

Ireoluwatomi Oloke, Preston Lindsay, Sean Byrne

The Intersection of Critical Emancipatory Peacebuilding and Social Enterprise: A Dialogical Approach to Social Entrepreneurship

The authentic inclusion of members of ethnic minority groups in positive peacebuilding projects allows such groups to develop economic, political, and social capacities essential to their achieving autonomy at the subnational level. This article presents an approach to peacebuilding based on a dialogical theory of action that ensures that the lowest local actors are authentically represented in peacebuilding projects. We develop a dialogical approach to social entrepreneurship that allows for the authentic inclusion of local actors alongside external actors and implementation of a social entrepreneurship project that allows for cooperative involvement. Upon evaluation and in consultation with local actors, the exact form of social entrepreneurship suitable for the community is determined and implemented.

Keywords: ethnic minority autonomy, social entrepreneurship, dialogical theory, positive peacebuilding.

Presek kritičnega emancipatornega utrjevanja miru in socialnega podjetništva: dialoški pristop h socialnemu podjetništvu

Avtentično vključevanje pripadnikov manjšinskih etničnih skupnosti v pozitivne projekte utrjevanja miru tem skupnostim omogoča razvoj ekonomskih, političnih in socialnih kapacitet, ki so bistvenega pomena za njihovo doseganje avtonomije na subnacionalni ravni. Članek predstavlja pristop h krepitvi miru, temelječ na dialoški teoriji akcije, ki tudi najnižjim lokalnim akterjem zagotavlja avtentično zastopanost v mirovnih projektih. Razvijamo dialoški pristop h socialnemu podjetništvu, ki omogoča avtentično vključevanje lokalnih akterjev skupaj z zunanjimi akterji in implementacijo projekta socialnega podjetništva, ki omogoča kooperativno delovanje. Evalvacija in posvetovanje z lokalnimi sodelavci omogočata implementacijo socialnega podjetništva, primerne za določeno skupnost.

Ključne besede: avtonomija etničnih manjšin, socialno podjetništvo, dialoška teorija, pozitivno utrjevanje miru.

Correspondence address: Ireoluwatomi Oloke, Peace and Conflict Studies, Arthur V. Mauro Centre for Peace and Justice, St. Pauls College, 70 Dysart Road, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2 Canada, e-mail: olokei@myumanitoba.ca; Preston Lindsay, Peace and Conflict Studies, Arthur V. Mauro Centre for Peace and Justice, St. Pauls College, 70 Dysart Road, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2 Canada, e-mail: rockyale@gmail.com; Sean Byrne, Peace and Conflict Studies, Arthur V. Mauro Centre for Peace and Justice, St. Pauls College, 70 Dysart Road, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB R3T 2N2 Canada, e-mail: sean.byrne@umanitoba.ca.

1. Introduction

This article develops a dialogical approach to social entrepreneurship that allows for the authentic inclusion of local actors alongside external actors during projects designed to create structures of positive peace (the absence of cultural, structural, and direct violence or the promotion of social justice) in multiethnic states. This initial statement brings to the fore three important concepts whose usage in this article must be clarified: local actors, authentic inclusion and dialogical approaches. The term local actors as used in this article refers to the members of minority ethnic groups who social entrepreneurship programs are targeted at. This means that external actors are usually the majority ethnic groups seeking to empower such minority ethnic groups, although external actors could also include other national or international actors willing to facilitate peaceful relations in multiethnic states. By using the phrase authentic inclusion, we mean the process in which local actors – representative of the ethnic minority group population – participate genuinely in the process of developing the context-specific social entrepreneurship approach. This is a process in which not just local elites are consulted, but concrete efforts are made to ensure that those the social entrepreneurship is targeted at are truly involved in its design. The idea of dialogical approaches mentioned throughout this study was adopted because it describes inclusive processes, in which external actors and local actors are authentically involved in the development and implementation of a project. Dialogical approaches allow external actors to provide assistance, while also empowering local actors who are typically left out of such processes to create context specific social entrepreneurship projects.

We argue in the next four sections that this dialogical approach is an important step towards ethnic minority autonomy because it allows minority ethnic groups, particularly those who constitute national minorities, to develop economic, political, and social capacities essential to their achieving autonomy at the subnational level. Ethnic minority autonomy in this study, refers to an approach carried out within a multiethnic state to promote social cohesion (improve inter-ethnic relations) by allowing minority groups to independently arrange their affairs at the subnational level (Bühlmann & Hänni 2012). The analysis of social entrepreneurship in this study is based on the assumption that the development of economic autonomy through a dialogical approach to social entrepreneurship is an important first step towards accomplishing this ethnic minority autonomy.

The article begins by outlining the dominant peacebuilding approach in the international system, namely liberal peacebuilding, and considers how its focus on economic liberalization can produce unequal economic relations that undermines peacebuilding and stimulates interethnic conflict. The second section considers how liberal peacebuilding approaches have fared in attempts to ensure local ownership of peacebuilding processes. This is contrasted with

the human security and dialogical approaches to ensuring the authentic involvement of local actors. The third section reviews the general idea of social entrepreneurship and provides examples of how social entrepreneurship projects have been carried out in the frames of potentially building positive peace or social justice. The final section applies the dialogical approach to peacebuilding to social entrepreneurship to develop a hybrid model that allows for the authentic inclusion of both local and external actors in peacebuilding projects.

2. (Neo)liberal Peacebuilding and Economic Inequality

The dominant peacebuilding approach adopted in the international system by Western states and international institutions is the liberal peace approach, which is alternatively described as the democratic peace or “neoliberal peace” (Chandler 2017). The approach is so described because it is based on the belief that the liberal democratic state with its primary features of democracy, human rights, security, individual freedom, and economic liberalization is the best way of organizing a state and is the solution to the challenges faced by post peace accord or conflict-prone states such as multi-ethnic states (Selby 2008, Pugh 2011). Hence, it is important to consider the underpinning ideals of liberal democracies, which are spread during international neoliberal peacebuilding endeavors.

There is a tense, antithetical relationship between capitalism and democracy, which are the economic and political systems that exist within liberal democracies. The contradiction between both systems is such that the political equality derived from the rights of citizens to participate in the democratic election of their leaders is virtually negated by the economic inequality that typically results from unfettered economic liberalization (Mac Ginty 2013). This condition is mostly a result of how the liberal democratic system emerged in Western states. Western liberal democracies started as liberal capitalist states, where it was the role of the government to protect the rights of the citizens, particularly the rights of the wealthy, propertied class to own their property (Louw 2010). This was a system of both economic and political inequality, and due to struggles by the working class and other external factors such as divisions within the ruling class, the right to vote was extended to non-propertied classes as nationalism was used in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century to prevent a united working class revolution in Europe (Macpherson 2011; Therborn 1977).

The democratic right to vote, at least in rhetoric, took away political inequality, yet the economic inequality inherent in capitalism remained, such that workers retain only a fraction of the profit made from the goods they produced and the owners of the means of production keep the rest (Elson 2000). This form of inequality is an essential part of capitalism considered to be critical

to economic development because it encourages innovation and productivity (Richmond 2014). In the neoliberal era, there has been an increased push for the continuation and intensification of this state of affairs. Neoliberalism is a worldview embodying both a political philosophy and an economic theory, based on the assumption that market economies produce roughly efficient economic outcomes when they are without government intervention (Palley 2012). It has been the dominating worldview in most western states since the emergence of the neoliberal era in the 1980s (Evans & Smith 2015; Mair 2013; Thiessen & Byrne 2017).

A primary neoliberal policy is the push for economic liberalization and unfettered markets, which is considered the best macroeconomic strategy because it supposedly allows for the development of factors critical to economic growth; competition, entrepreneurship, and innovation (Harvey 2005). Hence, neoliberalism is promoted by international development and financial institutions like the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, which ensure that weaker states adopt neoliberal policies like rolling back on the welfare state and privatizing public institutions before they are provided aid (Duffield 2010). These neoliberal policies are promoted within the liberal peace approach, which ignores the economic, class, and ethnic inequities that results from policies of economic neoliberalization. While the inequality produced by such policies may be mitigated in Western societies by the state's ability to provide substantial social welfare services to poorer citizens, this is not the case in poorer, multi-ethnic and/or potentially fragile states, where capitalist tensions may be inflamed by ethnic hatred (Selby 2008). When these neoliberal peace approaches ignore the inequality they produce, in which specific ethnic groups and classes benefit more than the others, this can hinder the peacebuilding process negatively, either by leading to the start of entirely new conflicts, or at the very least, resulting in citizens' apathy and disillusion with the system when they realize it only works in the favor of elites (Pugh 2011; Smith 2010; Selby 2008). Economic inequalities engendered by neoliberal ideals of unburdened economic liberalization have resulted in interethnic conflict in several states (Chua 2003). Such conflict is contrary to the claims of those organizations and institutions that support the export of neoliberal free market ideals and democracy across the world, based on the belief that the prosperity generated by this system will bring an end to all forms of intergroup conflict, including interethnic conflict (Chua 2003).

3. Authentic Inclusion of Local Actors in Peacebuilding

The previous section has considered how neoliberal peacebuilding approaches breed inequality or at the very least, ignore it. This section considers why the authentic inclusion of local actors is essential in building ethnic minority auto-

nomy; analyzes how neoliberal peacebuilding has fared in its attempts at inclusive peacebuilding; and contrast this with the human security and dialogical approaches to local ownership of peacebuilding projects. The purpose is to lay the background for the development of a dialogical model of social entrepreneurship that facilitates the authentic involvement of external and local actors. Often local resistance and resiliency is to counter the power politics of local elites that marginalize certain ethnic groups or other groups like LGBTQ2*, youth, women, and people living with disabilities as it is to resist Global North actors (Paffenholz 2015; Byrne, Mizzi & Hansen 2018).

Bühlmann and Hänni (2012) identify two distinct ways by which a multi-ethnic state can address concerns of decreasing social cohesion: (1) the inclusion of an ethnic minority into political institutions at the national level, by allowing them to gain representation in these institutions; and (2) the provision of autonomy to ethnic minorities, by encouraging them to independently arrange their affairs at the subnational level. They find the latter to be the most effective of the two approaches because it permits ethnic minorities who have gained autonomy within a given state to develop a sense of belonging within the state and be more invested in its survival. While the distinction between both approaches is important, they can also be brought together, such that the authentic inclusion of members of ethnic minorities within their societies (at the subnational level) can allow these groups to develop economic, political and social capacities essential to their achieving autonomy at the subnational level. Inclusion can be created by the way that social capital and cohesion is created within the ethnic minority groups, thereby improving their ability to independently arrange their affairs at the subnational level, that is, to gain autonomy. The combination of inclusion and autonomy is also capable of improving interethnic relations, in the same way that it improves intraethnic relations (Lijphart 1999).

4. The Liberal Peacebuilding Approach to Local Ownership

Liberal approaches to peacebuilding tend to focus on building state capacity by developing economic, political, and social institutions through top-down policies and processes (Richmond & Franks 2009). Peacebuilding of this form is typically carried out through state institutions, either because the government is considered neutral or simply because it is easier to function through previously existing institutions (Duffield 2010; Burke 2012). This is problematic particularly in situations where marginalized ethnic minorities are in conflict with the state, and aid organizations and other actors can only function to the extent that the governments allow them, leaving them to continue to perpetuate the marginalization of those who have already been diminished by the state (Burke 2012). This is the political corollary of neoliberal economic approaches

that emphasize free market ideals as the path to economic development, while ignoring those who have continued to suffer high levels of poverty in spite of the purported economic growth associated with neoliberal policies. Evidently, this affects the efficiency and sustainability of the peacebuilding process, as those who feel excluded from the process may try their best to sabotage the process and ensure its failure.

The nature of neoliberal peacebuilding is such that external actors who fund these projects such as the World Bank, western states and international NGO's tend to impose their ideas of what peacebuilding entails, with little or no input from local actors (Murtagh 2016; Galtung 1996). This usually results in the development of approaches that do not address the systemic issues that gave rise to conflict in the first place. This is not to say liberal peacebuilding approaches have not tried to create local ownership of peacebuilding projects. The renewed interest in the local has been described as the "local turn" in peacebuilding, in which external actors have indicated an interest in involving local actors based on the belief that local ownership, makes for sustainable peacebuilding projects (Kappler 2015). However, interventions that have sought to maintain local ownership in Rwanda (Hasselskog & Schierenbeck 2015), Guinea Bissau (Kohl 2015), Guinea (Arandel et al. 2015) and Afghanistan (Thiessen 2013) have failed to do so, and end up being controlled by elites at the international, national and local levels, with little or no input from the locals. The situation is the same, if not worse in cases where the involvement of the local is not an explicitly stated objective of the project like in Northern Ireland (Creary & Byrne 2014; Hyde & Byrne 2015; Senehi 2002, 2009; Kahn & Byrne 2016) or in South East Asia (Burke 2012). Hence, the so-called local turn in liberal international peacebuilding is considered to be mostly rhetoric, and external actors tend to dominate such processes with aid, technology, bureaucracy, rules, and knowledge.

Even in situations where external actors have attempted to revive traditional practices of the local community for use in peacebuilding, they are transformed in such a way that they become virtual creations of external peacebuilders and can no longer be considered traditional (Mac Ginty 2008). External actors barely have contact with local actors, and the uncommitted spaces, – neutral locations like hotels, supermarkets, and restaurants – where the expatriates mingle typically do not admit local actors and/or are priced beyond their reach (Kohl 2015). Yet, when such externally controlled peacebuilding projects fail, the blame is usually placed on local recipients (Galtung 1996; Paffenholz 2015).

5. Local Ownership in Theories of Human Security and Dialogical Action

A human security approach focuses on how an equitable and inclusive peace that identifies and addresses the specific needs of individual members of a

community can be developed (Newman 2011). Instead of the state-building method employed in liberal peacebuilding approaches, where the focus is on improving state capacity through policies of economic liberalization, and a human security approach suggests that, “public policy must be directed above all at enhancing the personal security, welfare, and dignity of individuals and communities” (Newman 2011, 1749). It seeks to ensure that the needs of all community members, and not just the elite, are met by reforming structures or institutions that promote “social and political exclusion, horizontal inequalities or structural violence,” which may lead to conflict if unchecked (Newman 2011, 1750). In sum, a human security approach considers issues of inequality, typically present in multiethnic societies where minority groups are clamoring for autonomy, and ensures peacebuilding produces equitable outcomes felt even at the bottom of society. A dialogical approach ensures that the process of carrying this out is inclusive.

Paulo Freire’s (1970) seminal text, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, is a useful resource that highlights the components of an inclusive theory of dialogical action, in which external actors and local actors are jointly involved in the development and implementation of a project. A dialogical process requires the authentic involvement of both parties to succeed. To avoid the pitfalls experienced by liberal peacebuilding attempts to create local ownership, the four elements of Freire’s (1970) dialogical theory – cooperation, unity for liberation, organization, and cultural synthesis – can serve as important guiding principles. This section presents an overview of these principles, and how they apply to the model of inclusive social entrepreneurship developed in this article is explored in subsequent sections. Cooperation is the coming together of both the external and internal actors in the process of addressing structural problems, and this must be done “with, and not for” the local actors, as their authentic involvement is critical to their gaining their humanity (Freire 1970, 48). This calls for a dialogue between both groups, where external actors initiate a process of reflection on the issues under consideration alongside the local actors in authentic ways, and by so doing gain their cooperation and commitment to the success of whatever project is subsequently carried out.

The second element of Freire’s dialogical theory is unity for liberation. The reflection upon the situation and the ways transformative change can be achieved must be carried out as a cooperative endeavor, and not in an individualistic manner (Freire 1970). The process of dialogue, reflection and action helps to bring together members of the community and creates a sense of solidarity amongst them that they are all actively involved in, and work together to bring meaningful change to their community. The third element of Freire’s dialogical theory is organization, which is a natural development of unity, as the external actors cooperate with the local actors to determine the best step to take. This involves doing what it takes to make sure the lowest local voices are heard such as frequenting uncommitted spaces where they can be found (e.g. Kohl 2015).

The fourth element of Freire's dialogical theory is cultural synthesis, where the perspectives from external and internal actors merged together to produce the best course of action (see Lederach's 1995 discussion of descriptive and elicitive peacebuilding approaches and the roles of insider-partials and outsider-impartials). Such an approach allows external actors to address material inequalities by providing funding and other assistance that stimulate existing local capacities and ensure "consensus, egalitarianism and community-oriented governance" (Richmond 2014, 461). Since it is a dialogical process, meaning that both the external and local actors are involved in this process of decisionmaking, suggestions on what needs to be done brought up by the external actors is not an imposition. A more emancipatory approach to peacebuilding is one that combines "international approaches and consensus for peace /.../ (with) localized dynamics for peace" (Richmond & Franks 2009, 183).

It has been suggested that emancipatory approaches such as these are too ambitious to fit into the current liberal peacebuilding agenda because the change they require is too drastic (e.g. Newman 2011; Lederach 1995). However, the fact that an approach is emancipatory does not mean that the kind of change it wishes to create is unattainable within the current liberal peacebuilding framework. Perhaps the meaning ascribed to emancipation can make the difference; emancipation in this context can be seen as the process where the individuals and communities which peacebuilding is targeted at are involved in the peacebuilding process in authentic ways (Paffenholz 2015). Elements of this can be seen in projects like the Theatre of Witness (Sepinuck 2014), the Forgiveness project (Cantacuzino 2016), and in work done with survivors of trauma (Denborough 2008) especially when multiethnic societies continue to suffer from "transgenerational trauma" (Volkan 1998) or continuing stress disorder from the legacy of colonization like residential schools, genocide, and famine (Byrne et al. 2018; Byrne 2017; Rahman et al. 2017; Clarke & Byrne 2017). While these projects are on a relatively smaller scale and are handled by only a few external actors, they show that success is possible.

The first step in carrying out any form of dialogical peacebuilding is a form of evaluation described by Freire (1970) as thematic investigation (peace inventory, and a conflict assessment), which is carried out by external actors with local actors, to understand the specifics of the situation in the recipient communities. This investigation allows the external actors to understand the situation from the people's perspective, and to identify the community's capacities, which can be built upon (Smith 2010). This does not mean investigators go in blind and donors do not know what they are funding. Prior research by external actors may have revealed some specific concerns/themes, the thematic investigation carried out with the local actors will reveal if this is an accurate representation of their challenges, and themes can be added and/or removed as necessary (e.g. Richmond 2010). Guidelines for carrying out such an extensive evaluation

of local experiences through ethnographic research has been documented elsewhere (e.g. Millar 2014). Determining the specific people who constitute local actors is also important, and it is important to define exactly whom the local is, to ensure that the process is not coopted by national or even local elites (Hasselskog & Schierenbeck 2015; Paffenholz 2015). One-way to do this is to define the local as the “specific population to which the project itself claims to provide experiences” (Millar 2014, 82).

6. Positive Peacebuilding through Social Entrepreneurships

This section examines the concept and practice of social entrepreneurship and determines the extent to which it allows for the form of authentic inclusion of the community members discussed above. The social economy is made up of organizations engaged in business activities in order to benefit society, and includes various types of organizations such as cooperatives, social enterprises, and other such triple-bottom-line organizations (Murtagh 2016). Although the structures of these organizations that engage in business for a social purpose varies considerably, there are general principles deemed necessary for these organizations to adhere to. Besides making profit, they should seek to ensure that their activities have positive effects on people and on the environment, a concept known as the “triple-bottom-line” (Bratt 2012). In addition to this concern for people, planet, and profit, is purpose – these organizations should “care for, support and develop the people who are associated with it” including employees, volunteers, beneficiaries and the local community at large (Pearce 2009, 24). It is by doing this that they develop into quadruple-bottom-line organizations.

Social entrepreneurship is a form of organization that exists in the social economy. David Bornstein defines social entrepreneurship as,

/.../ [the] process by which citizens build or transform institutions to advance solutions to social problems, such as poverty, illness, illiteracy, environmental destruction, human rights abuses and corruption, in order to make life better for many /.../ [and also provide environments] where entrepreneurs can improve the productive capacity of society and provide the ‘creative destruction’ that propels economic change (Bornstein 2010, 1).

Social entrepreneurs deploy innovative means to “address, mostly with extraordinary success, seemingly unsolvable social problems. They often trigger a bottom-up process, a sort of chain of change, involving and empowering groups or societies as a whole” (Praszkier & Nowak 2011, 503). The empowering, bottom-up feature of social entrepreneurship is one that makes it particularly

suited to the approach promoted in this study that encourages the inclusion of all local actors. Social entrepreneurship provides various opportunities for “vulnerable communities and individuals” to be involved in the process of designing approaches to address the underlying injustice and inequities in their society, such as “cooperative methods and communication, the pooling of resources and physical labor” (Bratberg 2013, 43).

In spite of this inclusive feature of social entrepreneurship, some literature on the subject tends to veer on the individualistic neoliberal side, positioning social entrepreneurs as “passionate and creative individuals” capable of “solving ‘the unsolvable’” structural problems of society (Praszkier et al. 2010, 155). This is likely because this literature is grounded in western Global North frames, and is more focused on recounting the individual experiences of handpicked social entrepreneurs, rather than focusing on the team and community required to accomplish the lauded endeavors (Battle-Anderson & Dees 2006). The problem with individualist accounts of social entrepreneurship is that they can and often do become tools of exclusion; disenfranchising those who may seem not to possess the special skills required of successful social entrepreneurs. This also raises the concern of distinguishing between social entrepreneurship and social enterprise, in which the major difference between the two forms of organization seems to be that the former regards innovation and creativity as essential to addressing social problems. Is innovation essential to creating structural changes in society? While this discussion is beyond the scope of this article, we suggest that social entrepreneurship does not have to be, and indeed should not be positioned as the individualist driven organizations as it tends to be shown as (Praszkier & Nowak 2011; Praszkier et al. 2010). This intellectual honesty is to avoid the trap of neoliberalism, where economic inequality is explained away on the premise of people earning what they morally deserve.

Alvord et al. (2004) have categorized approaches to social entrepreneurship into three groups. They include: (1) the capacity building approach, which involves identifying local actors’ capacity and building on these capacities to solve their problems, for e.g. village groups formed by BRAC; (2) the package dissemination approach, which involves distributing new products (innovations) required by marginalized groups, for e.g. the provision of microcredit loans to individuals for starting or maintaining small-business by Grameen Bank in Bangladesh; and (3) the movement approach, which involves “building a movement that mobilizes grassroots alliances to challenge abusive elites or institutions”, for e.g. the Self-Employed Women Association’s campaigns against police abuse of vendors (Alvord et al. 2004, 270).

The package delivery approach seems best suited to dialogical theory that allows for the authentic involvement of both external and local actors, given the example of microfinance, in which external actors provide small loans to local actors to engage in income generating activities. However, there are very real

concerns with microfinance that need to be explored. International financial institutions (IFIs) and development agencies have championed microfinance since the 1980s as the best way to reduce “poverty and promoting local economic and social development” in weaker countries (Bateman 2008, 246). It is not surprising that the rise of microfinance coincided with the neoliberal era in the 1980s, and was promoted by these institutions; given that its main argument was that if persons were given a little shove (like small loans) in a free market, hardworking, motivated, and gifted individual entrepreneurs would be rewarded by the market (Giroux & Giroux 2008; Palley 2012).

What this has looked like in practice, in places like Bangladesh and South Eastern Europe in the 1980s, was that small loans were given to several individuals to start similar businesses, leading to a proliferation of micro-enterprises within each sector. This happened in the dairy sector in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where “thousands of poor individuals were encouraged to access microfinance in order to purchase one or two cows and generate a little additional income from the sale of raw milk” (Bateman 2008, 251). Not only was this system unsustainable, in the way that it fragmented the number of available business and income between new and existing micro-enterprises, it actively prevented advancement and progress within sectors, as potentially efficient and already existing business lost a lot of their business (Bateman 2008) because the intra-sector fragmentation led to division amongst those doing the same business. It also hindered the building and development of much-needed social capital that would have been useful in strengthening the sector and creating social cohesion (Pearce 2009). Another outcome, both in Southeastern Europe and Bangladesh was that many who had taken out the loans were worse off and became indebted to microfinance banks either because their businesses failed, like in South-Eastern Europe, or they spent their loans on consumption and income generation like in Bangladesh (Davis 2007; Bateman 2008).

Given these concerns with microfinance, a capacity building approach that is focused on improving local actors’ capacity seems to be a more suitable approach that allows community members to be authentically included in the planning and implementation of economic projects (e.g. Lederach 1997). This approach very much resembles cooperatives, another form of organization in the social economy. Cooperatives possess some features that can help to mitigate the aforementioned individualism that can emerge in social entrepreneurship projects. They allow the form of authentic involvement essential to carrying out this approach and assessed in the following sections. Community based enterprises, also known as cooperatives, are a “range of organizations, which sought to tackle social issues by engaging in trade and which were owned and controlled by the community or the constituency they sought to benefit” (Pearce 2009, 29).

The integrated cooperative financial model successfully employed in regions of Italy, Portugal, Spain and Ireland as part of the post-World War II reconstruction period provides insights into some advantages a cooperative model of social entrepreneurship may have over a more individualistic one like micro-finance. The cooperative financial organizations in this model were focused on supporting cooperative ventures because it was believed that they possessed the best organizational structure suitable for a post-peace accord society (Bateman 2007). Not only did they allow for an equitable distribution of earnings and social benefits, they also allowed people to be authentically included in the economic process and gain a sense of participation that is “hugely important in establishing a culture of democracy, equity, tolerance, and cooperation outside of the cooperative” (Bateman 2007, 44).

Despite the advantages of cooperatives, there has been a shift away from more cooperative and community based social enterprises, towards privately run organizations in the neoliberal era (Pearce 2009). In spite of this, many community owned social entrepreneurship projects that do not involve external actors function virtually as cooperatives. One such locally owned social entrepreneurship project is Peace Basket, established soon after the Rwandan genocide of 1994, in which the Hutu majority ethnic group sought to eliminate all members of the Tutsi minority ethnic group to gain state power (Bratberg 2013). Polarization between both ethnic groups remained after the genocide, and Peace Basket was established as a poverty alleviation process where extremely poor villagers came together to make and sell traditional weaving baskets (Bratberg 2013). Peace Basket drew members from the Twa, Tutsi, and Hutu ethnic groups, who began building peaceful relationships with those previously considered enemies in the process of making baskets (Sentama 2017). Peace Baskets have not only made visible social impacts as peace symbols, they have also found economic success in domestic and international markets, although there is still room for more productivity (Shange 2015).

The concept of positive peace (social justice) is critical to this discussion because communities undergoing social entrepreneurship, or attempting to build ethnic minority autonomy, have not necessarily undergone violent conflict. Unlike negative peace, which involves bringing an end to direct violence, positive peace is constructed when underlying invisible and hidden structural problems that can create conflict are addressed through the development of stable institutions and conditions that engender peaceful relations (Galtung & Jacobsen 2000). The field of economic peace is interested in promoting positive peace through, “the economic study and design of political, economic, and cultural institutions, their interrelations, and their policies to prevent, mitigate, or resolve any type of latent or actual violence or other destructive conflict within and between societies” (Brauer & Caruso 2013, 151–152). The example of Peace Basket in Rwanda shows how social entrepreneurship can address

tangible economic issues, while also tackling problematic relationships between members of different ethnic groups, which if left unchecked, could result in a resurgence of violent ethnic conflict. By building social capital – “enhancing trust and preparedness for cooperation” – through a gradual process, social entrepreneurship aids in the creation of an environment conducive to peace (Praszkier & Nowak 2011, 502).

7. Dialogical Method of Social Entrepreneurship: A Step Towards Minority Autonomy

The foregoing discussion has suggested that the authentic inclusion of local actors (members of ethnic minorities) is a way of building the social capital and cohesiveness necessary for ethnic minority autonomy and also improving relations between minority and majority ethnic groups. A general model of dialogical action that allows for the authentic participation of both internal and external actors, with a human security approach to peacebuilding, designed to address the everyday needs of individuals and communities, was explored. A more inclusive and participatory approach to social entrepreneurship can be outlined based on this model. The intent is to create an emancipatory approach to peacebuilding that allows both external and local approaches towards peacebuilding to be represented (Richmond & Franks 2009). In the context of social entrepreneurship, the overarching social enterprise model designed to facilitate cooperative involvement would be the approach promulgated by external actors, and upon consultation with local actors, this could be adapted to the local context.

External actors could be from the national and/or international levels, because as Hasselskog & Schierenbeck (2015) show, national ownership is not necessarily the same as local ownership. These external actors hold a substantial amount of the responsibility of ensuring authentic local involvement in such a process, since they will usually control the resources required for carrying out projects. Since the purpose of this process is to achieve ethnic minority autonomy, this suggests that achieving this autonomy may require the assistance of outside donors to be accomplished. This may seem counterintuitive; even in the field of social entrepreneurship reliance on external assistance is generally considered detrimental to the entrepreneur’s autonomy and success. Instead, earned income, the profit from selling goods and services is usually considered the best form of revenue for social entrepreneurs as the end goal because it allows them to be truly independent to accomplish their social purposes (e.g. Boschee & McClurg 2003). Battle-Anderson and Dees have argued, however, that the view taken on donations as an impediment to achieving self-sufficiency may be unfounded, as even businesses surviving on earned income are never fully independent; they must depend on buyers to purchase their goods or services,

“suppliers for key inputs, on labor markets for talent, and often on bankers or investors for capital” (Battle-Anderson & Dees 2006, 147). Generally speaking, however, in order to be labeled as a social enterprise, the organization must be at least organizationally structured so as to generate financially sustainable practices (Schwab & Milligan 2015).

Funding from external actors such as banks, individual angel investors, governmental grants, and private companies can and are frequently used to stabilize the economic state of a community start-up, or a business, providing a necessary springboard for such an entity to become self-sufficient. For example, this has been realized in practice with BRAC, an organization in Bangladesh that engages in development activities, which has attained self-sufficiency in the sense that its earnings are greater than the donations it receives. While it was solely dependent on grants when it was launched, the organization’s 2016 report shows that only 17.4 per cent of BRAC’s total income was from donor grants (BRAC 2017). A similar situation was observed in the integrated cooperative system adopted as part of peacebuilding in post-war regions of Italy and Spain (Mondragon corporation), where cooperative enterprises that started out reliant on external funding became so self-sufficient that they could develop a fund to assist the development of new cooperatives (Bateman 2007). These examples suggest that even if social enterprises, and the ethnic minorities employing them as a route to achieving autonomy take donations in from development assistance at first, this will not prevent them from ultimately gaining self-sufficiency.

Having established that external assistance is not a barrier, and is often a necessary step to achieving autonomy, a dialogical approach to social entrepreneurship can represent, “a site of economic and political action to rework, restructure, and even remove the oppressive effects of neoliberalism” (Murtagh 2016, 120). This is best accomplished in a situation where local actors are able to have a say in how projects can be designed in ways that are beneficial to the community and its members, and not just in allowing the free market markets and local elites to determine economic and political processes. Battle-Anderson and Dees (2006) have noted that social enterprises should not be restricted to any specific form of organization, and each project should choose the form best suited to their social purpose. Hence, at least for the purpose of creating an inclusive process to accomplish ethnic minority autonomy, a dialogical approach to social entrepreneurship that involves the authentic involvement of internal and external actors seems useful.

The process of determining context-specific social entrepreneurship based on the interactions of local actors with external actors follows the dialogical approach. It also follows best-practices for social enterprise market research (Homan 2011). For example, interviews and focus groups conducted with local actors representing various subsets of the society can be used to elicit concrete suggestions on what programs the social entrepreneurship program should be

centred on, and surveys can be used to confirm that these views are shared by other members of the community and do not represent only the experiences of a select few. In such a dialogical approach, the general measures of social entrepreneurship are amended to address local needs and create appropriate structures or institutions in that context.

The four elements of Freire's (1970) dialogical theory – cooperation, unity for liberation, organization and cultural synthesis – highlighted earlier are also reflected in the dialogical approach to social entrepreneurship. This principle of cooperation between the external and local actors is reflected; external actors come to the local actors with a general idea of social entrepreneurship and how it can help to accomplish equitable economic development and create social capital if appropriately designed to suit their context. This cooperative endeavor creates internal unity for liberation among the members of the ethnic minority, a process that favors the goal of achieving minority autonomy. The principle of organization allows local voices to be authentically included, but is also mediated by external actors who bring the financial resources and professional understanding of how the overarching social entrepreneurship model works to the local group. As Freire puts it, "the fact that the leaders (external actors) do not have the right to arbitrarily impose their word does not mean that they must take a liberalist position, which would encourage license among the people (local actors)" (Freire 1970, 178). Cultural synthesis, which seeks to bring together the views of both external and local actors, is the essence of this model. It is a synthesis of the generally established way of doing social entrepreneurship with context and culture specific values and methods.

Organizations that seek to accomplish social purposes, like social enterprises, are already associated with the concept of subsidiarity; the idea that those at the bottom of society should be involved in making decisions that affect their communities, and that, "power is only delegated upwards when there is a clear benefit from doing so and when the community is agreed it is for the best" (Pearce 2009, 25). Following a dialogical approach may best serve as the most stable and concrete path by which social enterprises, particularly those that are externally funded, can fulfill the principle of subsidiarity. The local ownership of positive peacebuilding that emerges from this allows for a sustainable peace not only within ethnic minorities, but in their relationships with other ethnic groups at the national and international level because people are interested in seeing the success of peace processes they were part of.

One of the challenges encountered in attempts to ensure local ownership in liberal peacebuilding approaches is that because intervention by external actors is not "value-free /.../ it is difficult to propose a way forward for international peacebuilding because it will always be a form of intervention by powerful actors in weaker societies" (Newman 2011, 1747). A dialogical approach to social entrepreneurship does not call for the external actors to suspend their values or

ideas of what social entrepreneurship looks like, or of the goals it should seek to accomplish. It is unrealistic to think that donors would give economic resources to projects that they know nothing about, and which will be determined entirely by the recipients. Instead, the idea inherent in the word dialogical is that there is a general understanding or framework of what social entrepreneurship looks like, and this is combined with the local context specific intervention. For example, Praszkie et al. (2010) argue that context specific social entrepreneurship approaches should be rooted in the culture to be sustainable. However, everyday traditional practices are not inherently good and should be rigorously examined, and if they are not feasible, communities are well capable of adapting to new approaches (Mac Ginty 2008).

8. Conclusion

Liberal peacebuilding approaches that have sought to ensure local ownership of peacebuilding processes, whether in theory or in practice, have faced various challenges (Paffenholz 2015). A dialogical approach to social entrepreneurship provides a means by which social enterprise projects can allow for the authentic inclusion of local actors, while also allowing external actors to have their inputs in the development of such projects. Inclusion of members of minority ethnic groups in such projects allows for the development of economic, political, and social capacities needed to achieve autonomy at the subnational level. Such inclusion can be implemented using simple tools like surveys, interviews, and focus groups to elicit suggestions from local actors representing various subsets of the society on the specific programs the social entrepreneurship project should focus on. This can then develop into more context specific forms of inclusion.

The simplistic presentation of such a dialogical model of social entrepreneurship, nonetheless, indicates that there are potential challenges that would arise in the application of such an approach. One such challenge is that the power to allow the approach to truly involve local actors in authentic ways lies substantially with the external actors because they provide most of the financial resources and expertise. Also, given its set up, it may take a substantial amount of time and patience for the model to begin to show results, and external actors like aid organizations or national bureaucrats may not have these in abundance. Another related issue involves creating efficient strategies to ensure that local, and where applicable, national elites do not take control of the process, excluding those at the bottom of society. Nonetheless, external actors who embrace these challenges and desire to see the sustainable peace that comes with local ownership of peacebuilding projects, may be willing to give the necessary time and energies to ensure the success of a dialogical approach to social entrepreneurship, or any other form of positive peacebuilding (Özerdem 2014). This is especially so for national governments in multi-ethnic states seeking to regain the loyalty of

minority ethnic groups by allowing them to independently arrange their affairs at the subnational level.

References

- Alvord, S. H., Brown, L. D. & Letts, C. W., 2004. Social Entrepreneurship and Societal Transformation: An Exploratory Study. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 40 (3), 260–282.
- Arandel, C., Brinkerhoff, D. & Bell, M., 2015. Reducing Fragility through Strengthening Local Governance in Guinea. *Third World Quarterly* 36 (5), 985–1006.
- Bateman, M., 2007. Financial Cooperatives for Sustainable Local Economic and Social Development. *Small Enterprise Development* 18 (1), 37–49.
- Bateman, M., 2008. Microfinance and Borderlands: Impacts of “Local Neoliberalism”. In M. Pugh & M. Turner (eds.) *Whose Peace? Critical Perspectives on the Political Economy of Peacebuilding*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 245–265.
- Battle-Anderson, B. & Dees, J., 2006. Rhetoric, Reality, and Research: Building a Solid Foundation for the Practice of Social Entrepreneurship. In A. Nicholls (ed.) *Social Entrepreneurship: New Models of Sustainable Social Change*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 144–168.
- Bornstein, D., & Davis, S., 2010. *Social Entrepreneurship: What Everyone Needs to Know*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Boschee, J. & McClurg, J., 2003. *Toward a Better Understanding of Social Entrepreneurship: Some Important Distinctions*. Institute for Social Entrepreneurs, Minnesota.
- BRAC – BRAC centre, 2017. 2016 Report, <http://www.brac.net/annual-reports-and-publications> (accessed September 2018).
- Bratberg, S., 2013. Peace-Building through Social Entrepreneurship in Post-Genocide Rwanda: The Case of Peace Basket Cooperative, http://www.academia.edu/5809735/Peace-building_through_Social_Entrepreneurship_in_post-genocide_Rwanda_The_case_of_Peace_basket (accessed September 2018).
- Bratt, R., 2012. The Quadruple Bottom Line and Nonprofit Housing Organizations in the United States. *Housing Studies* 27 (4), 438–456.
- Brauer, J. & Caruso, R., 2013. Economists and Peacebuilding. In R. Mac Ginty (ed.) *Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding*. Taylor & Francis Group, London, 147–158.
- Bühlmann, M. & Hänni, M., 2012. Creating a “We-Feeling” in Heterogeneous Nations: A Cross-Country Investigation of the Impact of Inclusion and Autonomy on the National Pride of Ethnic Minorities. *Comparative Sociology* 11 (3), 325–353.
- Burke, A., 2012. Hollow Words: Foreign Aid and Peacebuilding in Peripheral Conflicts. *Asian Affairs* 39 (4), 181–201.
- Byrne, S., 2017. The Legacy of Colonialism Among Indigenous Peoples: Destructive Outcomes, Healing and Reconciliatory Potentials. *Peace Research: Canadian Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies* 49 (2), 5–13.
- Byrne, S., Clarke, M. A. & Rahman, A., 2018. Colonialism and Peace and Conflict Studies. *Peace and Conflict Studies* 25 (1), 1–21.
- Byrne, S., Mizzi, R. & Hansen, N., 2018. Living in a Liminal Peace: Where is the Social Justice for LGBTQ and Disability Communities Living in Post Peace Accord Northern Ireland? *Journal for Peace and Justice Studies* 27 (1), 24–52.
- Cantacuzino, M., 2016. *Forgiveness Project: Stories for a Vengeful Age*. Jessica Kingsley, London.
- Chandler, D., 2017. *Peacebuilding: The Twenty Years’ Crisis, 1997–2017*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.

- Chua, A., 2003. *World on Fire: How Exporting Free Market Democracy Breeds Ethnic Hatred and Global Instability*. Doubleday, New York.
- Clarke, M. A. & Byrne, S., 2017. The Three R's: Resistance, Resilience and Reconciliation in Ireland and Canada. *Peace Research: Canadian Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies* 49 (2), 105–132.
- Creary, P. & Byrne, S., 2014. Peace with Strings Attached: Exploring Reflections of Structure and Agency in Northern Ireland Peacebuilding Funding. *Peacebuilding* 2 (1), 64–82.
- Davis, P., 2007. *Discussions Among the Poor: Exploring Poverty Dynamics with Focus Groups in Bangladesh*. Chronic Poverty Research Centre Working Paper 84. Department of Economics and International Development, University of Bath.
- Denborough, D., 2008. *Collective Narrative Practice: Responding to Individuals, Groups, and Communities Who Have Experienced Trauma*. Dulwich Centre, Adelaide.
- Duffield, M., 2010. The Liberal Way of Development and the Development – Security Impasse: Exploring the Global Life-Chance Divide. *Security Dialogue* 41 (1), 53–76.
- Elson, D., 2000. Socialized Markets, not Market Socialism. *Socialist Register* 36, 67–85.
- Evans, B. M. & Smith, C. W., 2015. *Transforming Provincial Politics: The Political Economy of Canada's Provinces and Territories in the Neoliberal Era*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Freire, P., 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. 30th Anniversary Edition. Continuum, New York.
- Galtung, J. & Jacobsen, C., 2000. *Searching for Peace: The Road to TRANSCEND*. Pluto Press, London.
- Galtung, J., 1996. *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilization*. SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks.
- Giroux, H. & Giroux, S., 2008. Challenging Neoliberalism's New World Order: The Promise of Critical Pedagogy. In N. Denzin, Y. Lincoln & L. Smith (eds.) *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*. SAGE Publications, Thousand Oaks, 181–190.
- Harvey, D., 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hasselskog, M. & Schierenbeck, I., 2015. National Policy in Local Practice: The Case of Rwanda. *Third World Quarterly* 36 (5), 950–966.
- Homan, M., 2011. *Promoting Community Change: Making it Happen in the Real World*. Nelson Education, Toronto.
- Hyde, J. & Byrne, S., 2015. The International Fund for Ireland and the European Union Peace III Fund: The Impact of Reconciliation and Peacebuilding in Northern Ireland and the Border Area. *International Journal of Conflict Engagement and Resolution* 3 (2), 93–115.
- Kappler, S., 2015. The Dynamic Local: Delocalisation and (Re-)Localisation in the Search for Peacebuilding Identity. *Third World Quarterly* 36 (5), 875–889.
- Kohl, C., 2015. Diverging Expectations and Perceptions of Peacebuilding? Local Owners' and External Actors' Interactions in Guinea-Bissau's Security Sector Reforms. *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 9 (3), 334–352.
- Lederach, J. P., 1995. *Preparing for Peace: Conflict Transformation Across Societies*. Syracuse University Press, New York.
- Lederach, J. P., 1997. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. United States Institute of Peace Press, Washington.
- Lijphart, A. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in 36 Countries*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Louw, E., 2010. *The Media and Political Process*. SAGE Publications, London.
- Mac Ginty, R. (ed.), 2013. *Routledge Handbook of Peacebuilding*. Routledge, Abingdon.

- Mac Ginty, R., 2008. Indigenous Peacemaking Versus the Liberal Peace. *Cooperation and Conflict* 43 (2), 139–163.
- Macpherson, C., 2011. *The Real World of Democracy*. House of Anansi Press, New York.
- Mair, P., 2013. *Ruling the Void: The Hollowing of Western Democracy*. Verso, London.
- Millar, G., 2014. *An Ethnographic Approach to Peacebuilding: Understanding Local Experiences in Transitional States*. Taylor & Francis Group, London.
- Murtagh, B., 2016. Economics: Neoliberal Peace and the Politics of Social Economics. In O. P. Richmond, S. Pogodda & J. Ramovic (eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Disciplinary and Regional Approaches to Peace*. Springer, Berlin, 110–122.
- Newman, E., 2011. A Human Security Peace-Building Agenda. *Third World Quarterly* 32 (10), 1737–1756.
- Özerdem, A., 2014. *Local Ownership in International Peacebuilding*. Routledge, Abingdom.
- Paffenholz, T., 2015. Unpacking the Local Turn in Peacebuilding: A Critical Assessment Towards an Agenda for Future Research. *Third World Quarterly* 36 (5), 857–874.
- Palley, T., 2012. *From Financial Crisis to Stagnation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Pearce, J., 2009. Social Economy: Engaging as a Third System? In A. Amin (ed.) *The Social Economy: International Perspectives on Economic Solidarity*. Zed Books, London, 22–33.
- Praszkier, R. & Nowak, A., 2011. Social Entrepreneurship: Paving the Way for Peace. In S. Nan, Z. Mampilly & A. Bartoli (eds.) *Peacemaking: From Practice to Theory (Volume 2)*. Praeger Security International, Santa Barbara, 502–510.
- Praszkier, R., Nowak, A. & Coleman, P. T., 2010. Social Entrepreneurs and Constructive Change: The Wisdom of Circumventing Conflict. *Peace and Conflict* 16 (2), 153–174.
- Pugh, M., 2011. Local Agency and Political Economies of Peacebuilding. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism* 11 (2), 308–320.
- Rahman, A., Clarke, M. A. & Byrne, S., 2017. The Art of Breaking People Down: The British Colonial Model in Ireland and Canada. *Peace Research: Canadian Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies* 49 (2), 15–38.
- Richmond, O. P. & Franks, J., 2009. *Liberal Peace Transitions: Between Statebuilding and Peacebuilding*. Edinburgh University Press, Edinburgh.
- Richmond, O. P. (ed.), 2010. *Palgrave Advances in Peacebuilding: Critical Developments and Approaches*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Richmond, O. P., 2014. The Impact of Socio-Economic Inequality on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding. *Civil Wars* 16 (4), 449–467.
- Schwab, H., & Milligan, K., 2015. Explainer: What is a Social Entrepreneur? *World Economic Forum*, 18 December 2018, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2015/12/explainer-what-is-a-social-entrepreneur/> (accessed September 2018).
- Selby, J., 2008. The Political Economy of Peace Processes. In M. Pugh, N. Cooper & M. Turner (eds.) *Whose Peace? Critical Perspectives on the Political Economy of Peacebuilding*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 11–29.
- Senehi, J., 2002. Constructive Storytelling: A Peace Process. *Peace and Conflict Studies* 9 (2), 41–63.
- Senehi, J., 2009. The Role of Constructive Transcultural Storytelling in Ethnopolitical Conflict Transformation in Northern Ireland. In J. Carter, G. Irani & V. Volkan (eds.) *Regional and Ethnic Conflicts: Perspectives from the Front Lines*. Prentice Hall, New York, 226–236.
- Sentama, E., 2017. Social Cohesion through Cooperative Contact: A Theoretical Perspective. *Journal of African Conflicts and Peace Studies* 3 (2), 1–15.
- Sepinuck, T., 2014. *Theatre of Witness: Finding the Medicine in Stories of Suffering, Transformation, and Peace*. Jessica Kingsley, London.

- Shange, J., 2015. Handicraft Cooperatives Movement in Rwanda: The Boat Has to Stay Afloat before it Takes on any Passengers. *Donnish Journal of African Studies and Development* 1 (3), 15–20.
- Smith, J., 2010. Economic Globalization and Strategic Peacebuilding. In D. Philpott & G. Powers (eds.) *Strategies of Peace Transforming Conflict in a Violent World*. Oxford University Press, New York, 247–279.
- Therborn, G., 1977. The Rule of Capital and the Rise of Democracy. *New Left Review* 103, 3–41.
- Thiessen, C. & Byrne, S., 2017. Proceed with Caution: Research Production and Uptake in Conflict-Affected Countries. *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development* 13 (1), 1–15.
- Thiessen, C., 2013. *Local Ownership of Peacebuilding in Afghanistan: Shouldering Responsibility for Sustainable Peace and Development*. Lexington Books, Lanham.
- Volkan, V., 1998. *Bloodlines: From Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism*. Westview Press, Boulder.