been affected by violence and the programs were tailored according to their experiences. Managing to target groups and individuals that elite-led, macro-level organisations often failed to reach but which are groups that is seen as key in peace building, the OFPs work helped channel local struggles, building capacities and contribute to increased stability (ibid 2011:19f).

Lastly, it is key to note that although the theory states that peace-building should be determined from below, the need for a supportive, higher level, infrastructure is still regarded as vital. The role for international agencies is viewed as important and could mean, for example, them conducting lobbying at a higher level and thereby working to provide space in which the local initiatives can grow (ibid. 2011:28).

5.4 Operationalisation of the theories

Within the three above-mentioned theories, key words is identified that characterises each peace-building approach.

5.4.1 Indicators of a liberal peace discourse

Democracy, human rights, liberalisation of economy, enforcement of rule of law, ideology, reconstruction, systematic approach, institutional reform, global, outsiders, normative.

This is translated into action as promoting an agenda of intervention, national-building and economic growth. Elimination of crime and violence and the stability of the state is also key factors within the liberal peace theory and searching for patterns promoting such peace building elements is included when doing the

overall analysis of the local ownership discourse (Souva, Prins 2007:185ff; Richmond 2006:293ff).

5.4.2 Indicators of a hybrid peace discourse

Cosmopolitanism, dialogue, dialectical relationship, cooperation, flexibility, multileveled, partnership.

This is translated into action as promoting an agenda influenced by trade-offs, finding alternative sources of “coercion, incentives and tutelage”, fluidity, compliance and incentives, negotiations, cooperation and contestation, multileveled, multi-issued with a constant dynamism resulting in a “whirr of hybridity” (Mac Ginty 2010:398ff; Pugh 2011:314f).

5.4.3 Indicators of a peace-building from below discourse

Strengthening local capacities, community-based, sustainability, contextual, diverse methods, sensibility, local, insiders, traditionalism, non-state actors.

The dominating agenda within the peace-building from below-approach emphasises non-state actors, a holistic view of peace with a relationship-building focus. The notion of positive peace rather than viewing peace as the absence of conflict is key in which the state is a “secondary constructed institution and an appendage to the primary world of people” (Oda 2007:6; Svensson, Jama 2004:58, 78f).

6 Analysis

The WDRs have been divided under three separate headings. The empirical material will be analysed using a CDA together with the key words that has been identified under operationalisation of the theories.

Attached in an appendix, the results when using the methodological tools; identification of the nodes, chain of equivalence and how the locals are represented in the reports, is presented. In the text the key words identified from each peace theory is highlighted when it corresponds with features found in the reports.

6.1 World Development Report 1978

The fourth chapter and the conclusion in the WDR 1978 is the text used as the material for the analysis.

6.1.1 Framework for social practice in the end of the 1970s

The international community was influenced by the context of the Cold War and the politics during the 1970s was influenced by recession and oil embargo. Between 1975 and 1984, there were renewed tensions between east and west although steps were taken to achieve alleviations of the tensions between the US and Soviet, such as signing of the SALT agreement in 1969 and 1979.

The discursive practice during this period emphasised the importance of 'peace as order', meaning that social justice and local participation and ownership over the processes in peace-building were of secondary importance to pact-based and institutionalist democratisation processes (Heathershaw 2008:610). The main structural position regarding peace-building in the end of the 1970s favoured peace-building via state-building. Hence, the social practice for peace building actors was formed in this context.

6.1.2 Discursive practice

The report draws upon a widened definition of development first expressed by a World Bank representative in a speech held in 1972, namely by the former World Bank director, Robert McNamara. This could be said to be the intertextual roots that the report is stemming from. The inter-discursive feature in the text builds primarily on modernization theory which opens up for a broadening of the definition of 'development' (Gilman 2009:3). Although the perception that development and building stable societies includes not only economic aspects but also social issues is expressed in the 1978 WDR, local ownership is excluded and if any discursive shift can be traced in the report it is more between modernization theory and liberal theory and not towards a hybrid-peace or bottom-up peace-building approach.

6.1.3 Analysis of text

In the report, focusing on the economic growth which is seen as the cure for poverty and insecure, unstable patterns in society, is key and it is “the poor” that is expressed as the ones which will be benefiting from the economic growth as well as the ones that needs to modify their actions to attack poverty in an effective way (World Bank 1978:26). “Modification in the pattern of growth to increase the productivity of the poor must thus be central to an effective attack of poverty” (ibid. 1978:26). This is expressed using a high level of modality, indicating that the Bank expresses this as an established truth (Sulkunen, Törrönen 1997:49).

Economic growth is presented partly as a tool to achieve poverty reduction and increased living conditions for the locals but also as an end in itself and is expressed to be best achieved through “raising productivity”, “accelerating employment” and “increasing investment”. Economic growth, being one of the cornerstones in the liberal peace-building theory, constitutes a clear link between liberal peace and the discourse in the 1978 report.

Expressing the need for achieving the “projected aggregate growth” and the percentage in which the annual growth must be developing with is one example of the information which is given and the focus is on the nation-state level rather than on the local level and the same goes with the rhetoric over ownership which implicitly states that it is the leaders and the ones on top that should set the agenda (World Bank 1978:28). The level of modality and certainty is high in such statements.

Mobilising local participation is desirable because of its potential money saving opportunities. This, however, is a process that is said to be difficult since it is expressed that this “require effective local leadership and adequate central

support, which often has been lacking” (ibid. 1978:36). This leads to the next link between the liberal peace discourse and the discourse of local ownership in the report. **Stability** is a key word as well as one of the indicators of a liberal peace discourse; “it is vital to preserve a stable climate.” (ibid. 1978:27).

And, for achieving such stability “restriction” and controlling the implementation is key, implying that it is the role of the outsiders and not the locals to provide for such a process and to decide upon the actions being taken, constructing the locals as receivers rather than partners or owners (ibid. 1978:28). There is no ambiguity in the message being raised whether external interventions should be implemented or not. This is rather presented as an unquestioned truth, with a high level of modality, in the framework of top lead structural change in the report continuously expressed in which poverty reduction for the poor will be most efficiently led and implemented (ibid. 1978:34). When referring to some sort of partnership with the locals, the locals are expressed to be “officials”, “community groups” and “local elites”, whose primary role it is to provide for the “minorities”, the “poor” and the “truly needy” which are portrayed as passive agents to change and as a group which is in need to “be provided” for rather than being included as agents who themselves are taking part in controlling and affecting the agenda (ibid. 1978:108ff).

And, in order to maintain stability, bringing about economic growth while advocating for a institutional reform, a **systematic approach** is highlighted as crucial. This can be done by contextualising the interventions and implementing the agenda in a way that is suitable “in the context of specific economic settings” (ibid. 1978:26).

By approaching the reforms in a systematic and structured way the power of deciding over the process is maintained at the top and measures to control the development from the outside can be implemented, thereby keeping the power-relation-balance and maintaining stability in the system.

If not **liberalizing the economy** and making improvements in the “patterns of growth”, poverty will continue to “plague” the the low income countries. In order to start mobilising thereby decreasing the risk of such plague, the “productivity and incomes of the poor” is key (34). However, the liberalisation of the economy is expressed to might increase “the inequality of incomes” for it “then to decrease in the later stages of development” (ibid. 1978:33). Using the word “might” indicate a lower level of modality, meaning a medium degree of certainty.

6.2 World Development Report 1999-2000

The fifth chapter in the WDR 1999-2000, named “Decentralization: Rethinking Government” is the text used as the material for the analysis.

6.2.1 Framework for the social practice in the end of the 1990s and beginning of the 21st century

In 1999, there had been a solidification of the perception that there was a link between peace-building, democratisation and development. The language of security was incorporated into humanitarian discourse and the language of developmentalists was used by militaries and defence ministries creating a merge of security and development as a powerful and influential discourse.

As expressed by Boutros Boutros-Ghali in a speech held 1993; “Without peace there can be no development and there can be no democracy” (Heathershaw 2008:600; 615f).

Post-conflict peace-building was discursively connected with liberal democracy and the defining force of such connection was the growing optimism of the post-Cold War period emerging in the beginning of the 1990s (ibid 2008:600f). Civil society, local ownership and the understanding of peace as more than lack of violence but rather as a positive peace that started growing after the Cold War had during this period become hugely influential (ibid. 2008:607). The critique that was raised towards the state-centric, interventionist peace-building that was implemented and in many ways regarded as failures in the early 1990s in Africa and the Balkans led to, in the mid-1990s, the forming of a increased interest in promoting local ownership and civil society involvement in peace-building. A multilateral approach dominated.

6.2.2 Discursive practice

There is a intertextual connection evident between the Comprehensive Development Framework (CDF) that was adopted by the World Bank just prior to the publishing of the report. This comes through in how the more holistic approach in which both the CDF and the 1999-2000 WDR is constructed.

There is a medium high level of interdiscursivity in the text; one discourse emphasising increased local ownership and drawing more on a hybrid peace-building theory and another with an emphasise on central ownership with its root in a liberal peace theory. Also, when analysing the background papers to the

report the connection to both liberal values as well as a hybridity between the local and centralisation with papers such as “The Future Course of Trade Liberalization” and “Urban Governance and Politics in a Global Context: The Growing Importance of the Local” is evident.

The a degree of interdiscursivity in the discourse can imply that there is an emergent shift in the discourse taking place during this period.

6.2.3 Analysis of text

In the report, the phrase 'local ownership' is not mentioned but it is “self-determination and influence in the decisions of their governments” which is labelled as “localization” which the report refers to when addressing local ownership and partnership.

Localisation is not expressed in terms of local ownership but instead verbalized as “the push to increase local autonomy in decision-making” (ibid. 2000:43). “**Partnership**” is emphasised, although when expressed it is done so with the understanding that the partnership between global and local actors will be characterised by close monitoring of the locals during the partnership, thereby implying that there is a power-relation in the partnership benefiting the global rather than the local (ibid. 2000:50;III).

“The degree to which local officials are accountable to their constituents determines whether decentralization produces the intended benefits – that is, more efficient and responsive services, and greater local self-determination” (ibid. 2000:121). Here the phrase; *accountable to their constituents* implies that, not only, is there someone on top making sure that the locals are held accountable, but the phrase also invokes the underlying meaning that there is a inevitable *need* for the locals to be controlled and, not least, when expressed as 'constituents', also establish that the 'local self-determination' which is expressed in the final part of the sentence is a determination that is conditional (ibid. 2000:121).

Stability is a key word permeating the report and decentralization and localisation is portrayed as destabilizing thereby inexplicitly linking the process of increased local ownership together with something that is in the need to be contained, managed and carefully controlled (ibid. 2000:122).

Strategies to “stop decentralization are unlikely to succeed”, referring to the “insurmountable pressure” for increased localisation and power. Attempts to “resist” the development is said to be pointless and the final advice that is given in the report is that countries should arm themselves “with lessons from the countries that have gone before them”(ibid. 2000:124). Such formulation not only advocates

for a systematic approach, but it also builds on the **normative** assumption regarding what is desirable and how to **systematise** the way of achieving the desired goal.

“Decentralization programs”, “set of rules” and “institutionalisation” is expressed as positive factors while “informal” and “negotiation-based decentralization” is said to be more hard to manage, implying again that the process needs to be managed systemically and structured (ibid. 2000:111f).

Whilst bringing forward a number of examples and expressing the variability of successes and hurdles that countries has faced in the process of increased localisation, a generalisation of how to best handle the numerous obstacles is expressed; “explicit rules” is the reoccurring answer, again emphasising the importance of taking on a systematic approach as well as **enforcing rule of law** (ibid. 2000:124).

Keeping the localisation, and the *locals*, in check is insinuated as vital, not least by expressing that classical arguments promoting localization is “scanty”, implying that there is a hidden agenda in the localisation process (ibid. 2000:109).

That the ownership is conditionality given and comes with constraints is made clear with phrases such as “greater responsibilities and control over resources”, implying that it is not full control that should be held at the local level, but rather a limited ownership and responsibilities that is given and then monitored from the top. With “rules”, creating “systems”, “sequencing” the process” a strategic, systematic and top-down approach is emphasised (ibid. 2000:122f).

It is the building and **strengthening of the nation-state that** is presented as the main objective and the prerequisite for other development. In order for the localization process to be “successful”, meaning leading to economic growth and stable states, there must be a well-functioning national or international government providing the space, resources and allocate responsibilities in which the locals are allocated to work within. The locals role is to be used in “delivery and management” but always under the monitoring eyes of the central government (ibid. 2000:109,111).

(...) while the central government should continue funding and designing redistribution efforts, local governments are often in a good position to implement and administer standardized national policies (ibid. 2000:115).

What is expressed to be the most pressing risk linked with the localisation process is lack of effectiveness, capacity and an overall incompetence at the local level. Such risks are to be met with appropriate measures taken from the top. If the shift towards increased local ownership should be successful or not is,

according to the report, fundamentally dependent on the “design” of the reform, implying that the localisation process is a process of **institutional reform** (ibid. 2000:107,122).

In the report, some examples of decentralization processes is being told, one of which is the emergence of a more localised government in Russia. The heading given to this story is “The cart before the horse: decentralization in Russia”. The localisation process is thereby referred to as the cart and the central government as the horse, implying not only that it is fundamentally wrong for the cart to be in front, leading the horse, meaning the central government, but also that the cart is something which is objectified, passive and in need of the horse to move forward and be controlled (ibid. 2000:123). The **normative** assumption that the power-relation between local and central always should favour the central when it comes to ownership over power is, in this example, made clear.

6.3 World Development Report 2011

The fourth chapter in the WDR 2011, named “Conflict, Security and Development” is the text used as the material for the analysis.

6.3.1 Framework for the social practice year 2011

In 2011 the discourse surrounding post-conflict peace-building had shifted and critique was raised expressing that the universalist ethos of peace can, and in fact *had*, been used as a mean of supporting the existing power structures. While some shifting towards advocating for a more bottom-up approach, in light of the 9/11-attacks and the “war on terror”, state-building and top-down peace-building approach has, with the US as one of its main advocates, re-gained ground (Heathershaw 2008:607).

The discourse favoured a 'justice-based'-approach emphasising poverty-alleviation and self-determination. In the current debate the hybrid peace-building theory is gaining ground with reports such as *The Responsibility to Protect* (R2P) which blends a civil society perspective with that of state-building (ibid. 2008:613).

6.3.2 Discursive practice

How such a strive to incorporate both top-down as well as bottom-up approaches within the same framework is done is exemplified in the report of the UN High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change; *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility* which “seeks to please everyone – both humanitarians who demand that the rights of the individuals must be placed above the sovereignty of the state, and state-builders who believe that juridical sovereignty should be built from without in the base of ‘failed states’” (ibid. 2008:614).

Intertextual features can be shown between a report published by the UN in 2004 where the importance of state-building is emphasised. However, discursive features can be traced back to the 1960s and the paradigm of economic development that emerged during that period and can be traced in a statement from the first head of the World Bank, Eugene Meyer, as early as 1946 (Desai, Isser, Woolcock 2012:245f). This discursive feature is evident in all three reports being analysed.

6.3.3 Analysis of text

A reoccurring theme in the text is the emphasis that is laid on incorporating local communities in order to bring about national progress and stability. Expressed as “involving with” and “delivering to” local community and not as the locals determining the agenda or owning the process, the discourse emphasise local **partnership** rather than local ownership (ibid. 2011:122). A reoccurring advice is

building inclusive-enough coalitions and identifying the signals and commitment mechanism that can galvanize support for change (ibid. 2011:119).

By expressing that pacts to end violence not need to be “all inclusive”, but, on the contrary, “minimally inclusive at the beginning” the **flexibility** in the peace-building process is brought forward. Adaptability to changing conditions when implementing commitment mechanism such as power-sharing arrangements expresses the need for contextualising the peace-building response to the local community. Promoting power-sharing can be seen as a step towards increased local ownership, however not implying that the process is owned by the locals but rather that they can receive a more powerful role in the process.

The power-sharing can be formally established but is expressed to more often consist of informal coalitions which is, by exemplifying with successes in

Sudan, Sierra Leone and Indonesia, expressed as key to build support and instil confidence and peaceful relations in a local context (ibid. 2011:119f)

The answer to when inclusive is inclusive enough is formulated within four key lessons which is potentially arbitrary in its advices, stating that groups *may* be legitimately excluded where there is an evolving belief” for their lost right to participate. It is legitimated to include groups in the process as a smokescreen, bringing forward the notion that it is the perceived participation that is seen as vital rather than the actual partnership (ibid. 2011:124).

Trade-offs between inclusiveness and efficiency is advice given as well as taking on a flexible and adaptive approach in which the leaders are better to respond with taking away power and ownership from certain groups if they show abusive and destabilizing tendencies (ibid. 2011:124).

Underlying is the notion that it is primarily the stability, growth and development of the state that is the main objective, establishing the view of the nation-state as the unquestioned frame in which peace-building should occur within. “Signals on political reform are crucial” and election is seen as a key part in restoring faith in the **institutional transformation**. Restoring confidence in national institutions is vital and this means identifying what the locals and the key stakeholders prioritize (ibid. 2011:122,124,128).

Throughout the text, examples is used to highlight how local communities has been used to increase legitimacy for the state leaders and how the local capacities can be utilized to “signal an inclusive partnership”. The use of the word *signal* implies that it is the *image* of the local partnership that is important, rather than the establishment of joint power-sharing. “Capturing the narrative”, and mobilising support for the leaders agenda is said to be key in successful transitions from violence; “signalling early intent” (ibid. 2011:123ff).

Violence is expressed to be bad for business and business is said to be good for stability and bringing about a sustainable growth, thereby implying that it is a **liberal economic order** which is advocated for (ibid. 2011:122).

It is a **multilevelled** and dualistic discourse which is presented with phrases such as “All politics is local” (ibid. 2011:122) and “(...) there is a need for building coalitions for delivery that include a mixture of state and non-state, bottom-up and top-down approaches” (ibid. 2011:136) while in another segment of the text expressing that local actors can be excluded and that local ownership-program are to be implemented in order to “extend the state's reach” (ibid. 2011:131).

7 Conclusion

As the analysis shows, the local ownership-discourse has transformed in how it is presented in the three reports and the reports have also undergone changes in regards to which peace-building theory it is primarily influenced by. However, with that being said: the transformation of how the local ownership discourse has been constructed has not been consistent with how the discourse of local ownership in peace building theories has developed during the same period.

The WDR published in 1978 did not use the local ownership-discourse, nor was it very ambiguous in its adherence to the liberal peace-building theory with its strong emphasis on liberalisation of the market and poverty reduction through economic and structural programs implemented from the top. Development and peace was intrinsically portrayed as linked with economic growth and reduction of poverty and the locals was presented as poor people in need for assistance from outside and not able to manage or control the development without being meticulously managed and supervised.

The 1999-2000 WDR report with its emphasis on decentralization can at first glance be perceived to be developed in coherence with hybrid-peace or bottom-up peace theory. However, when critically analysing the discourse it becomes clear that the node of decentralization is paired with words such as rules, supervision, democracy, stability and accountability; all being words that are indicators of a liberal peace discourse. The locals are divided into two discursive groups, one group as passive and needy poor, the other as local elites that can be used strategically to provide for the other locals. None of the groups of locals are portrayed in such a way that they have ownership over the process but, if anything, as partners or mere recipients of peace-building programs.

The latest analysed WDR from 2011, focusing on restoration, expressing a link between conflict, security and development and highlighting the need for trade-offs and intersectionality stands out as the report most in line with a hybrid peace-building theory. It is also the one report where local ownership is perceived as vital and as a *necessity*, embedding the discourse of local ownership throughout the text and promoting increased flexibility and multileveled approaches towards peace-building. However, while the 2011 report displays a shift in the discourse of local ownership in line with the hybrid-peace theory, there is still a discrepancy between major factors in the discourse of local ownership in the report and the hybrid peace theory. One is how the 2011 WDR builds on the classical Western “peace idiom”, something that the hybrid peace theorists are steering away from. Another is lack of expressed potential for the locals to resist, ignore, subvert and

maintain and formulate alternatives to the liberal peace. It goes without questioning that the main ownership of the process not should lie with the locals although they are to be *conditionally* given a more powerful role. Also, the notion that a liberal democracy is to be advocated for since it is expressed as a joining and stabilising factor is something which is more linked with a liberal peace-building discourse rather than a hybrid peace or a peace-building from below discourse.

8 Recommendations

So, what is the meaning with seeking to entangle how the World Bank in the World Development Reports constructs the local ownership-discourse and looking into how such discourses relates to peace-building theories? What has the choice of words got to do with peace building?

By incorporating a local ownership-discourse in the rhetoric of peace-building an image is conveyed that adaptability, flexibility and a grassroots-oriented approach is prioritized. And, with liberal peace-building theory loosing ground during the recent years, receiving criticism and being questioned for its adaptability to different contextual settings, conveying such an image can potentially be key in order to gain legitimacy for the ideas that is presented in the reports.

One feature within the discourse analysis framework is that it allows the researcher to express opinions and formulate recommendations to break a hegemonic dominance and reveal power structures. As presented in the analysis and conclusion, the local ownership discourse has since the end of the 70s become more prominent in both peace building theories as well as in the analysed WDRs. There is a level of inter-discursiveness between primarily a liberal peace building tradition and hybrid peace building, however the emphasis in the WDR is still very much centred around the liberal peace building tradition. The dominance of the liberal peace building ideas still very much exists.

If the term local ownership are to be used in a way truly promoting local ownership, consistency and substance of the meaning is key, something which a reckless use of the concept might hinder. If the discourse of local ownership is used to promote a liberal peace building tradition that does not truly believe in and promote for such ownership, not only is there a potential for the term to lose its power but it might also lead to the actual loss of power for the locals when programs and agendas is being implemented not supporting increased local ownership.

If the World Bank wishes to keep its position as a key player in peace building while maintaining legitimacy for its work, it should do so by being clear on the values they formulate their opinions on and not try to, as this thesis has indicated, hiding it under the veil of bottom up peace building or a hybrid peace theory when its, in actual fact, core message still is more in the line with the

liberal peace building theory than on peace building approaches which emphasises increased local ownership.

If the local ownership discourse will translate into increased ownership in peace building for local actors recognising the embedded discourses is crucial. Without favour language over action, the discursive framings of the local ownership are indeed crucial in shaping the peace building practice.

9 References

- Ambro, G., 2006, *Defining Local Ownership: A grounded theory approach From Aga Khan Rural Support Programme's Projects in Baltistan*, access through: [//www.umb.no/statisk/akrsp/06_publications_and_presentations/03_phd_and_masters_theses/geir_fulltext.pdf](http://www.umb.no/statisk/akrsp/06_publications_and_presentations/03_phd_and_masters_theses/geir_fulltext.pdf), available: 16-04-2012
- Bendix, D. & Stanley, R., 2008, "Deconstructing local ownership of security sector reform: A review of the literature", access through: <http://www.iss.co.za/uploads/17NO2BENDIX.PDF>, available: 02-05-2012
- Bergström, G. & Boréus, K., 2005, *Textens mening och makt*, Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Boege, V., Brown, A., Clements, K. & Nolan, A., 2008, *On Hybrid Political Order and Emerging States: State Formation in the Context of 'Fragility'*, Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, Berghof Handbook Dialouge, no 8
- Börjesson, M. 2003, *Diskurser och konstruktioner*, Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Call, C. & Cousens, E., 2008, "Ending Wars and Building Peace: International Responses to War-Torn Societies", *International Studies Perspectives*, vol. 9, pp. 1-21
- Chesterman, S. 2007, "Ownership in Theory and in Practice: Transfer or Authority in UN State-Building Operations", *Journal of Intervention and State-Building*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3-26
- Chesterman, S. 2009, "The Fall and Rise of the Rule of Law and the Trope of Ownership", *Rule of Law in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations*, World Bank Headquarters, Washington DC
- Cornwall, A. & Brock, K. 2005, *Beyond buzzwords: "Poverty reduction", "participation" and "empowerment" in development policy*. Overarching Concerns, Programme Paper Number 10. Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development
- Desai, D., Isser, D. & Woolcock, M. 2012 "Rethinking Justice Reform in Fragile and Conflict-Affected States" Cissé, H., Bradlow, D. & Kingsbury, B. (eds.) *The World Bank Legal Review: Volume 3*, Washington: the World Bank
- Donais, T. 2009, "Empowerment or Imposition? Dilemmas of Local Ownership in Post-Conflict Peacebuilding Processes", *Peace and Change*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 3-26

- Doyle, M. 1986, "Liberalism and World Politics", *American Political Science Review*, vol. 80, no. 4, pp. 1151-1169
- Fairclough, N. 1989, *Language and Power*. London: Longmans
- Fairclough, N. 1992, *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Fairclough, N. 1995, *Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Longman
- Fairclough, N. 2001, *Language and Power* (2nd edition). London: Longman
- Fairclough, N. 2001b, "The Dialectics of Discourse", *Textus*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 3-10
- Fairclough, N. 2003, *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge
- Fairclough, N. 2006, *Language and Globalization*. London: Routledge
- Galtung, J., 1967, "Theories of Peace: A Synthetic Approach to Peace Thinking", *International Peace Research Institute*, Oslo
- Gilman, N. 2009, *Concentric Circles of Context*, Working Paper, 4 April, access through: <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/cih/pdf/Gilman.pdf>, available: 19-04-2012
- Hall, S. 1997, *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Hardy, C., Harley, B. & Philips, N. 2004, "Discourse analysis and content analysis: two solitudes?", *Qualitative Methods*, vol. 2, pp. 19-22
- Heatershaw, J. 2008, "Unpacking the liberal peace: the dividing and merging of peacebuilding discourse", *Millennium: journal of international studies*, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 597-621
- Jorgensson, M. & Philips, L., 2002, *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*, London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Jørgensen Winther, M. & Phillips, L., 2000. *Diskursanalys som teori och metod*. Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Lederach, P. 1997. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press
- Lundestad, G. 2010, *Öst, väst, nord, syd: huvuddrag i internationell politik efter 1945*. Lund: Studentlitteratur
- Mac Ginty, R., 2010, "Hybrid Peace: The Interaction Between Top-Down and Bottom-Up Peace", *Security Dialogue*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 391-412
- Miall, H., Ramsbotham, O. & Woodhouse, T. 2005, *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Mobekk, E. 2010, "Security Sector Reform and the Challenges of Ownership", Sedra, M. (ed.) *The Future of Security Sector Reform*, The Centre for International Governance Innovation, Canada

- Newman, E., Paris, R., & Richmond, O., 2009, "Introduction", in Newman, E. Paris, R. & Richmond, O. (red.) *New perspectives on Liberal Peacebuilding*. Tokyo and New York: United Nations University Press.
- Oda, H., 2007, "Peacebuilding from Below: Theoretical and Methodological Considerations toward an Anthropological Study on Peace", *Journal of the Graduate School of Letters*, Hokkaido University, vol. 2, pp. 1-16
- Pearce, J., 1997, "Sustainable Peace-Building in the South: Experiences from Latin America" *Development in Practice*, vol. 7, no 4, pp 438-455
- Potter, J., Wetherell, M., Gill, R. & Edwards, D. 1990. "Discourse: Noun, Verb or Social Practice?" *Philosophical Psychology*, vol. 3, no. 2
- Pugh, M., 2002, "Postwar Political Economy in Bosnia and Herzegovina: The Spoils of Peace" *Global Governance*, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 467-482
- Pugh, M., 2005, "The Political Economy of Peacebuilding: a Critical Theory Perspective. *International Journals of Peace Studies*, vol. 10, no, 22, pp. 23-42
- Pugh, M., 2011, "Local Agency and Political Economies of Peacebuilding", *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 308-320
- Richmond, O., 2006, "The problem of peace: understanding the 'liberal peace'", *Conflict, Security & Development*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 291-314
- Richmond, O., 2008, "A Post-Liberal, Everyday Ethic of Peace", access through: <http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/intrel/media/Ethics%20of%20the%20Liberal%20Peace%202008.pdf>, Available: 25-04-2012
- Richmond, O. 2011, *A Post-Liberal Peace*, New York: Routledge
- Riggins, S. 1997, *The Language and Politics of Exclusion: Others in Discourse*. California: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Russett, B. & Oneal, J. 2001. *Triangulation Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company
- Sande Lie, J.H, 2008, "The World Bank and Conflicts: From Narrow rules to Broader Principles", *Security in Practice*, no. 9. Oslo: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs
- Schmeidl, S. 2009, "Pret-a-Porter States: How the McDonalidization of State-Building misses the Mark in Afghanistan", pp. 67-76 in Fischer M. & Schmelzle, B. (eds). *Building Peace in The Absence of States: Challenging the Discourse on State Failure*. Berlin: Berghof Research Center
- Skinner, Q. 1989, "Language and Political Change", pp. 1-23 in Ball, T., Farr., J., Russell, L. *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*. New York: Cambridge University Press
- Souva, M. & Prins, B., 2007, "The Liberal Peace Revisited: The Role of Democracy, Dependence, and Development in Militarized Interstate Dispute

- Initiation, 1950-1999". *International Interactions: Empirical and Theoretical Research in International Relations*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 183-200
- Spiro, D., 1984, "The Insignificance of the Liberal Peace", *International Security*, vol. 19, o. 2, pp. 50-86
- Sulkunen, P & Törrönen, J. 1997, "The production of values: The concept of modality in textual discourse analysis", *Semiotica*, no. 1, vol. 2, pp.43-69
- Svensson, N. & Jama, A. 2004, *Horn of Africa: Transforming Itself From a Culture of War Into Culture of Peace*, Somalia International Rehabilitation Centre, Lund.
- Talbot, M., Atkinson, K., Atkinson, D. 2003, *Language and Power in the Modern World*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Teorell, J., & Svensson, T., 2007, *Att fråga och att svara, samhällsvetenskaplig metod*. Malmö: Liber AB
- van Dijk, T.A., 1996, *Discourse Studies: A multidisciplinary Introduction*, London: Sage
- Wilén, N. & Chapaux, V. 2011, "Problems of Local Participation and Collaboration with the UN in a Post-conflict Environment: Who are the 'Locals'?", *Global Society*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 531-548
- Wodak, R., & Krzyzanowski, M. (eds.) 2008, *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan
- World Bank, 2003, "Community-Driven Reconstruction as an Instrument in War-to-Peace Transition, *CPR Working Papers*, no. 7
- World Bank, 1978 *World Development Report 1978*, Oxford University Press: Oxford
- World Bank, 2000, *Entering the 21st Century, World Development Report 1999/2000*, Oxford University Press: Oxford
- World Bank, 2011, *Conflict, Security, and Development: World Development Report 2011*, Oxford University Press: Oxford