

NGOs and the Bureaucracy: A Collaboration in Search of a Framework

Danilo M. Ocampo

Before the 1986 EDSA Uprising, many non-government organizations (NGOs) adopted a generally hostile position towards the government and its bureaucratic instrumentalities. This was understandable given the largely autocratic character of the Marcos regime and the democratic tradition of the NGOs. This hostility reached a point where government was considered the enemy because it worked against the interests of the people whom the NGOs were committed to serve. [1] Hence, these NGOs would not even imagine working with government.

In turn, the autocratic government, particularly the military establishment, looked upon some NGOs as enemies. This mutual hostility worsened to the extent that some people connected with NGOs would be arrested, kidnapped, tortured, or killed by the military.

The relationship between NGOs and government has since improved, as the government that we now have is perceived to be popular, having been directly installed by "people power".

This article shall discuss the role and position of NGOs now that a government with popular support is in place. [2] It shall also explore the following issues: whether NGOs need to play the same active role in organizing and conscientizing the poor, the powerless, and the oppressed; whether there could now be a responsible collaboration between the Philippine administrative system (PAS) and

the NGOs; if so, what would be the rational basis for such collaboration; and, what would be the nature, form, and limits thereof?

The subject of PAS-NGO collaboration concerns social scientists. The Philippine Social Science Council (PSSC), through its Resources for People Program (RPP), undertook a year-round series of monthly fora and roundtable discussions on PAS-NGO collaboration.

Government officials expressed similar interest. The Asian Institute of Management planned to sponsor a workshop where members of the Cabinet and the League of Governors of the Philippines, some Senators and Congressmen, and representatives of some NGOs would get to know each other. The objective of the workshop was to get over the "natural apprehension and mistrust" between the bureaucracy and the NGOs. [3]

The matter of NGO relations with government organizations (GO-NGO) also preoccupies the global NGO community. An entire section of the brief preliminary report of the international symposium on "Development Alternatives: The Challenge for NGOs", held in London from 11-13 March 1987 was devoted to this important subject. It states in part:

NGOs have no intention or desire to supplant or compete with the State in their (NGOs) development efforts; on the contrary, in both the North and the South, most NGOs continue to interact heavily with governments. Participants at the Symposium expressed a need to work out the best possible form of interaction.

Relations between NGOs and governments vary drastically from region to region. NGOs in India derive much support and encouragement from their government; they are registered with the government and tend to work in close collaboration with it. NGOs from Africa also acknowledge the frequent need to work closely with government or at least to avoid antagonizing the authorities. Most NGOs from Latin America offer a much different perspective: NGOs and other people's movements there have functioned historically in opposition to government. Today, in many parts of the newly democratic countries, these same NGOs see themselves as playing a crucial role in strengthening civil society. [4]

Defining NGOs

The National Economic and Development Agency (NEDA) defines NGOs as follows:

Non-government organizations refer to private, non-profit, voluntary organizations that are committed to the task of what is broadly termed as "development".

Most NGOs are relatively small and flexible. They focus their services on marginal groups in the rural and urban areas. Their activities range from technical aspects of productive activity to such socio-economic aspects as planning and information systems, savings and credit activities, education and organization, rural credit access, and others. Farmers, women, tribal minorities, squatters, youth, etc., are generally their target clientele.

NGOs are generally people-oriented with a firm conviction of the need for people's participation in decisions and processes affecting them. The particular approach used is bottom-up rather than top-down. As such, they have an intimate knowledge of local situations and are in a better position to know and understand the problems and needs of local communities. Likewise, NGOs tend to enjoy the confidence of the people they serve at the local level. [5]

The Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) registered about 29,541 NGOs as of 1986. The Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP) came out a few years earlier with a survey of around 16,000 NGOs all over the country. [6] This article, however, shall refer to that particular sector of the broader NGO community in the Philippines that has, for its main agenda, social reform or development. It is composed of organizations that proliferated before and during martial law, and which were organized to press for meaningful social reforms such as agrarian reform and rural development,

human rights and social justice, autonomous industrialization, community-based health services, and freedom from foreign military bases. Thus, NGOs here exclude such traditional sectors of the NGO community as charity-welfare agencies, socio-civic clubs, professional and business associations, and the like.

Another feature of NGOs is that the men and women behind them have the "commitment, zeal, and tenacity in working with the poor and deprived sections of society". [7] Total commitment to the upliftment of the poor is the undisguised motivation of these NGOs; courage and self-sacrifice the most enduring qualities of their members.

NGOs, as defined above, may be further categorized into four types of organizations -- sectoral people's organizations, issue advocacy groups, service agencies, and popular coalitions.

Sectoral People's Organizations are composed of women, industrial workers, farmers, teachers, church people, youth and students, doctors, lawyers, tribal Filipinos, nationalist businessmen, and others. These are formed primarily to advocate specific issues vital to the welfare and development of particular sectors. They are usually national in scope, while some are regional. Their basic organizational units are called chapters or affiliate organizations found in their specific workplaces or places of residence. This category would include those autonomous community organizations at the village-level which are independent of existing organizations with nationwide or regionwide constituencies.

Issue Advocacy Groups carry such social issues as the foreign debt, freedom from nuclear weapons and military bases, prostitution of women and children, human rights and militarization, self-determination for minority groups, community-based health, and others.

Service Agencies engage in community organizing, training of community leaders, and assisting in the implementation of socio-economic projects in com-



munities (e.g., the facilitation of funding, preparation of project proposals, management training, etc.). Also in this category are organizations that assist victims of human rights violations and militarization, and research agencies supporting the research-information needs of people's organizations. [8]

Popular Coalitions are formal temporary alliances among sectoral or multi-sectoral organizations that seek to promote common objectives or demands at a particular time (e.g., the Congress for a People's Agrarian Reform, Freedom from Debt Coalition, Coalition for Peace, and the Cordillera People's Alliance).

These categories are not mutually exclusive. They are based on the NGOs' primary social functions. In many instances, people's organizations also engage in issue advocacy activities pertaining to their specific sectoral interests, or provide services to their constituents, or are members or affiliates of existing popular coalitions.

At least three documents make a distinction between NGOs and people's or-

ganizations (POs). [9] According to these sources, NGOs refer only to those organizations that fall under the category "service agencies". The Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Areas (Phildhra) rationalizes the distinction as follows:

A distinction must be drawn between NGOs that provide services to POs at the grassroots level and the POs themselves... NGOs and POs, being different in nature and orientation, in development thrusts and processes, have their own set of principles, concepts, and philosophies on which they base their methodology, mode of practice and framework of actions. [10]

The distinction makes two things clear: a) that POs perform the principal role in the development process-- that other types of organizations merely complement or support the struggle of the organized basic masses; and b) that POs and NGOs (which this article would call service agencies) are not identical in terms of their social functions and values. This distinction, however, does not invalidate the earlier definition of NGOs which includes POs.

Role of NGOs in Recent History

To better understand the background and context of this discussion, it may be useful to recall the role of NGOs in recent history.

In the latter part of the 1960s, there emerged militant social reform movements involving intellectuals, students, and urban workers. These were directed at the appalling conditions of mass poverty, wealth maldistribution, oppression of the poor, and foreign domination. They reached a high point in the First Quarter Storm of 1970.

In September 1972, President Marcos declared Martial Law and inaugurated authoritarian rule. He imprisoned his political opponents, closed down independent newspapers, and ruled by decree after abolishing Congress, emasculating the Judiciary, and ensuring the loyalty of the military by giving it more power and privileges. In the late 1970s, workers, students, and human rights advocates in the religious sector defied martial law and launched open mass actions for democratic rights. During the same period, a parallel movement for grassroots development emerged, involving organizations engaged in empowering local communities for self-reliant development. These organizations undertook conscientization (education for critical awareness) and organizing work to enable communities to act on their immediate problems and resist the impositions of government and big business that are adverse to their interest and welfare.

The 1983 Aquino assassination set off a process of mass politicization as evidenced by the people's direct participation in public affairs. This culminated in the EDSA Revolution of February 1986.

Constitutional Recognition of the Role of NGOs

The EDSA Revolution was brought about by a conjuncture of political events, and a specific configuration of various social forces (e.g., the institutional Church, the rebellious faction in the military, the

business sector, and the anti-Marcos elite and politicians). Its success may also be attributed to the years of painstaking education, organizing, and popular mobilization work undertaken by the NGOs. [11]

In recognition of the role of NGOs in recent history, the 1987 Philippine Constitution explicitly provides legal basis for NGO participation in government, particularly in its social development efforts.

Article XII, Section 23 states:

The state shall encourage non-governmental, community-based or sectoral organizations that promote the welfare of the nation.

Article XIII contains two sections pertaining to NGOs. Section 15 states:

The State shall respect the role of independent people's organizations to enable people to pursue and protect, within the democratic framework, their legitimate and collective interests and aspirations through peaceful and lawful means.

People's organizations are bonafide associations of citizens with demonstrated capacity to promote the public interest and with identifiable leadership, membership, and structure.

Section 16 provides:

The right of the people and their organizations to effective and reasonable participation at all levels of social, political, and economic decision-making shall not be abridged. The State shall, by law, facilitate the establishment of adequate consultation mechanisms.

NGO Competence for Social Development

Rajesh Tandon points out the following essential contributions of NGOs in the social process:

1) NGOs have been able to highlight the plight and concerns of a wide section of exploited people in society who are otherwise powerless and invisible...Most NGOs have been working only among such sections of people; through their educational and organizational work with and among them, the concerns of these marginalized and exploited sections of our society have become visible to the public in general, and to planners and decision-makers in particular.

2) NGOs have brought certain critical development issues and concerns into the public debate and to the attention of policy-makers...Today, NGOs provide the main forum for study, documentation, debate, and exchange of views and experiences on scores of similar developmental, social, and political concerns.

3) NGOs have experimented with several solutions and models to solve major developmental and social problems facing society...Social insights, principles that work, practices that make a difference -- these have been evolved in the planning, training, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of a whole series of development activities. [14]

It is for these reasons that NGOs possess the qualities of "accessibility as well as acceptability to grassroots groups and organized communities". [15]

Tandon says further that NGOs represent a third force or sector between government and business. He locates this crucial role and position of the NGO sector to the "degree of freedom (of NGOs) that the government institutions do not have, and a sense of commitment and concern (for the public interest, specifically of the poor) that the profit-seeking business sector does not possess. [16] With such degree of freedom, autonomy,

commitment, and concern, NGOs could enunciate and advocate issues, policies, and programs that are beneficial to the poor majority in society, even if they are against the interest of the ruling elite.

Gohler describes the distinct advantage of NGOs in doing development work:

Traditionally, [NGOs] claimed to be less troubled by the major obstacle to development encountered by the principal channels of international assistance, i.e., bilateral, government to government, and multilateral (UN) agencies. This list of problems includes top-down, hierarchical, and bureaucratic management styles; strict adherence to preconceived plans executed by foreign experts; preference by planners for large, capital-intensive development programs; and short timeframes, combined with pressure for quantifiable, quick results.

In contrast, [NGOs] see themselves as practitioners of development approaches which effectively reach the poorest of the poor. They stress the importance of community participation in the development process -- helping people help themselves. [NGOs] also claim to be more flexible, more efficient, and thus more cost-effective than governmental development agencies. In sum, private, non-profit development agencies prefer to be known as people-to-people organizations, operating at the grassroots level,



HASIK - KASARINLAN

assisting communities in making independent choices affecting their future. [15]

In addition, David asserts that the NGO community has already developed "a vast network, an infrastructure and expertise for dealing with people's problems at the local level...[and that] citizen's participation in development, through self-reliance and collective efforts in the planning and execution of projects...stands a greater chance of being realized through the NGOs than through the bureaucratic agencies of the State". [17]

A recent report on small businesses published by the University of the Philippines - Institute of Small Scale Industries (UP-ISSI) reveals that lending programs for income generating projects of NGOs have a better track record than do credit programs of most financing institutions. [18]

Government Incentives For NGOs

One way by which the government hopes to encourage the growth and development of NGOs is through the provision of some incentives. The NEDA paper enumerates these incentives as follows: a) duty-free and tax-free importation of foreign donations; b) income tax exemption; and, c) education and training. [19]

■ Duty- and Tax-free Donations

NGOs may avail of exemptions from customs duties on importations of machinery, equipment, and other goods which are directly required or necessary in the activities of the NGOs, and contribute to the promotion of rural or regional development, generation of employment, and strengthening of health services or moral values. The NEDA is empowered, under Section 105 of the Tariff and Customs Code as amended, to recommend to the Department of Finance any NGO that wishes to avail of this privilege. This tax privilege does not include, however, exemption from the Value Added Tax (VAT).

The VAT tax burden, however, may be relaxed under NEDA Board Resolution No. 58 (s. 1988) which allows non-profit

religious and charitable organizations to have their donations consigned to concerned government agencies (e.g., to the Department of Health in the case of medicines/medical equipment or to the Department of Social Welfare and Development in the case of food) so that these goods may be released from customs custody without pre-payment of taxes.

■ Income Tax Exemption

NGOs may avail of income tax exemption by virtue of Section 26 of the National Internal Revenue Code. Farmers organizations or the like may operate as sales agents that market the products of their members and return to them the proceeds of the sale. As such, they are entitled to income tax exemption. Agricultural and labor organizations formed not principally for profit may avail of this privilege.

■ Education and Training

The Department of Labor and Employment - Bureau of Rural Workers (DOLE/BRW) and the Department of Trade provide education and training assistance to NGOs.

The Department of Trade and Industry (DTI) extends skills training for the development of the entrepreneurial capabilities of its accredited NGOs so that they may acquire some expertise and competence in implementing the livelihood program of the Department.

The DOLE/BRW provides education on project development to rural workers' organizations. Rural workers are trained to pursue income-generating projects to help augment their earnings.

■ Trade-offs in Government Assistance

We may learn from the experiences of other countries, particularly in Europe and North America, that have a long history with NGO-GO relations. Lissner outlines four main categories of government cash contributions for NGO activities in rich Western countries:

- a) general subsidies; b) emergency relief contributions; c) subsidies for specific

projects; and d) contributions to volunteer institutions.

In addition, many governments make *contributions in kind*, most often in the form of surplus food, medical supplies, and certain categories of "government-owned excess property" (e.g., vehicles). Some governments also provide subsidized or *free services* to voluntary agencies (e.g., air freight, generally in military aircraft, ocean shipping of aid supplies, logistics and medicine). Finally...governments encourage voluntary agency activities by means of *tax concessions* (i.e., to the agencies themselves and to persons and companies that provide agencies with gifts in cash and kind). [19]

Lissner points out that while many NGOs in these countries do avail of various forms of government support, a considerable number of NGOs do not, in fact, receive any government support, in cash or in kind. Some of these organizations have chosen in principle not to apply for such support because they see cooperation with government as a threat to their integrity as voluntary agencies. Other NGOs do not qualify for government incentives because they pursue religious or expressly political objectives (e.g., mission societies or solidarity movements siding with one particular party to a conflict overseas).

In what way may government support threaten the integrity of NGOs and limit their freedom to set their own priorities? Lissner outlines four kinds of detrimental effects that close cooperation with government may have on NGOs:

a) they may be pressured into accepting policies and priorities with which they disagree;

b) they may be used (or may let themselves be used) by the government towards ends which the government cannot or prefers not to be associated with;

c) they may change their priorities to suit the requirements of the government rather than their own initial policies or the particular needs they have encountered (in their work); and,

d) they may tailor or change their "style" and *modus operandi* to become more acceptable to the government. [20]

Existing GO-NGO Linkages

Existing linkages between the government and the NGO community are formed along the sectoral agency level. Each

department of the executive branch of government establishes its own modality of relationship with NGOs working along the functional areas of responsibility of the department.

In the area of comprehensive GO-NGO links, the NEDA has undertaken certain initiatives to formulate a broader framework of policies for legislative and administrative actions.

A NEDA discussion paper lists the following linkages at the departmental agency level. [21]

■ Department of Agriculture (DA)

The DA has created an Outreach Desk, a special unit under the Special Concerns Office, charged with coordinating with NGOs. This Desk aims to facilitate the participation of the marginalized groups in the agricultural sector in all stages of planning and programming in the Department. It is also expected to evolve an operational model of institutionalizing the partnership between the Department and the NGOs and small farmers' organizations within a three-year period along the following areas of concern: policy research, development and advocacy, human resources development, information systems development, and consultancy and quick referral system development.

The Desk has formed the Interim Consultative Council composed of NGOs and small farmers' organizations presently dealing or planning to work with the DA. The Council is tasked with the development of general concepts and strategies in coordinating with NGOs in government projects.

The Department has tapped NGOs to assist in implementing the Livelihood Enhancement for Agricultural Development (LEAD) program. This is aimed at mobilizing farming communities for agro-based income-generating projects. NGOs are tapped to bring the program to the grassroots, to their specific clientele. Likewise, NGOs are asked to identify viable projects, undertake project studies, and as-

sist farming groups in marketing their products. [22]

■ Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE)

The DOLE, through its Rural Workers Organization Education Division (RWOED), conducts seminars, conferences, and sectoral consultation-workshops with rural workers' organizations before the end of every year. Through its Bureau of Rural Workers, the Department also undertakes regular consultations with its partner NGOs in the area of policy formulation, program planning and development, monitoring and evaluation, and resource sharing.

■ Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)

An Outreach Desk has been established within the DENR. It is tasked with coordinating with NGOs, in keeping with the recommendation made during the Consultative Workshop on Conservation, Utilization, and Management of Natural Resources held from 16-18 March 1988. It is expected to facilitate the conceptualization, implementation, coordination, and monitoring of DENR-NGO projects.

■ Department of Health (DOH)

The DOH has begun setting up a mechanism for coordination with NGOs. Shortly before September 1988, a GO-NGO workshop was conducted where policy recommendations were generated to become the basis for the guidelines that will govern GO-NGO collaboration at the department level.

■ Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD)

The Department convenes yearly a National NGO-DSWD Consultation Conference (particularly with those NGOs that apply for licensing, accreditation, and certification for duty-free donations from abroad). In the last conference held in July 1988, it was strongly recommended that Provincial/Regional Councils of NGOs be organized as forums for discussions of sub-national issues and problems. It was

also recommended that more frequent dialogues be held to settle issues in program implementation.

■ Department of Trade and Industry (DTI)

The DTI has set up the Tulong sa Tao (TST) program. This taps NGOs as channels for department services and assistance to small businesses. It provides assistance in the form of loans which they can use as a funding base for livelihood lending programs in the communities they serve. In a sense, the NGOs will serve as a relending channel. The program also provides resource persons or business counsellors to train NGO beneficiaries and give expert technical advice on problems encountered by NGO-assisted enterprises. [23]

■ National Economic and Development Agency (NEDA)

NGO representatives are invited as members of various sectoral inter-agency planning subcommittees and adhoc committees, and as participants in the public hearing and consultations on the Medium Term Philippine Development Plan. In the past, private interests were largely represented by the private business sector. At present, private sector participation involves voluntary organizations, academic/research institutions, and cause-oriented groups.

Towards a Framework of PAS-NGO Collaboration

PAS-NGO collaboration, at the moment, is still in the exploratory stage. It may be approached from at least three perspectives or models of relationship.

■ NGOs as Partners of Government

This model assumes that both government and NGOs offer distinct competencies to the development process, that both serve a common public, and that one's competencies and resources complement and do not duplicate or contradict the other's.

In a democratic society, the government is the repository of legitimate authority and commands vast resources, in terms of manpower, technology, and funds, which could serve as powerful instruments for social progress. Government, however, operates through a certain type of bureaucracy, and its attention, resources, and priorities are subject to competing claims from various interest groups. These factors hinder its effectiveness in addressing the needs of the poor majority in society, and the basic requirements of development and thoroughgoing social reform.

The NGOs, while they may possess positive qualities that enable them to undertake development efforts which shall benefit the majority, are also beset with certain problems and constraints that limit their impact on society, particularly its weakest section. NGOs have very limited funds, manpower, and technological skills such that "their efforts and effects tend to be confined to small areas". [24] Further, while they have the "political will" to pursue much needed reforms, NGOs do not have the coercive machineries of State (i.e., police powers) to enforce its conception of the "public interest".

From the foregoing, a collaborative relationship, on the basis of partnership between government and NGOs is deemed necessary and useful. Within this framework of complementation and partnership, Phildhrra proposes the following set of guiding principles: [25]

1) *Autonomy of NGOs/POs.* NGOs/POs must be free from government domination, control, or interference in their operations even if they come under any mechanism of collaboration with government.

2) *Primacy of basic sectors.* People's organizations that represent the basic masses must play the primary role in development efforts that will affect them.

3) *NGOs/POs must be given a substantial role in decision-making.* NGOs/POs must be given adequate power to influence decision-making. Specifically, the POs must be given the prerogative to make final decisions on policies, programs, and projects that are intended to benefit the particular sector they represent. To attain this,

NGOs/POs must be given adequate representation in governing bodies.

4) *Wide representation of NGOs.* Local government officials must take stock of the NGOs operating in their locality and ensure the latter's representation in any council or policy-making and implementing body.

5) *Observance of democratic processes.* Policies and programs, before they are finally promulgated, must undergo a prior process of consultation with the affected peoples, sectors, or communities. Planning must be a bottom-up approach and must avoid the traditional top-down or technocratic approach.

This partnership option looks harmless but is difficult to undertake as there still seems to be a certain degree of strain in the relationship between NGOs and government.

Alfiler observes:

There seems to be mutual distrust caused largely by differences in NGOs' and government's assumptions and approaches in their methods of delivering social services, and a lack of appreciation of each other's policies, intentions, and long-run plans and responsibilities.

One of the sources of tension between government and some NGOs is the assumption made by the latter about community organization processes. Some NGOs explain poverty in rural communities as a manifestation of the people's sense of powerlessness. To counter this deprivation, people must, therefore, empower themselves through collective action, setting up people's organizations which they must manage themselves.

This philosophy of organizing is held suspect by some government sectors since it may imbue communities with a more politicized view of their environment and may cause them to regard government in a negative light. [26]

Alfiler hastens to qualify, though, that government does not distrust all NGOs nor do all NGOs refuse to work with government, and that a few NGOs do support government and some cooperate with the latter on a case-to-case basis.

■ NGOs as Conduits of Government Services

NEDA is humble enough to admit that the ability of government to provide services at the community level has been quite limited, and that NGOs possess the demonstrated capacity to work effectively

at that level. Government must, therefore, recognize the significant role that NGOs play in the process of government-sponsored development. [27]

NEDA further sees NGOs as a "valuable linkage" between "community-based groups from the bottom up and government and larger private bodies extending downward".

David notes that "there is a firm insistence (from government) that NGO initiatives be woven around programs designated by the government itself...that henceforth, (NGO) programs should reflect, as much as possible, the government's own system of priorities". [28]

The problem with this approach is that it limits the autonomy and capacity of NGOs, particularly the sectoral people's organizations, to play an essential role in policy-making, and in designing programs and projects. NGOs must not be made to serve as mere sounding boards for policy consultations; instead, their organic representation in the policy-making bodies must be made more substantial.

■ NGOs as Organs of Popular Self-organization

Morales [29] and Braid [30] propose a "devolution of government powers that should allow for a broader role for people's organizations in policy formulation, program planning, and project implementation."

In existing literature on Public Administration, the meaning of the decentralization process, as part of the continuing reorganization of the Philippine bureaucracy, is restricted to the following: a) devolution of powers from the national government to the local governments; b) deconcentration of authority and resources from the central offices of the sectoral departments to their regional offices, and the strengthening of the regional and provincial development councils; c) giving greater autonomy to the regional autonomous governments in Mindanao and the Cordillera; and, d) carrying out the policy of privatization by transferring ownership and operation of public enterprises to the business sector.



Manila Chronicle, 18 March 1990

"Devolution of government powers to people's organizations and service agencies" may mean divesting government agencies of certain functions (including the planning and control thereof) that can be more effectively undertaken by NGOs. If this strategic recommendation is adopted, we may come up with a dynamic combination of local government autonomy, private business autonomy, and people's autonomy.

At present, it appears that the dominant framework of relationship that the government and most NGOs are working on is the "partnership" model. Some government agencies still operate along the "conduit" model. The model of "self-government" is expected to encounter the greatest resistance. Local government officials who are elected by their constituencies may not take kindly to the further diminution of their already very limited powers. [31] The same is true for government bureaucrats. Students of public administration may also look at this policy proposal as further undermining the government's administrative capability to respond to public needs, threatened as it is now with the erosion of the people's confidence.

The evolving relationship between the government and NGOs must be viewed within the larger political, social, and economic context. It is not unfair to say that the government after EDSA has fallen short of popular expectations. The people

expected from this government bold and innovative reforms to alleviate poverty and social inequality, promote economic development, break the political and economic domination of the elite, promote human rights, evolve a more independent foreign policy, and establish good government.

Conclusion

The emergence of a popular government after the 1986 EDSA Uprising opened new opportunities for the government bureaucracy and the NGO community to establish a collaborative relationship towards people-oriented development, social reform, and good government.

The 1987 Philippine Constitution expressly recognizes the role of NGOs in the social development effort and encourages their participation in government processes. To assist NGOs in their work, various government incentives have been made available. Government line agencies are developing mechanisms to elicit their (NGOs) active participation in the evolution of policies, programs, projects, and service-delivery systems.

The further evolution of a positive relationship between government and NGOs, however, is currently endangered by a growing perception among the latter that government lacks the sincerity and political will to carry out reforms.

Notes

1. A case in point is the experience of the Bontocs and Kalingas in the Cordilleras who perceived the government as their enemy because it insisted on implementing the Chico Dam Project. See Karina C. David, "Community Organizing and People's Participation", *Lambataya*, Third and Fourth Quarters 1984 (Quezon City: Network for Participatory Development).

2. See also Randolph S. David, "The Role of International Development Agencies in the Philippines", *Partnership: The Philippine-Canadian NGO Consultation for the CIDA Country Review Program* (Manila: The Steering Committee of the Philippine-Canadian NGO Consultation, 1988), pp. 66-75.

3. Paulyn Sicam, "Giving Power to the People", *The Sunday Chronicle Magazine*, 28 August 1988.

4. "Preliminary Report", Symposium on "Development Alternatives: The Challenge for NGOs", held

from 11 to 13 March 1987 in London. Sponsored by World Development (Washington, D.C.) and the Overseas Development Institute (London).

5. NEDA, "Discussion Paper: Participation of Non-Government Organizations in the Development Process" (Manila: NEDA, September 1988), pp. 4-5.

6. Edna E. A. Co, "Non-Governmental Organizations: Metaphysics, Praxis, and Lessons on Development Work Towards a Participatory Public Service" (A Term paper on Public Administration 208, UP College of Public Administration, 10 October 1988), p. 6.

7. Rajesh Tandon, "Regulating NGOs: New Moves", *Lokayan Bulletin*, Vol. 4, Nos. 3-4 (Delhi: Lokayan, 1986), pp. 37-42.

8. See *Partnership*, op. cit.; Pildhrra, "A Proposal Providing the Principles and Mechanics for Institutionalizing the Participation of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and People's Organizations

(POs) in Government Policy Formulation and Plan Implementation"; and Ponciano Bennagen, "Towards a New Development Synergy" (notes taken of his oral presentation during the PSSC-RPP General Assembly on 28 October 1988).

9. Philthrra, op. cit..

10. NEDA, op. cit..

11. Ledevina V. Carino, "People's Power and Government: Towards the Long-Term Efficacy of a Revolutionary Tool", *Philippine Journal of Public Administration (PJPA)*, Vol. XXX No. 3, July 1986, p. 250. Carino says "...mass actions like the February (1986) events...may be the climax of a long process of political education, analysis, and conscientization. While unable at that time to produce the desired results, the earlier strikes, marches, and protest rallies of labor, peasants, professional and business groups were in a sense dress rehearsals for the massive proclamation of the Filipinos' commitment to democracy that stunned the world last February."

12. Tandon, op. cit..

13. NEDA, op. cit..

14. Tandon, op. cit..

15. Ernst Gohlert, "Strategic Organizations: Development Agencies of the Future?", *RUDOC News*, Vol. 2, No. 4, October-December 1987 (Bangkok: Thai Institute for Rural Development), pp. 1-3.

16. Randolph David, op. cit..

17. Liza Austria, "Non-government Agencies Tapped for Small Businesses", (Asian News and Features), in *Manila Bulletin*, 20 February 1988.

18. NEDA, op. cit..

19. Jorgen Lissner, *The Politics of Altruism: A Study of the Political Behavior of Voluntary Development Agencies* (Geneva: Lutheran World Federation, 1977), pp. 89-94.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 95.

21. NEDA, op. cit..

22. Austria, op. cit..

23. *Ibid.*

24. Ledevina V. Carino, cited in Ma. Concepcion Alfiler, "The Role of Non-governmental Organizations in the Health Sector of the Philippines", *PJPA* Vol. XXX No. 3 July 1986, p. 292.

25. Philthrra, op. cit..

26. Alfiler, pp. 291-292.

27. NEDA, op. cit..

28. Randolph David, op. cit..

29. Horacio Morales, Jr., "The Vicious Cycle of Underdevelopment and the Limits of the Aquino Charisma", (Manila: Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement, October 1987). Mimeo.

30. "Response of Dr. Florangel Rosario Braid, Chairperson, PSSC Executive Board", transcript of proceedings of PSSC-RPP General Assembly on 28 October 1988.

31. Romeo B. Ocampo, "Privatization, Public Choice, and Public Administration" (mimeo), paper presented at the Third National Conference on Public Administration, 28-30 September 1987.