

# **Amplifying Voices from the South: Globalising Civil Society**

**Dr. Rajesh Tandon  
Ms. Mohini Kak**

**April 2007**



**Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA)  
42, Tughlakabad Institutional Area, New Delhi - 110 062  
Phone: 29960931-33, 29956908, Fax: (91-11) 29955183  
Email: [info@pria.org](mailto:info@pria.org), Website: [www.pria.org](http://www.pria.org)**

## Introduction

The 21<sup>st</sup> century world is a world with porous boundaries where very little remains limited within the national or local frame. Local issues and priorities, like that of water and sanitation, are no longer local but are determined by global policies and priorities. Our goals of development are no longer ours, but instead are clearly outlined for us by multilateral institutions in the form of Millennium Development Goals, Kyoto Environmental norms etc. It is the concerns and the needs of the most marginalised that these global goals seek to address. Yet who determines these goals? Is it the 'developed' North or the 'under-developed' South?

Thirty years ago, the answer would have been an emphatic 'developed' North. Within the developed North, it was the views and priorities of the governments. Today, the situation has changed. Governments of southern countries (specially bigger over like Chindia, or India-Brazil-South Africa Trilateral (IBSA) or G22 at Cancun are good examples) have begun to speak out and emphasise their views too.

Civil society has also emerged as a growing voice on the global arena. It is the voice of non-state actors – the people's voice. Northern civil society organisations have occupied much of the global space over these decades. During the past 15 years or so, southern civil society has also begun to be visible and audible at the global arena.

The growth of Southern civil society as a credible and influential actor in the development sector, both nationally and globally, has been a journey of challenges, influenced by a range of individual and collective endeavours and emergent politico-economic conditions. Addressing all such influences is not only difficult but perhaps beyond the scope of this chapter. The chapter does however seek to look at the development of Southern civil society from the eyes of an institution, Participatory Research In Asia (PRIA) with a 25 year old history of engaging with civil society. It looks at how its belief in the tenet 'knowledge is power' provided a depth and a direction to its efforts at amplifying the voices of the marginalised from the South in the global debates on development.

This chapter is divided into four sections. Section 1 examines the role of Participatory Research in the development of PRIA. Section 2 looks at PRIA's involvement in the growth of the civil society movement and networks in India and internationally while

Section 3 focuses on civil society voices in global governance today. Finally, some lessons learnt during this journey are shared in the end.

## **I. History of a Movement: Participatory Research and PRIA**

*“What we share is a commitment to working with those women and men in our different societies whose voices are not heard. We share a belief in the fundamental intelligence of everyone and the right of all to make history and to create knowledge. No matter how compelling, abstract theories are not sufficient to transform the world without the involvement of the vast majority of working people”*

*- Participatory Research Network (PRIA, 1982: 1).*

Every movement has a history, a motivation, an angst that stirs action for change. The movement of Participatory Research had similar trajectories. Within that movement, the birth of the Society for Participatory Research in Asia (PRIA) was no different. Stirred by the emerging discourse on Participatory Research in the 1970s, its founder members joined the debates motivated by the possibilities that Participatory Research offered as methodology of social change.

The movement for Participatory Research was a movement for equality and for a voice. It was a movement and ideology which captured the imagination of young scholars and practitioners around the world in the 1970s. Participatory Research believed in the power of people’s knowledge – the knowledge of communities, the knowledge of farmers, tribals, workers...the knowledge of the common man or woman.

The existing academic regime at the time, with its stress on scientism (objectivity and neutrality) had dispossessed people’s knowledge of all credibility. It had robbed people of self-belief – belief in their capacity and knowledge gained from years of experience of living and struggling. For example, the voices of the farmers were made irrelevant in assessing the quality and credibility of new seeds; doctors’ views on the health of industrial workers were more relevant than the experiences of the workers themselves; the government agency was more proficient in determining tribal rights than the tribals themselves. Participatory Research thus sought to wrest the power of knowledge from the hands of the academic and policy elites back into the public domain, into the hands of the creators and generators of knowledge – the people.

The challenge for Participatory Research, however, was not only 'whose knowledge matters' but also 'how to make knowledge matter'. Knowledge alone held no relevance, if it did not transform social conditions. Thus Participatory Research strove "to play a liberating role in the learning process by promoting the development of a critical understanding of social problems, their structural causes and possibilities of overcoming them" (PRIA, 1982: 3). In other words, Participatory Research aimed at bringing about a conscientisation that capacitated the marginalised to challenge unjust social, political and institutional structures.

It was this philosophy of Participatory Research that formed the soul of PRIA. Although formally instituted in February 1982, its amoebic shape emerged in 1978 when its founder member took on the role of Asian node for the International Participatory Research Network. As the node for the Asian region, PRIA (in its pre-natal avatar) organised a number of meetings and experience sharing workshops on Participatory Research in India and its neighbouring countries. Being a member of ASPBAE (Asian South Pacific Bureau of Adult Education, a regional association of adult education practitioners) facilitated the organisation of these meetings and resulted in the initiation of an informal network of organisations interested in the possibilities of Participatory Research.

#### *The International Participatory Research Network*

Young adult educators from the International Council for Adult Education (ICAE) Movement motivated by the ideas and practices of Paolo Friere and Myles Horton were interested in exploring and developing the idea of Participatory Research as a new empowering approach towards participation. In response to the realisation that people in many countries were thinking along similar lines Hall (1975) compiled a special issue of the ICAE Journal *Convergence* titled 'Participatory Research'. The overwhelming response to the publication led to the idea of initiating an international network of Participatory Research.

*"The adult education community and related community development and activists bought out all the copies of the journal for the first time in the history of the journal. Requests for copies poured in from all over the world and the small item in my lead article inviting persons who were interested in exchanging*

*information about their activities went from a trickle to a stream to a river. It was clear to me that many people in the majority world and people working with or for marginalised persons in the rich countries were actively engaged in research projects which were very different from the standards of the day in most of the universities of the world (Hall, 1998:4)".*

Further exploration of the idea at the 1<sup>st</sup> World Assembly of the ICAE in Dar es Salaam, 1976 and the Cartagena Conference of April 1977 on 'Action Research' organised by Orlando Fals Borda gave impetus to this movement and by September 1977, an informal meeting in Aurora, Ontario gave birth to the an international network of participatory research. By 1978 there were five nodes in the network: Toronto, New Delhi, Tanzania, Netherlands and Venezuela (Hall, 1998).

In 1980, PRIA founder (Dr. Rajesh Tandon) took on the responsibility of International Coordinator of this network.

In these initial years PRIA not only promoted its ideology of 'knowledge is power' but also added to the development of Participatory Research as a concept. The rural context of Asian development and the largely unorganised nature of the marginalised – landless etc – meant Participatory Research efforts in Asia required corresponding efforts at organisation building. The existence of traditional discrimination hierarchies also required stronger efforts at challenging oppressive social and political structures (Tandon, 1979). It was through these and more experiences specific to the Asian socio-economic and political context that PRIA emerged as leading ideologue on Participatory Research globally and regionally.

### ***Networking As a Vehicle for Collective Solidarity***

Although the teachings of Paolo Friere, Myles Horton, Budd Hall, Orlando Fals Borda and others had given birth to the concept of Participatory Action Research (PAR), it was the adoption of a concerted strategy of networking that gave Participatory Research its global outreach. The establishment of strong regional networks not only ensured the strengthening of local voices but also provided a channel whereby local voices could reach out to the global fora.

The creation of regional networks of Participatory Research in 1978 had been a starting point, but as the concept of Participatory Research developed, global acceptance of the idea of 'peoples knowledge' became essential. Only the united voices of civil society actors supported by visible successes of the tools of Participatory Research could bring about this acceptance. And it was towards this end that PRIA as the Asia regional node and as International Coordinator of the Participatory Research Network worked during the 1980s. This was an important strategic decision, as a hindsight, though global networks were rare thirty years ago.

PRIA promoted the practice of experience sharing both through the organisation of formal workshops and through the dissemination of informational material for activist practitioners, thereby developing a loose network of a large number of practitioners. It also initiated a series of capacity building initiatives for field-based development workers of voluntary organisations promoting the practice of Participatory Research in enhancing the depth and effectivity of their programs.

The strength of this network gained visibility at the 1985 International Conference on Adult Education held in Paris, where the ICAE recommendation on the 'Right to Learn' was accepted as the Declaration of the Conference. The 'Right to Learn' not only accepted learning as a means of empowerment but also granted legitimacy to local practices – a starting point for global recognition of the relevance of local knowledge and practice.

The 1985 Conference held great significance also because it was for the first time that Non Governmental Organisations (NGOs) had not only been invited to such an intergovernmental meeting but also asked to address the plenary and to present statements on agenda items.

*"Through the strong presence of so many women and men associated with its member national and regional organisations, the ICAE was widely acknowledged as proof of the importance, value and maturity of the non governmental sector. The value of a strong international network was clearly demonstrated". (ICAE, 1985: 1)*

Thus by the late 80s civil society had started gaining credibility and visibility in international development forums, propagating the bottom up perspective of combating social and economic development issues. Although a great success for civil society

actors, it also posed a great challenge. Recognition as the 'third sector' meant an increased space for participation and an increased responsibility to ably fulfil the role. From being a small localised player civil society had gained recognition as an important national and international player.

Recognising this challenge, PRIA turned its focus to creating a network of civil Society Organisations (CSOs) aimed at influencing policies and debates defining and outlining the nature and scope of civil society – globally and nationally.

## **II. Recovering Civil Society...the 1990s.**

### *Strengthening Civil Society: Local and Global*

Civil Society was growing, it was a new emerging force, as yet sparsely understood and surrounded by conservative beliefs about its capacities. Rather than have the state and market actors define and limit its role, it was essential for civil society to define itself. It was this role that PRIA took upon itself in the early 1990s.

The emergence of an open market economy, the rise of liberalisation and the growing emphasis on civil society by multilateral institutions led to a veritable 'associational revolution' in the Asian region in the 1990s. While the number of civil society organisations grew, corresponding reform of legal and institutional structures within the government accommodating and responding to this rise of the 'third sector' did not take place. For example, in India, the law governing the registration of societies dated back to 1860. The existence of such a dated Act was not only an indication of the non-acknowledgement of the diverse and changing nature of new civil society organisations but also a disincentive for the growth of civil society.

In response to this need of constructing an enabling environment for civil society in India, PRIA along with a number of civil society leaders decided, "to create a national forum for the protection, enrichment and growth of voluntarism in India" (VANI website) giving birth to a Voluntary Action Network India (VANI) in 1988. As a loose network of member organisations spanning the entire length and breadth of the country, VANI took on the mandate of promoting a collective voice for the voluntary sector. Providing leadership to VANI in its initial years, PRIA built on its existing Participatory Research network to include smaller local organisations and worked towards developing a

common framework and agenda of actions that incorporated the shared demands of diverse civil society organisations.

The network took on broader issues concerning the voluntary sector in India as a whole such as initiating a debate on structural adjustment and the role of civil society therein, advocacy for simplification of Acts, rules and regulations governing the voluntary sector, etc.

An important aspect driving these efforts was the need to provide increasing credibility to Indian and southern civil society. Although civil society in the South was increasing numerically, its significance in terms of influence was overshadowed by its northern counterparts which were better organisation, more resourced and highly articulate. Two sets of challenges were faced by this emerging growth of civil society organisations in southern countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. First related to the weak capacities of such actors. Intellectual material and institutional capacities of local CSOs were generally weak. PRIA began to play the role of a support organisation for the sector of civil society first in India, and then beyond. In partnership with IDR (Institute for Development Research, Boston), it promoted a South Asian, Asian wide and international network of Support Organisations dedicated to the mission of empowering local CSOs through enhancing their capacities for people-centred developments.

The second challenge facing southern CSOs was lack of enabling regulatory frameworks in many southern countries. Old archaic structures existed in some (like former colonies of Britain); many others had no such frameworks (like Vietnam). Most governments of these southern countries had a “suspicious” orientation towards CSOs engaged in social mobilisation and community empowerment. It was, therefore, necessary to create a modern framework of regulation for GO-NGO relations. Building on its earlier work that examined such relations in many countries (GO-NGO Relations: A source of Life or Kiss of Death, PRIA 1989), PRIA supported the efforts of the Commonwealth Foundation to develop such a framework. This document ‘Guidelines for Global Policy and Practice’ was released by the Commonwealth Foundation in 1996.

Strengthening civil society voices from the South required more than focused efforts at the national level. Thus, parallel to the national efforts at creating VANI, efforts to bring together a network to advocate on issues concerning the voluntary sector in international fora was being initiated. In 1991 this idea of bringing together non-profit

organisations on a global stage was floated by an international group of civic leaders and activists; an idea that materialised in the shape of CIVICUS (World Alliance for Citizen Participation), with PRIA as one of its founding members. It was one of the “first major attempts to establish a worldwide framework specifically geared to the promotion of civil society... a bold new idea” (CIVICUS, 1994: ix).

Aimed at strengthening civil society through providing it visibility, encouraging partnership and voluntarism, engaging with multi-lateral and other major international agencies, CIVICUS’s multi-sectoral approach gave it strength and an unprecedented global outreach.

By bringing together actors from different sectors on a common platform – NGOs, donors, foundations and corporate grant makers – it tapped the unexplored opportunities of multi-sector dialogue and cooperation. It also increased the outreach and influence of civil society through the creation of horizontal platforms of engagement and dialogue between the donors and the donees. Sharing between sectors increased the capacity of CSOs motivating them to “explore innovative forms of interaction with business and governments”.

### Sleeping with the Bear

Rooted in the perspectives of social transformation from below, civil society was still hesitant of engaging with global multi-lateral institutions and governments. Entering into dialogue with the ‘power holders’ was seen as the first step towards cooption, or in other words, ‘selling out’ the voices of the marginalised. The role of civil society was seen as an external pressure group demanding accountability from such global institutions while questioning unequal power structures. Change was thus asserted from the outside not from within, and entering into direct relationship with such global multilateral institutions with the government was seen as a compromise of civil society values and traditions. This was particularly fine for such International Financial Institutions like the World Bank and International Monetary Fund in the early 1990, as they were seen to be the ‘villains’ of the poor.

Yet, engagement was a necessity if long lasting change was to be ensured. With the formation of a World Bank NGO Working Group in 1981, multi-laterals had provided a foothold to civil society; it was up to civil society to carve out a space and leave a mark.

Though civil society had been successful in establishing the identity of the group as an autonomous body within the World Bank, its influence in policy decisions was limited. By the late 1980s, participation had become the keyword and the World Bank was exploring strategies for the adoption of participation in its policy planning and operations. Its Participation Report was released in 1994 and encouraged by the seriousness of the Bank towards its adoption, the NGO Working Group activated a sub-group on participation in 1995 “to monitor and influence effective implementation of World Bank policy on participation and promote a wider and deeper involvement of civil society in the Bank’s participatory development efforts” (Long, 2001: 41).

Gauging the relevance and possible impact of the Participation sub group on the Bank’s long-term policy of participation in its programs, PRIA accepted the responsibility of the Chair of the World Bank-NGO Working Group – Sub group on Participation in 1995 (despite facing flak for ‘selling out’ to the enemy).

Its unique contribution as member and chair of this group came from its underlying philosophy of participatory research – (i) the focus on the decentralised nature of engagement through the involvement of local and regional CSOs and (ii) the emphasis on capacity building of all primary stakeholders on the processes of participation.

For the first time, regional meetings were held to involve smaller national and local NGOs in the dialogue and decision making process.

“The decentralised meetings, enabled a more narrow geographic focus and gave more Southern NGOs the opportunity to participate in their region, to learn more about the Bank and its activities in their countries and to become advocates for issues of greatest concern to them”. (Long, 2001: 42)

Capacity Building too began to be seen as an integral part of promoting participatory approaches – with the World Bank beginning to stress its inclusion in its country programs.

The Participation Sub group, though limited by its mandate to influencing World Bank policies, envisioned its efforts as setting a trend for other multilaterals to follow. Through its efforts, issues related to the participation of the poor in large-scale development projects and policy formulation became a global agenda.

## Enhancing Capacities: Civil Society as catalyst of change

While strengthening civil society voices through the formation of united platforms of action was one side of the equation, enhancing the capacity of local and national regional CSOs of southern countries was the other. Most NGOs engaged in the promotion of development initiatives worked at the grassroots. Their primary mode of functioning was service delivery and social mobilisation – empowering the poor and marginalised through the delivery of a range of services including health, education, income generation through micro-credit enterprises etc. The local nature of their pursuits kept them largely bereft of global occurrences and priorities until they were ‘forced’ by circumstances to face up to the changing contexts and challenges.

The wave of democratisation and liberalisation in the 1990s shifted the focus of most governments and multi-lateral institutions towards democratisation, decentralisation and accountable governance. This meant changing socio-economic and political structures within the State and a re-examination of the roles and relevance of civil society actors in society.

“These shifts in roles, functions and expectations are necessitating renewed and comprehensive attention toward strengthening capacities of all these categories of actors to prepare themselves to be relevant and effective in the new millennium”. (*IFCB, 1998: 3*)

It required a redefinition of roles and linkages with respect to the community, other civil society actors, media, government private sector etc. To address this challenge of ensuring an effective and efficient civil society with the capacity to learn and adapt to the changing contexts, PRIA along with other Southern NGOs from southern countries proposed the formation of an interagency group for the capacity building of Southern NGOs in October 1996. This proposal laid the foundation for the formation of the International Forum of Capacity Building (IFCB) in 1998 with PRIA as its first global Secretariat.

PRIA played the role of a catalyst and leader of this multi-layered, multi-party coalition focused on the specific capacity building needs of civil society organisations of the South. Capacity building interventions were not new, but till date had largely followed universal prescriptions set down by agencies of the North who financed these initiatives.

Improving effectiveness of program delivery through better organisational management had been the prime agenda of these initiatives. Capacity building for enhancing sustainability was ignored while it assumed great significance for SNGOs in the context of changing conditions and new challenges.

The declining role of the State meant the need to up-scale efforts to ensure service provision for the most marginalised; the increasing global nature of policy formulation meant the need for civil society to up-scale their strength through knowledge and synthesis of experiences of implementing micro-projects to influence macro social and economic policies; it also meant the need for engagement of multiple stakeholders – beyond the community and the state to include the media, academia and the private sector.

The new priorities for Southern Civil Society, thus, were (i) greater systematisation of programme planning and implementation (ii) institutional development focusing on networking, building partnerships and alliances (iii) the use of information technology (iv) policy advocacy with enhanced skills of research and documentation with the focus of linking micro experiences to macro policy reform (v) and last and most importantly resource mobilisation and financial sustainability (Global Alliance News, 1997: 5-6).

The IFCB's capacity building endeavours from a 'southern' perspective complimented the ongoing efforts at networking – national and international. It made more effective the voices from the underdeveloped regions of the world. New leadership and capacity emerged with many CSOs taking on larger roles and making an impact on the global development scene.

### **III. Citizens and Global governance**

*“It is a truism that the state exists to promote the well-being of its citizens. However, it is only now becoming accepted that the only true definition of well-being can come from citizens themselves, because it is they who have to live with their problems, their needs, their hopes and their aspirations”.*

The Commonwealth Foundation, Sept, 1999: Foreword

By the late 1990s, civil society, largely represented by NGOs, had become an integral part of the development discourse and were widely recognised by the State as the most

credible medium of bringing the voices of the marginalised to the fore. However, in all debates and contestations aimed at defining the roles and purposes of civil society, the most essential component of civil society was left out, that is, the citizens. With enhanced capacities and strong networks, civil society was more focused on deepening and changing the nature of its engagement with the State rather than using its newly developed capacities for empowering citizens to raise their own voices and engage directly with governance.

“In the discourse, the basic building blocks of civil society – citizens – have largely remained invisible... Neither governments nor other civil society intermediaries can assume the voices of these citizens. They themselves must be listened to” (The Commonwealth Foundation, 1999: 19).

It was this realisation that motivated PRIA as a partner of the Commonwealth Foundation to play a key role in the formulation of its Citizens and Governance (C&G) Program. With a strong belief in participatory research, PRIA’s mission had always been the empowerment of citizens by enhancing their belief in their own knowledge and capacities. Through the C&G Programme, PRIA created the opportunity of promoting the idea of citizen centred development, where citizens and not simply civil society organisations were the key actors.

Focus on citizens meant deepening the level of interventions and more comprehensive efforts at linking the local to the global. This depth of focus was becoming more and more essential in light of the increasing globalisation of issues in the new millennium. It necessitated the participation and involvement of citizens not simply as ‘users and beneficiaries’ but as active players and ‘contributors’ in the development process. With the role of the state declining in the new liberalised era, it was essential for citizens to be empowered and create spaces ensuring that their voices have an impact.

The Citizens and Governance Programme through voicing the views of the people from across 47 countries of the Commonwealth, brought the focus back on the people – the citizens – and led to an increase in efforts by civil society organisations and state actors in promoting citizen participation in governance at the national level. The study laid the foundations for the above program by highlighting the almost universal nature of concerns that citizens across the Commonwealth had. The study also focused on the

need for shifting the roles of intermediary NGOs towards supporting and enabling ordinary citizens to get involved in public spheres, public issues and public institutions. While civil society influence had grown globally, its influence on UN agencies and other multi-laterals was still largely limited to big international conferences which invited civil society involvement, debates and suggestions on specific issues. This engagement was sporadic and far from achieving the level of influence required for focused advocacy. There was no mechanism in place that could ably demand accountability from these institutions which formed and influenced global-national policies.

In an attempt to address this lacuna, the Forum International Montreal (FIM) was formed in 1998 by a number of civil society activists and leaders. It was formed with the specific goal of “improving the influence of international civil society on the United Nations and the multilateral system” (FIM website). PRIA with its vast experience of engagement with international multilateral institutions became an integral part of this forum.

Its interest at promoting multilateral democracy gained initial recognition in 2002 when it took on the focused project of engaging with the G8 – a body infamous for its lack of public accountability yet with undeniable global influence. It sought to transform engagement with this highly influential body from a sporadic demonstration based engagement to a serious dialogue based interface. Through its efforts it sought to “demonstrate to the G8 organisers the value of open and frank dialogue with international civil society” (Alliance, 2005: 17). While most host G8 country governments have been ‘consulting’ with their own civil society, there had been no attempt to dialogue with civil society from the south.

Although no formal space has as yet been created for civil society – G8 dialogue, a norm has definitely been established whereby dialogue with southern civil society on specific issues forms part of the G8 agenda.

Likewise, PRIA supported efforts by FIM, CIVICUS and other global network and platform of civil society to enable the voices of southern CSOs to be heard directly and concretely. In this regard, it has facilitated workshops and conferences which aim at ‘Democratising Global Governance’ through southern civil society engagements. These attempts have been made in the past five years in ‘global’ venues like New York, London, Paris, Geneva, Montreal; they have also been made at ‘local’ venues (with

global frameworks of reality) like Delhi, Sao Paolo, Nairobi, Manila, Hong Kong. PRIA's commitment to supporting the voice of civil society from south has been widely manifested and appreciated in these fora.

## **Emerging Lessons**

The journey of PRIA – 25 years and more -- is going on. New experiences and situation are creating new possibilities. Yet it is important to look back over the past thirty years and draw some lessons from the journey so far. Some of these are enumerated here.

1. Clarity of perspectives, values and purposes is essential to sustain any impact. PRIA's perspective of Participatory Research – local knowledge and participation – continued to inform its efforts in supporting its mission of 'Amplifying Voices from the South'. Despite many opportunities to become 'sole spokesperson' for the southern civil society voice, PRIA resisted this role and enabled many others to join together to gain a collective voice.
2. Thirty years ago, 'globalising civil society' was not even on the horizon; no donors, NGOs, governments or academics could imagine this possibility. PRIA joined a few other likeminded civil society actors from other countries who were beginning to see the value of a 'southern-led' international network. Network of Participatory Research provided first such opportunity. This building alliances and associations with like-minded others was important for PRIA then too. The networking approach to building global visibility is radically different from the managerial approach to creating multi-nationals.
3. PRIA's credibility in global fora was maintained primarily because of its national and local roots. PRIA's work with countries, CSOs, trade unions and governments in India – on participation, empowerment and governance – gave it practical insights and helped shape its analysis of global forces and institutions. But acting simultaneously in local and global spaces is neither easy nor sustainable. Important choices had to be made to remain rooted in local actions, even when global actions were most crucial and demanding.
4. 'Amplifying southern voices' also implies dealing with unequal north-south relations of power. Such unequal relations of power exist everywhere. Their local/national

manifestation is far less complex to deal with than international manifestations. Some of these northern civil society actors (who were also donors of many southern CSOs) felt challenged and threatened in the process. Funding relations distorted several opportunities for global cooperation among CSOs from the north and the south.

5. Finally, it is important to acknowledge that leadership is crucial in such transformative interventions. Leadership of ideas, perspectives and values plays a significant role in building global coalitions. Leadership rooted in southern contexts gains its inspiration and maintains its accountability from that southern context. Local practice empowers leadership for global actions.

## Reference:

CIVICUS (1994), *Citizens: Strengthening Global Civil Society*, Washington: CIVICUS: World Alliance for Citizen Participation

Hall, Budd L. (1998), 'Looking Back, Looking Forward: Reflections on the Origins of the International Participatory Research Network and the Participatory Research Group in Toronto, Canada', Paper prepared for the Participatory Research: Strategies for Empowerment Workshop, 16-18 April, 1998 PRIA, New Delhi

IFCB (1998), *Future Capacity Building of Southern NGOs: International Conference May 6-8, 1998, Brussels*, Prepared by the Global Secretariat IFCB, New Delhi: PRIA

International Council for Adult Education (1985), 'The Right to Learn: Participation of ICAE and member organisations in the 1985 UNESCO International Conference on Adult Education in Paris, Canada: ICAE

Long, Carolyn (2001) *Participation of the Poor in Development Initiatives: Taking their rightful place*, London: IDR and Earthscan Publications Ltd

Martin, Nigel (2005), Not representative but still Legitimate: FIM and the G8, *Alliance* Vol. 10, Number 2, June 2005

PRIA (1982), *Participatory Research: An Introduction*, New Delhi: PRIA

PRIA (1997) *Capacity Building of Southern NGOs*, *Global Alliance News* Vol. 1, No. 5, June 1997

Tandon, Rajesh (1979), 'Issues and Experiences in Participatory Research in Asia', Paper presented during the Adult Education Research Seminar held at Kungälv, Sweden during June 25-27, 1979

The Commonwealth Foundation (1999), *Citizens and Governance: Civil Society in the new millennium (A report prepared by the CF in partnership with CIVICUS)*, London: The Commonwealth Foundation

FIM – [www.fimcivilsociety.org](http://www.fimcivilsociety.org)

VANI – [www.vaniindia.org](http://www.vaniindia.org)