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Abstract

This research explored the hypothesis that ‘education should be an integral part of the first phase of humanitarian assistance’. A group of twenty-four participants were interviewed, comprised of education, health and also non-technical advisers in six international INGOs, the United Nations, representatives from five major donors and three global bodies, including the Global Education Cluster, the Inter Agency Network for Education in Emergencies and one education partnership body. Using a theoretical framework of governmentality, the findings demonstrated that while education is believed to be an important part of response, saving lives takes precedence over education in the early phase of humanitarian assistance. Through the rationality that justifies saving lives and the technologies that enables the system to do so, education becomes excluded, obscured, obstructed or delayed in humanitarian assistance, affecting its funding opportunities and reproducing the ‘truths’ that the focus of assistance must be on saving lives. The research concludes that without education, human beings are viewed as a biological entity and such rationality produces subjects, in this case children, who experience life with a bare existence.
Using the theoretical framework of governmentality, this research explores the hypothesis that ‘education should be an integral part of the first phase of humanitarian assistance’. While education is a recognized part of the humanitarian system - for example, it is a member of the Global Education Cluster and there exists a set of globally defined standards and guidelines for preparedness, response and recovery from humanitarian disasters, education consistently receives limited humanitarian funding. This dissertation seeks to explore therefore the perceptions of education in emergencies amongst donors, INGO advisers from the education and health sectors, the Global Education Cluster, the Inter Agency Network for Education in Emergencies and one education partnership body. In exploring whether education should be an integral part of humanitarian response, it seeks an explanation for the limited levels of funding it receives.

An analytics of governmentality provides an appropriate framework for understanding the humanitarian assistance given that regimes of practice have the population as their target; they endeavor to shape the behaviour of the collective and individuals according to their end goals and, given that any regime aims to ‘increase the longevity, health, prosperity and happiness of populations’ (Inda, 2005: 6, Smith, 2008: 13). The discussion of this dissertation is therefore framed around the three analytical themes of governmentality.
This chapter aims to review the key literature in education in emergencies. It also provides a brief review of governmentality, the theoretical view in which this dissertation is framed.

**Governmentality**

Foucault was the first to develop the concept of governmentality which has provided new ways for thinking about government and power in society. Interest in the theory grew during the 1970’s and 1980’s through the dissatisfaction with the Marxist critique and combined with the emerging market driven neoliberal solutions to government. Foucault’s ideas on the art of government are a series of seminal lectures, given between 1975 and 1979, entitled ‘Society must be Defended’, [slide 1] Security, territory and population’ [slide 2] and ‘The birth of biopolitics [slide 3], (Gordon, 1991). The theory has been further elaborated by authors including Dean and Rose, whose literature I include this review. I begin with a seminal key text from Foucault.

While Foucault’s seminal text Discipline and Punish (1979) does not explicitly explain the concept governmentality, this text is important in realm of humanitarian assistance in that demonstrates the underlying principles of biopower and the technologies of the self (which are described in detail in other texts). Discipline and Power demonstrates the distinction between ancient, dominant forms of power (power possessed and held by one over another) and the gentle, coercive form of disciplinary power, characteristic of modern society. This text is useful in understanding power within humanitarian contexts where governing targets the life of populations.
Based on Foucault, Dean (1999) and Inda (2005) both provide perhaps the most accessible contemporary texts to the concept of governmentality. They provide the tools for the analysis of modern power, showing how modern government develops the strategies and technologies it needs to shape institutions, the population and also individuals in the ways that it needs to achieve its goals and produce the subjects that it wants. Dean (1999) presents clear definitions and explanations of how an analytics of governmentality can help to understand the ways of governing the conduct of conduct in modern society. Dean (1999) also explains that governments problematise the experiences of life in response to solutions they have found and for resolving the problems its needs. This concept can be seen the way technical solutions are formulated in humanitarian response. Inda’s Anthropology of Modernity (2005) is comprised of five essays that each demonstrates the application of biopower across disparate contexts and global themes. The essays are preceded by a clear explanation of the three themes of governmentality: the rationalities and the techniques of governmentality followed by third theme of the subjects. These themes comprise the framework that I have applied in the discussion of this dissertation.

A Foucauldian text, Governing of the Soul (Rose, 1989) is also amongst the most relevant and also powerful text of the governmentality literature. Its basic premise is that our private and personal selves are as deeply governed through the technologies that are made available to us. Technologies of language act upon our inner selves such that our personal selves are governed and we become the subjects the experts make available to us. In the third part of the text, Rose shows how with technologies including language, images and the criteria of the norm, the soul of the child also becomes intensely governed. The notion that we adjust ourselves to languages made available to us is relevant when examining humanitarian discourses. Adopting the concept of bio-power, the unpublished text Biopolitics and the Governing
of Childhood (Wells, 2013), also demonstrates how modern society governs the production of childhood through the technologies of child saving as well as the application of child rights.

Finally, Agamben (1998) draws upon Schmitt’s idea of the ‘state of exception’ and also the possibilities of biopolitics (after Foucault), Agamben concludes that sovereign forms of power exist within modern times with the potential to strip the person of all social and political rights, creating life ‘in the camp’, life in the ‘state of exception’. This challenges the notion that sovereign power lays in the past.

**Education in emergencies**

A systematic literature review revealed a range of research themes that education in emergencies relates to, or can be viewed a part of. These include the right to education, the protective role of education in humanitarian contexts, education and conflict, education and peace building, education and gender, education and psychosocial support and also the education of refugee and displaced persons. Financing of education also comprises a growing body of research education in emergencies can draw upon.

The present review however confirms the claims that there remains relatively limited academic, published research specifically in the field of education in emergencies (Bromley and Adina, 2009, Kagawa, 2005, Talbot, 2005,) and in particular, emergencies caused by natural disaster.

The international non-government organizations (INGOs), the Global Education Cluster, the United Nations (UN) and their partners have also produced a substantial collection of material for education in emergencies. This is produced largely in the form
of tools, toolkits, guidelines and standards, briefing papers, reports and manuals. While much of this cannot be classified as academic research, it provides professional guidance in this growing field of expertise, and also drives and informs advocacy.

**Emergence of the sector**

Education in emergencies can be defined as the interventions and structured activities made available to children before, during and after a humanitarian crisis. The field of education in emergencies is also referred to within the humanitarian sector as *education in humanitarian crisis* or *education in humanitarian assistance*.

While education in emergencies has emerged as a formalized sector over the last two decades, it could be argued that local communities provided education services long before it was recognized, or using a Foucauldian term problematised (Bromley and Andina, 2009). For example, refugees have historically fought for schooling for refugee and displaced children (Kagawa, 2005), leading to the creation of the United Nations Commissions for Refugees (UNHCR), in 1950. The development of the Inter Agency Network for Education in Emergencies Minimum Standards (2004), helped formalize the sector, as well as put education in emergencies within the human rights framework.

At the time, education was not included in the Sphere Handbook (2004). The recent revision of the Sphere Handbook (2011) has included education as a ‘companion’. It dedicates a page to explaining the rationale this relationship while it also explains that it retains its focus on the life saving sectors in order that it remains a handbook of a manageable size.
The right to education

In addition to the rights instruments themselves, that education is a human right is well documented (Aguilar and Retamal, 2009, Halvorsen, 1990, Johnson, 2010, McMillan, 2011, Tomaskevsi, 2005). Academic literature underpinning the right to education in emergency situations is less so. The article The Right To Education for Children in Emergencies however (Anderson, Hofmann and Hyll-Larsen, 2010) presents a comprehensive overview of the critical role that education plays within a humanitarian setting. It also acknowledges however, that much needs to be done to translate this right into a reality.

The UN Special Rapporteur publicly made statement about the right to education in emergencies in 2010. The right to education in situations of emergency was formally affirmed by the General Assembly of the United Nations. In addition to underscoring the pertinence of education in emergency situations, the Rapporteur also expresses ‘a deep concern despite the progress in the sector, that the level of funding for international education goals is inadequate’ (UN, Special Rapporteur, 2010), and that despite the funding from humanitarian Flash Appeals, the sector was one of the most underfunded with respect to meeting the original requirements’.

A small body of research seeks to challenge the view that humanitarian response saves lives (Martone, 2010). In attempt to interrogate this mandate it also tries to explain the protective, life sustaining and sometimes life saving role of education. The earlier grey literature that defends education in emergencies also argued that the provision of education in emergencies could save lives but this argument has been dropped from the more recent literature (which is mostly in the form of INGO advocacy briefs).
With a ground-breaking study in the 1990’s, Graça Machel (1996) drew considerable attention to the impacts of violent conflict and war on children when it was reasserted that education is a basic right at all times. The study was guided by the Rights of the Child with its operative principles presenting ‘a new, multidisciplinary approach to protecting children’ Machel (1996: 7), highlighting the right to education for all children, including refugees and the displaced. Machel outlines the risks and threats to education during conflict and brought attention to the funding challenges that also cause further destabilization and impacts upon children.

In reference to education in areas of conflict, Rose and Greely (2006) outline its various roles for peace building, preventing education from attack and psychosocial support. Novelli and Lopes Cardozo (2008) reviewed and summarized education in conflict literature and called for a more critically informed approach to the emerging area.

Although there is growing body of evidence of the impacts of specific approaches to the provision of psychosocial support through education structures, research that demonstrates the impacts of psychosocial support in emergency contexts can be described as lacking. Programmes are often implemented in schools or child friendly spaces or centres. Greater understanding of local culture and ethical awareness is needed, along with participation of local communities towards building the capacity of local people (Wessels, 2008). Attempts have been made to identify research priorities in order to strengthen field practice have been made, responding to the call for more attention to the quality of psychosocial assistance in emergencies and the need to maximize its value in humanitarian response (Wietse A. et al. 2001).
Funding challenge for education in emergencies

Education in emergencies is, as stated by the UN Special Rapporteur (2010), one of the least funded sectors in humanitarian aid. The limited funding can impede the rate at which children return to school in the aftermath of an emergency or the time in which school systems are restored. While this is widely recognized within the humanitarian sector, the evidence of its underfunded status is mostly contained in humanitarian sector reports. This review suggests that funding issues have not been adequately researched and documented by academics. The Department for International Development (DFID) recently acknowledged the economic cost benefits of early intervention response activities in complex emergencies (Cabot Venton et al. 2012).

Individual Humanitarian organisations have documented possible reasons for the poor status of funding but again, this has not been an issue systematically researched. One of the most widely cited reasons for the low funding levels is the conceptualization of humanitarian response and how education fits within it. There is anecdotal recognition that providing education may not have equal life saving value as some other humanitarian interventions, such as the provision of critical health care, food, shelter or water. However, that it may not be perceived to have strong life saving value, begs the question of how important the provision of education is during a humanitarian response (Martone, 2010).

The relationship between education and development are perhaps better understood although it too faces challenges in meeting funding targets. In reviewing leading books in the sector McGrath (2011: 540) concludes that the contribution of education to development is not quite understood by economists. McGrath (2011) also suggests a ‘lack of understanding of the modernization and global education agenda and the
practical limitations involved’. This may suggest that education faces challenges both within and outside humanitarian contexts.

The methodology chapter that follows starts by explaining why this research is framed within the theoretical perspective of governmentality.
This chapter aims to first explain the rationale for adopting the theoretical framework of governmentality for exploring education in humanitarian contexts. Secondly, this chapter aims to present a reflective description as to how this research was conducted.

The analysis of this research is framed within the three themes of an analytics of governmentality, as described in the introduction of this dissertation. First epistemological theme is the rationality of governing. This asks why the government does what it does – what are the beliefs that guide and shape governing. Second are the technologies of governing and finally, which examines the techniques and instruments that are utilized in governing and the implications of these. The third theme considers the kinds of subjects that are produced from this form of governing.

**Design process**

The starting point for the methodology involved developing a set of core questions and narrowing the focus of the research into a three specific points to explore the hypothesis. The hypothesis was to explore that ‘education should be an integral part of the first phase of humanitarian assistance’, the text ‘what makes a question researchable’ (White, 2009), was helpful in developing a precise yet relevant set of research questions through a process of re-ordering, reformulating, discarding and distilling.
Key research questions were:

- What are the perceptions of education in humanitarian crisis?
- What factors lay behind funding discrepancies between the humanitarian sectors?
- What factors lay behind funding discrepancies for education across different humanitarian contexts?

**Donor Interview Questions**

1. How does your organisation define ‘education in humanitarian crisis’?
2. What sectors are included in the humanitarian mandate?
3. What does your organisation view as the main benefits of providing education in a crisis situation?
4. What are the main reasons for responding / funding to crisis?
5. Are you able to provide data to facilitate a comparison of past funding across the sectors? (For example, how much has been allocated to education in crisis compared to health and other sectors, annually?)
6. How are the different sectors viewed in terms of their relevance in the earlier phases of emergency or crisis?
7. Does your organisation offer greater support to particular aspects or phases of crisis / emergencies? For example, is there more emphasis and interest in preparedness, disaster risk reduction, response, recovery or increasing resilience?
8. Are there specific contexts of crisis that is more likely to fund than others? For example – crisis occurring in low-income countries in specific regions of the world; funding education in natural disasters, protracted crisis or post conflict?
**INGO, UN and global representative questions**

1. What is the understanding within the humanitarian sector of what education in emergencies is and does?

2. What do you believe are the main benefits of providing humanitarian assistance?

3. Can you refer me to empirical evidence that can be used to demonstrate (to donors) the benefits and value of investing in or providing it?

4. In what ways does your organization support and invest in education in emergencies? (Can refer to documented information).

5. In your opinion, how is education in emergencies viewed amongst humanitarians professionals within your organization?

6. What do you think about the relevance or importance of different sectors in the earlier days or phases of an emergency?

7. In humanitarian crisis, what needs should be included in very early assessments and in early planning processes? Is it possible and viable to include all? Are there any challenges do achieving this?

8. What do you believe are the major factors that affect the timeliness and quality of implementing education in emergencies programming?

9. How is education in emergencies viewed by major donors? How does it compare with the views of children and their communities?

10. What is your opinion on the level of donor funding for education in emergencies?

11. Why do donors to consistently invest in some sectors more than others? Are there any factors, conditions or issues that lay behind donor motivations or reasons for investing in some sectors more than others?
Organizations were selected on the basis of being amongst the leading international humanitarian organizations. To avoid a bias from a particular technical stance, I planned for a degree of control in the research, by attempting to balance the number of education specialists as non-education specialists. This however proved to be a challenge as the education advisers were most responsive.

Each of the participants was approached by email, where I explained the purpose and method of the study. In maintaining ethical standards I observed the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) ‘tips and skills’, outlined on page 146 of Bryman’s Social Research Methods. This advises that the researcher ensures the subjects are informed fully about the purpose, methods and possible use of the research. In accordance with advice I mentioned that participation was completely voluntary, and, ‘confidentiality of information would be maintained and anonymity of participants respected’, which was explained again at the start of interviews (Bryman, 2001). I also requested that I record interviews for ease of transcription purposes, which everyone complied with.

Overall, the response to invitations was positive although two donors proved difficult to engage with and one of these was not able to respond at all. Also, forming a ‘control’ group, comprised of non-education specialists was also difficult and achieving a balance was not possible. While I eventually managed to speak with a total of nine non-education interviewees, my final data does reflect more responses from education personnel than individuals that are not speaking from an education perspective. This point must be considered in interpreting the final conclusions of the study.

Interviews were conducted over Skype. The first questions were piloted in an initial interview on 12th March, 2013 and the final interview was conducted on 3rd August,
2013. Twenty-four interviews were conducted in total, the majority lasting for the duration of forty minutes to one hour.

Conversations with participants situated in the field within emergency situations were especially dynamic. These people naturally drew on examples from the field much more readily. This concurs with Ritchie and Lewis (who comments that ‘people tend to find it easier to talk about an experience or something they have done, than motives or reasons for something’ (Ritchie and Lewis, p. 2003: 113).

**Challenges in the interview process**

The first four participants were invited to review their own transcripts once they were complete. This resulted in losing some useful detail - one participant deleted and changed more than half of her original contribution. ‘Interviews can have a certain seductive quality’ (Ritchie and Lewis, 2012: p 68). They appear comfortable and disclose information willingly during the interview but are then left with worrying thoughts afterwards – ‘they may regret having been so open’ (Ritchie and Lewis, 2012: p 68).

Finally, there is a possibility that the results could be biased towards the perspective of an education specialist. As I have experience working in the humanitarian sector, I was able to secure the interviews very easily. However, this advantage did not help foster a connection in the same way with non-education specialists, which is evident in the imbalance of participant numbers.
**Analysis**

Listening to each recording, I first created a full transcript each conversation. The majority of these were transcribed verbatim. Using a simple chart, I created a coding chart, for the different emerging themes.

Following a coding method (Ritchie and Lewis, 2003), I then sorted the content into the main emerging themes, coding each one using the participant's initials and the theme. Finally, I distilled the information from this grid and created a separate chart of key points people had made. These categories leant themselves very neatly to the governmentality framework. I used the actual words from the interviews in the discussion as much as possible.

The chart enabled me to ascertain the popularity of the different views under each of the themes. The comments from donors were separated from the comments of the INGO and UN respondents.
Emerging themes and headings for the final categories.

- Life-saving
- Perceived value of education
- Predictability in emergencies
- Visibility / invisibility
- Power, decision making, decision makers
- Goals and aims of the donor
- Media and emergencies
- Providing evidence
- Describing education, meaning, language
- Instruments, assessments, appeals…
Table 1: Organisations from which 24 informants were interviewed between the dates of 21/03/2013 and 08/08/2013.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International NGO’s</th>
<th>Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action Aid</td>
<td>Education x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Rescue Committee</td>
<td>Education x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Federation of the Red Cross</td>
<td>Health x 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan International</td>
<td>Education x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children UK</td>
<td>Education x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children Australia</td>
<td>DRR* x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Child Holland</td>
<td>Education x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalist x 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donors</th>
<th>Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian Aid (AusAID)</td>
<td>Education x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)</td>
<td>Education x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Humanitarian Department x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department for International Development (DFID)</td>
<td>Education x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (NORAD)</td>
<td>Education x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Agency for International Development (USAID)</td>
<td>Education x 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>United Nations</th>
<th>Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF - Global</td>
<td>Education x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF - Regional</td>
<td>Education x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO – Global</td>
<td>DRR* x 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global bodies</th>
<th>Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Education Cluster</td>
<td>Education x 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Partnership for Education (GPE)</td>
<td>Education x 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter Agency Network For Education in Emergencies</td>
<td>Education x 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Disaster Risk Reduction Specialist
Discussion

Education and the Rationalities of Humanitarian Assistance

Framed within the theory of governmentality, this first chapter is concerned with the rationalities that justify, inform and shape the regime of humanitarian assistance. Central to the discussion are the implications of such rationalities for the field of education, which wants to be an integral part of humanitarian response. I first introduce how interviewees in this research justify humanitarian assistance itself. Secondly, I discuss the notion of life saving, which in the modern era of government, is the main justification for humanitarian assistance. Third, I explain the notion of problematisation (Dean, 1999) and how the humanitarian sectors that are believed to save lives, are problematised by the humanitarian regime - while education is obscured and sometimes excluded because it is partially problematised. This partial problematization of education in humanitarian assistance can affect its operability and its level of funding.

An analytics of government is concerned the ‘different ways of producing truth’ (Dean, 2010: 27). These questions are useful when considering how different forms of humanitarian interventions are viewed and also what kinds of interventions donors will fund in humanitarian disasters and why.
How is humanitarian assistance justified?

In exploring the rationalities that justify humanitarian assistance, five key points emerged. According to the majority of participants interviewed, restoring normality and stability are amongst the key reasons for the provision for humanitarian intervention. Increasing resilience was also mentioned in relation to building stable economies. According to education informants from the UN, INGOs and one donor, global security and also the security of the donor country itself, increasingly features as a key reason for providing humanitarian assistance.

A point made several times in this research is that humanitarian assistance is not provided exclusively for the fulfillment of rights – and that donors are ‘not interested’ in seeing human rights stated as a justification of humanitarian assistance and in particular, the right to education. Education informants suggested that the right to education should not be used as an argument when appealing for donor funding. As one participant said, ‘rights get lost in the noise of emergencies – they are lost on donors.’

Despite a range of reasons for providing humanitarian assistance, the majority of participants throughout the research believe that saving lives features as the main rationality that justifies, shapes and informs humanitarian assistance. Four participants, including one donor, mentioned that ‘life saving’ is stated funding criteria in key humanitarian instruments, including, the Flash Appeal. One donor specifically articulated this point in saying, ‘in terms of our humanitarian policy it has to be life-saving and there’s a criteria for that.’

This means that government justifies itself in the contemporary era for the sake of saving lives, which in Foucauldian terms, is for the sake of ‘letting live’ (Dean,
1999, 125). This contrasts with the notion of sovereignty from the old era, the purpose of which was to ‘take life and let live’ (Foucault, 1979: 136, Dean, 2010: 124). An important distinction here is that the new era, government is concerned with ‘fostering the life of the population’ (Dean, 2010: 125). It is concerned with saving, fostering and enhancing not only life, but the life of the population.

**We keep them alive and then...**

A consistent finding throughout this research was that life saving takes precedence over interventions that are life sustaining during the first phase of humanitarian response. The architecture of humanitarian regime is established so that saving lives comes first.

According to informants of this research, education, which is seen as focusing on children’s psychosocial, emotional wellbeing, cognitive development, physical and social protection, frequently becomes obstructed and excluded in humanitarian assistance. While the research suggests that the provision of education can enhance children’s wellbeing, it is not viewed as a service (or experience) that saves their lives. However, the research suggests this is because it does not produce the evidence that it saves lives. The evidence it does produce is not in the numerical format that sectors seen to save lives produce. Applying an analytics of government (Dean, 1999), I discuss these points that lead to the exclusion of education in greater detail in the next chapter.

The Sphere Handbook (2011), which outlines guidance and standards of humanitarian response, was referred to throughout the research. It includes education as a ‘companion’ (Sphere, 2011: 12) and dedicates one page to explain this companionship. On the same page, it also explains that the focus on four technical (life saving) sectors
is to keep the Sphere Handbook as a ‘single volume of manageable size’ (Sphere, 2011: 12). As a result of its exclusion, the education sector has developed its own guidance and humanitarian standards, the Minimum Standards for Education in Emergencies. The focus of the Sphere Handbook however is seen as relevant to the question of ‘what is stated as truth’ because its contents are based upon two core beliefs that are articulated within it. This handbook can be viewed as a key tool that not only guides humanitarian assistance, but also justifies it and therefore justifies the exclusion of certain sectors.

The first belief stated within the Sphere Handbook is that ‘those affected by disaster or conflict and have a right to life with dignity and therefore a right to assistance’ (Sphere, 2011: 4). The second belief is that ‘steps should be taken to alleviate human suffering arising out of disaster or conflict’ (Sphere, 2011: 4). This Sphere Handbook (2011) could be described as one of the ‘sites where problems are given form’ and one of the ‘authorities accountable for vocalizing them’ (Inda, 2005: 8). The findings of this research would suggest that this instrument carries significant authority and is used for the ‘circulation of truths’ (Inda, 2005: 8) about what is life saving and also which technical sectors should be included in the earlier stages of humanitarian assistance in order to save lives. The research suggests a degree of agreement and acceptance amongst all of the informants interviewed for this research that life saving objects should be a key focus in the very initial response activities, but at the same time, there is discontent with the exclusivity of Sphere in that in practice, ‘life saving’ is prioritized.

**What people think of this ‘truth’ and how it affects education and funding?**

While there is some agreement and acceptance of the beliefs stated within the Sphere Handbook (2011), the research also suggests significant discontent amongst the majority of INGO, UN and also some donor education specialists interviewed, who
advocate for the early (or earlier) inclusion of education in humanitarian assistance. They would like to see education explicitly included in the Sphere Handbook and given the same weight and authority that other sectors hold.

A large proportion of education informants interviewed believe that when new emergencies are declared, education should be consistently included in the initial, critical administrative processes (alongside ‘life saving’ sectors) such as assessments and appeals. Education informants believe its exclusion leads to its limited funding and therefore its operability. I discuss more about how certain technologies affect funding opportunities in the next chapter.

A point raised by three of the twenty-six interviewees called to question what actually constitutes life saving and therefore a question over the focus of the Sphere Handbook itself. As one informant said, ‘who is to say what is life saving and when it happens? Are lives saved within one minute, the first day or one week [of a humanitarian disaster]?’ A similar point is made by Martone (2010) who explains that ‘in the majority of the world’s protracted refugee situations, people are not dying at unusually high rates and these crisis are more often not life threatening’ (Martone, 2010: 1). I return to this point in the second chapter, where I discuss how specific technologies are implemented to define, ‘regulate and inform’ (Inda, 2005) how humanitarian response unfolds.

According to education interviewees, what is believed to be the truth is reproduced in every emergency where lifesaving needs are prioritized in funding mechanisms, assessment processes and procedures and when education is excluded or extracted from humanitarian plans. If education activities are not included, the ‘truth’ reproduced that it is not needed. The belief reproduced amongst the humanitarian community is
that the sectors seen as life saving are critical to the response. They are believed to save lives, restore stability and ensure dignity (Sphere, 2011: 5) while education is not included as a category that has the potential to contribute to these ends.

Three of the education informants interviewed expressed the view that education is important in ensuring dignity but this point is overlooked at the expense of what are seen as life saving interventions. As one person said, 'I believe education can save lives but it can also ensure the dignity for someone or a family if they have lost everything' and, ‘…how will they maintain a life of dignity without education?’ As Martone (2006: 1) comments, ‘dignity remains an unregulated, unidentifiable and at a time, neglected part of our craftsmanship.’

The point is that despite its statement that the Sphere Handbook (2011) is based ‘core beliefs’, believed to be truths, established by the humanitarian community itself, according to this research, there is not complete consensus with its technical focus.

An analytics of governmentality (Dean, 1999) is useful when considering how these truths have been formulated. These truths have been formulated into problems, which have been framed and presented as the four objects that can save lives and ensure dignity. They have been problematised (Dean, 1999). I will now explain how problematization is used to produce what is known as truth.

**Problematizations in humanitarian response**

According to Inda (2005: 8) ‘the goal of governmental practice is to articulate the nature of problems and propose solutions to them’. In the case of humanitarian assistance, the research would suggest that while education has been problematised - in that it is now a recognised part of humanitarian response - it has not been problematised to the
same degree as the sectors that are believed to save lives. The research findings would suggest that education has been partially problematised. This means that education can be rendered obscured, or excluded in certain processes within the regime as it works with those it understands and has already has formulated solutions.

A key point is that it is only possible to govern if the sphere of activity is understood, known and rendered amenable to programming (Inda, 2005). It must know and understand it and there must be clear solutions formulated in order for it to be addressed. As Smith (2008: 23) describes, the problem itself must be formulated in a way that amenable to a controlled intervention and this will then lead to a known and specific intervention.

The sectors that are problematised and believed to save lives, secure a place within core of the humanitarian regime and its processes - including assessments, appeal processes and strategies. As one informant articulated, ‘I never hear about health and nutrition having trouble getting into an appeal...’ A further informant commented, ‘[In recent emergency situation] it was agreed education was a great need and was a priority sector – but then it was taken out of the humanitarian strategy. Nutrition and water were put in – the whole emergency is portrayed as a nutrition crises’.

It is the core belief of saving lives, the four technical sectors and the kinds of knowledge that they generate, that make certain decisions justifiable in humanitarian assistance. They ‘define the goals of and purpose of government’ (Inda 1995). Moreover, they determine the nature of knowledge that is generated. The knowledge generated from these problematised spheres renders humanitarian assistance thinkable and therefore governable.
In conclusion, the research suggests that saving lives is a key rationality that shapes and informs humanitarian assistance. The Sphere Handbook (2011), assessments and appeals are key and authoritative processes and instruments in humanitarian response that give the notion of saving lives greater priority and prominence, especially during the first stages of humanitarian response. They reproduce 'established truths' that humanitarian response is about saving lives. The sectors believed to save lives have been problematised by the humanitarian regime purely because solutions believed amenable have been formulated. Problematizing is another way of establishing the truth. Education is not believed be life saving and neither is it measurable, calculable and manageable in the same way as life saving interventions. As a result education can be obscured, excluded and delayed. Its funding can be affected because of its partial problematization – therefore reproducing the truth that it is not a core part of the regime.
In this second chapter, I discuss the second analytical theme of governmentality, the ‘technologies of government’ (Inda, 2005: 9). As already stated, certain technologies are created in seeking solutions to the objects that have been problematised (Dean, 1999, Smith, 2008). These technologies include and involve people, authorities, ‘mechanisms, calculations, documents and devices’ (Inda, 2005: 9). They are not simple instruments but are all techniques of power (Rose, 1989), utilized to know, shape and manage the population, which is its end target (Inda, 2005). This chapter will explain how and why the technologies employed within humanitarian assistance present obstacles for the inclusion and operability of education in humanitarian response. I also highlight how a liberal mode of government enables the agencies within the education sector (which straddles both the development and humanitarian domains), to adapt and shape their tools and practice so that education can operate more effectively in the humanitarian domain in order to secure adequate and timely funding.

Numerous technologies have been created to enable and facilitate the humanitarian domain to function and find solutions to its problematisations. In other words, humanitarian assistance has been ‘instrumentalised’ (Inda, 2005). Examples of the technologies employed in the humanitarian domain, and mentioned in the course of this research, include assessment frameworks, logical frameworks, reports, appeals, case studies, strategic plans, experts, teams, campaigns, language etc. These are all examples of the apparatus of governmenality. Latour (1986: 9) describes technologies as ‘material inscriptions’). These are ‘all the mundane tools – surveys, reports,
statistical methodologies, pamphlets..., charts statistics and so forth... - that represent events and phenomena as information, data and knowledge' (Inda, 2005: 9). Such tools can represent people and their experiences of humanitarian situations in a written and numerical form and comprise the face of the phenomena itself; they ‘translate thought and ideas into practice’ (Dean, 2010: 42, Inda, 2005) and they facilitate the existence of a form of power, which after Foucault we know as biopolitics.

It is worth mentioning here that such technologies or techniques of power presuppose the same end goal (Dean, 2010: 27). In the case of humanitarian response, that is to save lives, restore stability and ensure a life with dignity (Sphere, 2011: 5). Foucault would say that in this liberal mode of government, this end goal is to ‘secure the health and welfare of its population,’ (Wells, 2013: 1, Inda, 2005). Without such technologies, including the tools, mechanisms, people etc, all of which constitute a form of biopower, effective government, or what Foucault terms the ‘conduct of conduct’, cannot take place (Inda, 2005).

In relation to the point discussed in the previous chapter, these technologies are involved in producing knowledge that is used in reinforcing what is understood as truth (Dean, 2010: 27) – and also in generating new truths in relation to its goals (after Foucault). The humanitarian domain not only depends upon the information created in the assessments, reports, appeals etc., but it also depends upon technical knowledge of specialists and expertise of the right kind and also generating and using language of the right kind (Dean, 2010: 25). This knowledge is crucial to authorize the truths that embody that what is governed (Rose, 1999: 6). This means that all knowledge generated in humanitarian assistance must be aligned with its overall goals. This seems a particularly relevant point for education in humanitarian assistance, because
according to this research, qualitative data is needed to assess, plan and operate effectively.

While more than half of education participants believe that schools do not need to be established and operational with children attending them immediately, particularly in new, sudden onset humanitarian situations, the high majority said that education should be included in all humanitarian processes, instruments and tools (such as assessments and appeals) from the very outset, along with other sectors.

Education informants believe that when education is removed from or not included in early assessments, education needs are obscured. I will now discuss the points that render education obscured, obstructed, excluded, affect its levels of funding or delay its activities.

If we provide the evidence…

A key finding in this research indicates a strong view that the field of education in emergencies lacks what was referred to as evidence to substantiate its claims of impact and also to demonstrate its relevance in humanitarian assistance. A senior education informant said, ‘there has been research, but it doesn’t convince the people who don’t know about the sector.’ While a small number of education informants drew attention to what was referred to as ‘good data’ including global statistics, generated annually by the United Nations for the Global Monitoring Report (UNESCO), a strong view persists amongst those interviewed that education in humanitarian response lacks an adequate evidence base by the standards within the humanitarian regime.

Lack of evidence was also articulated by two of the donors and a high proportion of the education informants interviewed. According to education informants, there exists
substantial anecdotal evidence and as well as substantial unpublished material that explains the benefits of education in humanitarian response to children and communities. However, it is widely felt that this material lacks scientific rigor. One INGO education specialist said, ‘we need clearer evidence on what education in emergencies is and what it is actually doing’, while another articulated, ‘we make claims about the protective role of education but I’m unsure that we’ve proven it’. According to informants, a lack of evidence questions the legitimacy of education within humanitarian response.

A minority said more evidence is needed to show that education is life saving although three people highlighted the view that ‘trying to argue that education saves lives is a lost battle’. There was recognition amongst the same small group that without clear and compelling evidence, education in emergencies is unlikely to generate more appeal to donors.

As I have mentioned, the art of governmentality is dependent upon knowledge (Inda, 2005: 9) and so the form that this knowledge takes is critical for effective governance. It needs to understand and population that is being governed. Without clear knowledge that it understands and believes is amenable to particular solutions, it cannot maximize efficiency in its endeavour to increase the ‘health and welfare of the population’ (Wells, 2013). This means that to maximize efficiency, all interventions within the humanitarian regime must be able to operate within the contours of the technologies formulated and be able to shape and modify them.
A senior education interviewee indicated that the sector could learn more from its successes:

‘…some countries have been smart when it comes to preparing proposals. We must do some analysis and look at good practice – look at examples of where education really presents itself well. In Pakistan and South Sudan, education was presenting good data, good evidence, using every channel they could. We as an education in emergencies and cluster community – must make sure we are extremely professional and that we do the advocacy…’

**Donors want evidence with numbers**

As previously mentioned, in addition to a lack of evidence to substantiate its claims, almost half of the education informants interviewed, said education programming lacked ‘data of the right kind’. Education is viewed as a sector that generates ‘soft evidence’ rather than what informants called ‘hard evidence’. In humanitarian contexts, the donors tend to be more interested in interventions can readily generate hard evidence, or, according to education informants, evidence backed up by quantitative data. The analysis of the Sphere Handbook (2004), conducted by Smith (2008) also suggests that humanitarian assistance relies largely upon data of a numerical form. Smith (2008) points out, ‘a detailed reading of the entire Sphere Handbook produces an overall emphasis on the representation of situations and phenomena as numerical data, relegating the more descriptive contextual information to a secondary role’ (Smith, 2008: 27). The following quote from an education informant demonstrates this point:

‘Education is seen as a soft item for humanitarian work – [for health] it’s easy to count how many vaccines you’ve given, how many limbs you’ve set, how many bodies you’ve pulled out of the rubble… Education is harder to count, and to
say ‘we’ve made this much impact’ – it’s easier for donors to measure other things.’

The point here is that according to both education and health INGO and UN informants, donors want to see high numbers which the physical and biological are able to quickly generate. A significant proportion of the INGO education and health informants believe that numbers appeal to donors because they can easily demonstrate what the intervention is going to do. Showing who and how many people are being reached is powerful. This tends to put the sectors included in Sphere Handbook (2011) in a favourable position with donors. A health informant said, ‘yes, you have a much stronger case with life-saving interventions – if you have a clinic supporting ten thousand people, your numbers can be higher and your reach much, much bigger, and with rates of vaccination coverage or people accessing primary health care or what ever, your numbers are much greater.’

In a similar way to child protection, education is viewed as less tangible and harder to describe numerically, but according to education and health interviewees, donors want big impact evidenced by numbers. Numbers are useful and they can be readily be discussed, ranked, sorted, analyzed and formulated into plans and programmes. Rose explains, ‘numbers could be added, subtracted, compared and contrasted’ (Rose, 1989: 6). They can be administered effectively.

Although children, schools, teachers texts books can all be counted and therefore generate numerical data, education programming is seen to lag behind other sectors in its ability to produce impressive numbers, comparable with other sectors. One informant said, ‘I heard at a high level meeting that we [in education] need to follow
health in terms of evidence – they’re doing a much better job at documenting what they are doing’.

In order to administer effectively and govern conduct, the regime needs to regulate. It can only do this with knowledge it understands, is manageable and calculable (Inda, 2005). It would seem that the inputs of the more biological and physical sectors lend themselves to quantitative, numerical data and this fits with the format and type of metric advocated by Sphere (2011) and this is what donor want to see.

Any regime needs information (knowledge) that it can understand, manage and is calculable (Inda, 2005). It needs routine and ritualized ways of doing things (Dean, 2010: 31). If the sectors that have been problematised generate knowledge of a different kind, which Smith (2008) concludes is mostly numerical, it would seem logical to conclude that education is viewed as belonging to a different domain, or, is partially rather than fully problematised within the humanitarian domain. To govern effectively, the humanitarian regime assumes ‘relatively stable forms of organization of practice’ and ‘particular forms of knowledge’ (Dean, 2010: 31). When sectors like education introduce different forms of knowledge, that do not programme using the same format and formulas, the regime cannot govern the ‘conduct of conduct’ (after Foucault), as effectively and efficiently as it needs to achieve its goals.

**Time to generate the data**

Additionally, according to education informants, generating qualitative data in emergency contexts can take a longer time than generating quantitative data. Taking more time to gather data again gives the impression that education activities do not fit within the humanitarian domain where numbers describing urgent, life saving needs are generated and processed in a matter of hours and presented within the first Flash
Appeals within three to five days. Education informants commented that while numbers can be estimated to give a rough idea of how many supplies may be needed, number of teachers trained, shelters constructed etc, it takes time to understand the education context in a humanitarian terrain and the nature of the problems in order to design an appropriate, quality response that meets the needs. With greater reliance on numerical data, sectors seen as life saving are seen to produce data within much shorter time frames. This point becomes very relevant during the first phase of new emergencies because some processes (such as assessments and appeals) are time-dependent or time bound and as Inda (2005) points out, timing is an instrument, a technology employed to govern; they are ‘part of the secular set of techniques conforming to rational rules’ (Foucault, 1988).

**Donors want immediate impact**

Not only can it take more time and engagement to generate education data, but as almost half of the education informants commented, measuring the impact and the outcomes of education programming can also take longer than measuring the impact of life saving programmes. This also makes education less appealing to donors who want to see and report immediate and impressive impact to tax payers. Impacts as a result of education may not be immediate – impact is more often evident over the longer term. As one informant said, ‘it [education] is not going to save your life today but it can improve your life tomorrow’. According to education informants, donors want to be seen improving the present situation.

‘Education is in some ways is harder to show – to say ‘we’ve made this impact’ – because it’s a longer-term investment. It’s not like when you give a vaccine and then you’re vaccinated [or immunised] – and give a plumpy-nut biscuit and children start to respond. It’s easier for donors to measure other things – the kind of things where they can say ‘look we did this…’
The point is that interventions that show immediate change and impact are appealing to donors. Such evidence reinforces the truth. As Dean (1999) explains, such technologies are used for the production of knowledge to reinforce what we take to be ‘truth’ (Dean, 2010: 27).

However, one donor commented, ‘this is why we are interested in the outcomes more than anything now’, implying that education would have as good as chance as any sector in being funded, if it demonstrates specific outcomes. Whether demonstrating outcomes or outputs, education will still need to contribute towards the overall humanitarian goals and will still have to generate knowledge that is ‘calculable’ and deemed ‘governable’ and in a ‘programmable form’ (Inda, 2005: 9). In other words, evidence should be produced in the form that donors like and in the timeframe that donors need. This will demonstrate effective governance. It will demonstrate the effective conduct of conduct.

**An inherent complexity in the field of education**

As I have already mentioned, biopower, must have ways for knowing and managing the population. It also possesses the positive disposition that the entity is governable (Inda, 2005, Dean, 2010, Smith, 2008). According to informants from all of the four groups interviewed, education programming itself is often be perceived to be a ‘complex’ intervention due to the kinds of activities involved and also the rationale behind them in relation to a humanitarian context. One education informant said, ‘for some, education is seen as being fraught with difficulties… there is a discomfort with something quite different.’ Another said, ‘I definitely think there’s an inherent complexity to the education field… that surpasses that which happens in other sectors… not to diminish that which is happening in other sectors, but I think it’s significantly different.’ I
argue that this ‘complexity’ is only in light that the humanitarian regime applies a different metric. Mendenhall (2012) draws attention to the challenges affecting the sustainability of education support during relief and post conflict.

On the other hand, when education programmes follow the format of a standardized and basic, predictable nature where things can be counted, they are more likely to be understood, they are viewed as less complex and therefore more attractive to fund. According to senior education interviewees, some donors will readily fund the distribution of kits and installation of tents – because is something visual and simple that they understand’. As previously discussed, governing is depending upon understanding and knowing. At the same time, it must be ‘measurable and calculable’ (Inda, 2005: 9). Illustrating this point, one education participant said, ‘if you have a basic camp approach – like a standard model – take the kits and set them up… [the programme will be funded]’.

However, returning to the point of impact, there is also the strong belief amongst education informants that providing the basic, standard items alone – the hardware as it were - does not always achieve the impact intended. This point was aptly captured by one informant, who said, ‘just because we touched their lives by giving some stationary kits, it doesn’t mean we’ve reduced the impact of a disaster upon their education sufficiently so that they may stay in school and complete it successfully.’ Such physical items, such as classroom or school kits, can however make education more ‘visible’ (Inda, 2005).

**Complex environments**

There is a strong awareness however, that donors will select and support education in countries and contexts not only according to their own mandate and goals, but also
according to their ease of operability and programmability. Donors are believed to rely on a degree of regulation and stability in order to fund programmes. Places that are known to be highly complex, highly unstable or where the movement of the population is highly unpredictable are, according to education informants, are less likely to attract donor interest and funding for education than sectors like health or water and sanitation. As one health specialist said, ‘in complex places like DRC donors may be more willing to throw away money and save a life on health [rather] than on education – at least a life will be saved’. Implicit in this statement is the point that saving a life in a complex environment is more important than improving the quality of the life by means of education.

According to education interviewees, donors like a degree of stability and predictability. As it is believed that education is not a life saving intervention and it is viewed to have ‘inherent complexities’, it is less likely to be funded than those that are believed to save lives in places viewed as complex operating environments. This is illustrated with the following views from education participants,

‘It [education] wasn’t provided in Bakina Faso because it was uncertain if the camps [would be] be permanent or in transition – whether they would have to move to another refugee camp. The argument was that the people are going to move and we’d just have to reset up education again although they did set up the latrines.’

**The power of people in positions of authority**

In governmentality theory, to understand how exclusion or inclusion of education occurs it is necessary to understand the relations between all forms of power within the regime. This is because according to Foucault, power does not exist in the form of one dominant force over others, but rather power exists in a myriad of ways, within
technologies, knowledge, within individuals and populations, and also, as I have
discussed in the first chapter, within ‘truth generating practices’ (Rose, 1989: xiv).

According to education informants, the decision to include, exclude or delay education
in humanitarian programming (at a practical field or policy level) often lays at the hands
of individuals with authority. One education informant expressed, ‘there is a filtering out
of education’. In the earlier days of new emergencies, the view amongst many senior,
non-education staff, such as emergency coordinators, is that ‘education can wait’ and
this maxim, according to education specialists, is often articulated. As one education
informant said, ‘the words frequently heard are ‘it should come later’.’

It was strongly felt that the sector of education is not included in initial processes and
instruments including assessments, strategic plans and appeals. An education
informant explained, ‘there are institutional barriers’. Including or excluding can often
depend upon one individual understanding what education in humanitarian situations
actually is. As already discussed, understanding and knowing is necessary for effective
government (Inda, 2005).

Three examples were given where education was excluded from initial assessments
and initial response activities. One education informant said, ‘you look at the
coordinators – they make the final decision on Flash Appeals and Children’s
Emergency Relief Fund applications etc and that’s the point where education gets cut
out…. I find that really problematic’. Another education participant said, ‘…sometimes,
that one individual can stop education.’ Another articulated, ‘A lot of the time it has to
do with a couple of individuals in the hierarchy of a donor organization who might
decide whether education is or isn’t important and when those people move on [out of
their role], things can change.’
While such individuals can decide to exclude, they operate within and are connected with an array of apparatuses, ‘rationalities, strategies and technologies of power’ (Rose, 1989: xxii) all of which are involved in shaping persons and activities towards the end goal.

The media… before and after the plumpy-nut

Media is a further technology that carries power within the humanitarian regime. According to both education and health informants, the media tends to promote physical life-saving interventions more than interventions supporting more social and cognitive recovery. Education and learning therefore is not portrayed as a need as much as hunger, health, water and shelter. One explanation was that compared to education activities, the activities that address life saving (such as food, water or health), can be effectively conveyed in one image. An education interview explained, education ‘requires a narrative to explain it’ – an explanation of what is happening, why and what the benefits will be.

Related to this point, another informant expressed, ‘everyone wants to fund that borehole – it’s quick, it’s easy, its visual – to see the before and after, but education…’ The borehole also does not require the explanation. ‘Education provides a nice visual but it isn’t the end of the story’.

Images portraying experiences that are not normal and related to the physical wellbeing in humanitarian situations can also be more emotive and draw attention and empathy from the public more than images of children learning in classrooms. According to one education interviewee, education shows normality – a normal situation - what children do - but people want to see what is not normality and as one
person explained, ‘normal images just won’t get it.’ One informant pointed out the difficulty of portraying the idea that children are missing school.

The tax payers and the donors themselves want to see their money is going to do something immediately – therefore, ‘school can wait – they need the food first, so pictures of children eating, or life saving pictures like carrying a child out of the rubble, emotive pictures, stark images or images that are not the norm. ‘The child dying gets people in the heart much more – the hungry child, the big belly, flies around the face all evoke God, that is awful, we’ve got to do something. To take a child who is malnourished – before and after he’s eaten plumpy-nut or whatever it will make a better picture than a child sitting in school.’ In the words of another education participant from the INGO, ‘it is harder to show something for education which is for the child’s mind, for their psychosocial world.’ Another form of power, the media is a further technology that shapes, informs and guides towards the end goals of government.

It’s all in the language

In addition to visual images and the various technologies mentioned, the thinking involved in governing is also embodied in language (Dean, 1999). Rose (1989) explains that ‘it is not so important what language means, but what language does – what it enables human beings to imagine and do to themselves and others’ (Rose, 1989: xix). Language also has the power to reinforce and to reproduce truth (Rose, 1989, Inda, 2005, Dean, 2010). The research findings suggest an awareness amongst education specialists that the terminology often used to described education needs in emergency situations is not always completely aligned to the language most likely to attract funding from humanitarian donors. Three of the education specialists
interviewed mentioned the challenges in articulating education needs within first phase emergency appeals and proposals. Aware that the content of such documents needs to be aligned with humanitarian donor goals of saving lives, they sometimes reformulate the language to fit the life saving criteria. An education specialist explained, ‘We have been boxed into the life saving argument for so long – forced to use the terminology that education must be life saving.’ With the following words, one participant explained the kind of language and argument that will appeal to donors when submitting an education proposal:

‘...Do you want children to blunder from one land mine to another? Or take a life as a prostitute if they survive…? Do you want people to stumble from one tent to the next trying to do vaccinations trying to work out what age they are as they go? Do you want children to die from malnutrition – because [in schools] we can bring them all to one place, give nutritional supplements and other health care interventions...’

The humanitarian regime consistently employs language that helps reinforce its aims. Language becomes a tactic to help increase visibility (Biehl, 2005), establish identities and reinforce the aims of the regime. Throughout the research, language that reinforces life saving aims was consistently repeated.

Reforming ourselves in an improving direction
Although a hierarchical order exists within the humanitarian regime (and individuals have authority to include or exclude), as I have previously discussed, ‘government is accomplished through multiple actors and agents’ (Dean, 2010: 37) and technologies. While the research suggests the frequent exclusion, obscuration of education in processes (such as assessments, appeals and strategic plans), it also suggests strong opinion amongst all participants interviewed that on a programmatic level, education is
strengthening its position within the humanitarian architecture. An analytic of
governmentality is also looks for the ways that agents negotiate forms of government
(Inda, 2005: 11). Through demonstrating good practice, procedures and professional
ways of working, the sector becoming more established – resulting in a greater degree
of problematisation. The establishment of the Global Education Cluster is believed to
have played a role its professionalisation, developing expertise, tools, procedures and
vocabulary, all of which comprise essential technology in governmentality.

Also individuals and agencies within the education sector shape their tools, adapting to
respond to humanitarian needs. For example, according to informants, the Global
Campaign for Education (GPE) has developed flexible funding arrangements that
enable specified countries to access emergency funding through channels other than
the usual humanitarian funding appeal processes.

Education participants also see opportunities for improved practice through the
Transformative Agenda. As one participant explained, ‘It calls for a number of things –
reformulation of humanitarian goals and strategies at quite a high level’. It also calls for
greater collaboration and integration. These principles could help us. If these are the
main objectives, then education may have a role in them.’

As education informants have indicated, education needs to straddle both the
development and humanitarian domains. According to education participants, it is this
dual focus and its strong history in development that enables its inclusion or exclusion.
However, despite its formal status within the humanitarian domain, according to
education informants, it is often still excluded from key instruments and processes and
therefore remains underfunded.
I argue that it cannot be fully embedded because the present humanitarian aims, are designed to improve health, welfare and happiness of the population (after Foucault), that can include only those objects that are amenable to process and programme within a specified time frame which will allows it to quickly create the stable institutional environment for its successful operation. It can only create these conditions through a certain metric, through measureable objects. With these objects it can gather and organize the knowledge it needs in order to establish the conditions to operate in the first phase of emergencies. This includes the formation of self-governing individuals who will become a self-governing population (Foucault, Rose, 1989). In doing this, it produces the subjectivity of bare life (after Agamben, 1998), which I discuss in the following chapter.

Finally, one education participant strongly believes that education should not necessarily be an integral part of every humanitarian response and should not necessarily be included in initial humanitarian assessments. This informant believes that education belongs within the development domain where the focus should be on creating resilient schools and communities where risk is minimized as opposed to the response approach where the focus is on repairing the damage that was predictable in the first place. For this participant, education should not be problematised in the same way that lives saving sectors are, and education should not be included in the initial response activities, but rather, it should be seen to come ‘a little later, in a second tier of activities’.

**Chapter conclusion**

This chapter showed how technologies of governmentality are used to shape conduct within the humanitarian regime; that is to say, they are a form of ‘biopolitics’ (Inda, 2005). As education in humanitarian response is not problematised to the same
degree as the sectors believed to be life saving, it is sometimes viewed as a complex activity, difficult to implement, with insufficient evidence to demonstrate its benefits and legitimacy within the regime. I discussed the how specific technologies of metrics, administration, authoritative people, language and media are employed to shape conduct. As the goal of these technologies is to save lives and education is not believed to save lives, it excluded, obscured, obstructed or delayed and its levels of funding affected. Technologies therefore comprise a form of power (Inda, 2005, Dean, 2010, Rose, 1989). The exclusion of education reproduces the truth that it is not needed while reinforcing the notion and the goal of the regime - that lives must be saved in humanitarian contexts (as discussed in the previous chapter). However, I also discuss how individuals and agencies within the education sector shape their tools and practice to adapt to this form of government and in order to meet children’s education needs. The following chapter discusses the kind of subjects this form of governmentality produces.
Subjectivity comprises the third analytic theme of governmentality and is concerned with ‘who we are when we are governed’ (Dean, 1999). It asks ‘what types of selves, persons, actors, agents or identities arise from and inform governmental activity?’ (Inda, 2005: 10). In this chapter, I first describe the imagined subjectivity within the education discourse. I then show how this contrasts sharply with subjectivity formed by the liberal governance of humanitarian assistance. Drawing on the analysis of Smith (2008), I discuss how the focus on ‘…physical life saving assistance’ (Smith, 2008: 3), can render education excluded, obscured or delayed, producing subjects that are reduced to a limited, ‘bare life’.

‘Children are seen as passive recipients…’

This research suggests that when humanitarian disasters happen, education practitioners expect a humanitarian response to actively support and foster the kinds of subject that education is believed to produce. According to this research, they expect to see capable, informed, confident, literate people, continuing to develop the cognitive, social and emotional skills and abilities that may need to thrive and live in a difficult environment, as well as contribute towards the recovery and further development of their communities. They view the provision of education and in particular, schooling, as an appropriate institution to provide the experiences, and foster these characteristics. Such is the expected subjectivity of children affected by humanitarian disasters.

In reality, according to a significant proportion of education informants, the research would suggest that children and their communities are not treated or at least viewed as social, active and capable human beings in the earlier part of a humanitarian response.
As one education informant articulated, ‘children are seen as passive recipients...’ As discussed in the first two chapters, the focus during the first phase of humanitarian response is frequently on the physical and the biological sectors or, what I have called objects.

The views of a health informant concur the above point. After the very initial, immediate, life saving activities, the informant believes the following should be ensured, ‘you are then looking into the ways that to help people survive for the next two to three months – some kind of health care, temporary shelter, a way in which they can cook some kind of food, sanitation facilities, clean water and then it's protection issues, to make sure vulnerable groups are not targeted for any reason... you are putting up toilets... ... somewhere well lit so people can use them without fear of being assaulted at night... cash to cover basic needs...’. This informant mentioned that education should be included in the response some time later, after a livelihoods assessment. After some reflection, this person later mentioned that funding should be ‘ring-fenced’ for education so that it does not miss out as a result of the initial focus on saving lives.

As mentioned in the last chapter, education becomes ‘invisiblized’ (Inda, 2005) in humanitarian processes. In the early phases of humanitarian assistance, education needs are obscured, written out, sometimes extracted from the instruments and processes that could otherwise secure its place within humanitarian funding mechanisms and multi-sector strategic plans. The rationalities and technologies applied in the governing of humanitarian assistance render education invisible, while increasing the visibility of the physical, biological objects.
This begs the question of what kinds of subject are produced by this focus on the physical and biological and what kind of subjects are constructed through the technologies that are available in the humanitarian regime? I shall return to this point in the following paragraphs but first I will show other ways that contribute towards the making of the subject.

Images exposed through media also contribute towards subjectivity of the affected population. As one person said, ‘the child being carried out of the rubble, the pictures of the children eating, food distributed, or vaccines saving lives…’

The research suggests that the focus of humanitarian governance considers the person as a physical and biological being, but not a social, thinking being. As one person said, ‘[they are] thinking about the tents, the water and the food – not the education or social needs of children at all’.

**How is this possible?**

I argue that humanitarian assistance therefore produces a different kind of subjectivity to that expected by a high proportion of education people interviewed. This subjectivity happens through biopower, involving the application of the technologies including instrumentalised processes, procedures and activities, which were discussed in the previous chapter. As already mentioned, biopower is a way of governing that has good intent and ultimately aims to secure the ‘health, welfare, prosperity and happiness of the population’ (Dean, 1991:19). It believes it is doing the right thing in order to achieve its goals. This point is important because as a Foucauldian view would concur, despite the exclusion of particular objects (such as education), the overall intention of humanitarian intervention is good. A Foucauldian view would argue that focusing on
the four objects outlined in Sphere handbook is for the improved health and welfare of the beneficiaries – the people affected by a humanitarian disaster.

Also, in order to govern the conduct of conduct effectively, it must regulate and standardise (Foucault, 1991). As humanitarianism applies its instruments, many of which are bound by specific criteria and specific techniques for measuring the physical, it separates out the social, emotional and political in order to regulate (Smith, 2008). In doing so it produces a particular kind of subjectivity.

Bearing in mind the rationality for focusing on the biological and social, described above, I now describe the kind of subjectivity this form of governing produces.

**Reduced to zoe**

Here it is helpful to introduce the ideas of Giorgio Agamben who was interested in ‘the lives of those lived in the margins of society...’, their ‘exemplary status’ and the conditions that rendered them so (Downy, 2009: 109). In a detailed analysis of the Sphere handbook and standards, Smith (2008) describes the relevance of Agamben’s idea of ‘bare life’. For Smith, the technologies of humanitarian assistance reduce life to what Agamben calls ‘bare life’ (Agamben, 1998: 1-4).

Agamben combines two key ideas to formulate the concept of ‘bare life’. The first is the notion of sovereignty - defined by Carl Schmitt as ‘he who decides on the exception’ (Schmitt, 2005: 5). Agamben adapts and combines this notion of sovereignty with the ideas of Hannah Arendt (*The Human Condition*) and Aristotle. Their writings of ancient Greece speak of two forms of life. The first Greek form of life was *Zoe*, meaning the ‘simple biological life itself, the simple fact of living (Smith, 2008: 28). The second term for life was *bios*, ‘meaning full, social, political life’ - a life that is prepared (Agamben,

**What is the relevance to education?**

I argue that the findings of the research herein concurs with Smith’s analysis and conclusions in that to exclude education in humanitarian crisis situations is to offer the subject not a life with *bios* but rather a life without and that is what Agamben would term ‘bare life’ (Agamben, 1978).

For the child, the social, emotional, physical and cognitive experiences and benefits of school life are replaced with a bare existence or the life of ‘zoe’ (Agamben, 1978). As informants have articulated, those affected by disasters do need hope, trust and confidence, to build relationships and to develop skills – all what might be called traits and characteristics of a healthy, happy, social human being. Yet the figure of the child portrayed and reinforced in humanitarian assistance ‘represents that permanent state of exception’ which Agamben (2005: 21) argues state sovereignty is founded on (Wells, 2013).

The example from an education informant in West Africa demonstrates the difference that education is making to nomadic and African communities, living together in a humanitarian context.

‘The temporary learning spaces are the only places where the nomad children and the African communities are together – the rest of the life is in the camp, the Africans are subdued and considered the slaves of the Tuareg community.’
The temporary learning spaces are the only place where the children from these two communities have time to play and interact together.'

I argue that removing or denying experiences of education offers the life of zoe or, to borrow Agamben’s term, 'bare life' (Agamben, 1995: 7).

I also argue however that humanitarianism believes that it needs to install bare life into the early humanitarian situation as soon as possible because it must establish what Foucault has defined as regularity in order to achieve a sense of order, manageability – it must achieve the regulation of bodies. The humanitarian space must be administered effectively and as Redfield articulates in his exploration of Foucault’s text *Discipline and Power*, ‘they [bodies] must be properly positioned and conditions for reaching them properly established’ (Redfield, 2005: 64). To do this it limits its focus to the physical, biological objects.

For effective governing, humanitarian assistance needs to ensure the governed population is also involved in governing itself. It needs to ensure a degree of self-governing. As previously mentioned, a liberal government employs the capacities of free subjects as a means to achieving its purposes and goals (Dean, 1999, 267). Nikolas Rose explains the aims of the liberal government are to ‘create individuals who do not need to be governed by others, but will govern themselves, master themselves, care for themselves’ (Rose 1996: 45). A health informant corroborates this view with her statement that, ‘for us its about working towards self reliance, how we’re going to pull out – so that something is sustainable without our input - what our exit strategy is going to be…’ The liberal mode of government promotes the kind of subjectivity where people can self manage, self regulate, act for themselves and think for themselves.

The reason why discipline in the prison system is so effective is not because it is forced but because inmates begin to think of themselves as the panoptic on – with the internalized gaze of the prison officer (Foucault, 1991, Redfield, 2005). Disaster affected populations may need the aid to survive but they also need to become the ‘the beneficiary’ in order to benefit. In essence, I am suggesting that they become the beneficiary population. Without them becoming the beneficiary population, it would be difficult for aid to be delivered, and for them to receive and benefit from it. If humanitarian agencies began to think and respond in terms of individuals, it would not be able to function or deal with effectively with populations. It develops therefore what Foucault would call the cellular individuality (Foucault, 1991: 167) – so individuals think that they are being dealt with individually, but in reality, they are part of a system – one distinct group.

It could be asked if it is possible for the humanitarian system to operate in any other from the outset of a new disaster, viewing human life more than ‘a purely biological entity’ (Smith, 2008: 4). The previous chapter mentioned examples of how individuals and agencies within the humanitarian regime continue attempt to shape, reform and to negotiate power and as Foucault explains this is possible because ‘power is everywhere’ and ‘comes from everywhere’ (Foucault 1998: 63); it is complex, moving and diffuse (Smith, 2008: 12), enabling reformation and change – for example, through agents such as the Transformative Agenda.
In conclusion, this chapter discussed the kinds of subjects that are produced from a regime that views the human as a biological entity in the earlier phases of humanitarian assistance. I argue that and rationalities and technologies of humanitarian assistance obscure or obstruct the opportunities that foster the social aspects of being human and that this obstruction produces subjects of with a life of zoe, an existence of ‘bare life’ (Agamben, 1998: 11).
Employing the Foucauldian theoretical framework of governmentality, this research explored the hypothesis that ‘education should be an integral part of the first phase of humanitarian assistance’. In exploring whether education should be an integral part of humanitarian assistance, it seeks an explanation for the limited levels of funding it receives.

In semi-structured interviews, twenty-four participants were interviewed, a group comprised of education, health and also non-technical advisers in six international INGOs, the United Nations, representatives from five major donors and three global bodies, including the Global Education Cluster, the Inter Agency Network for Education in Emergencies and one education partnership body.

The research suggests that saving lives is a key rationality that shapes and informs humanitarian assistance. The Sphere Handbook (2011), assessments and appeals are key and authoritative processes and instruments in humanitarian response that give the notion of saving lives greater priority and prominence, especially during the first stages of humanitarian response. They reproduce ‘established truths’ that humanitarian response is about saving lives. The sectors believed to save lives have been problematised by the humanitarian regime purely because solutions believed amenable have been formulated. Problematizing is another way of establishing the truth. Education is not believed be life saving and neither is it measurable, calculable and manageable in the same way as life saving interventions. As a result education can be obscured, excluded and delayed. Education in emergencies funding can be
affected because of its partial problematization – therefore reproducing the truth that it is not a core part of the regime.

Technologies of governmentality are used to shape conduct within the humanitarian regime; that is to say, they are a form of ‘biopolitics’ (Inda, 2005). As education in humanitarian response is not problematised to the same degree as the sectors believed to be life saving, it is sometimes viewed as a complex activity, difficult to implement, with insufficient evidence to demonstrate its benefits and legitimacy within the regime. Specific technologies of metrics, administration, authoritative people, language and media are employed to shape conduct.

As the goal of these technologies is to save lives and education is not believed to save lives, it excluded, obscured, obstructed or delayed and its levels of funding affected. Technologies therefore comprise a form of power (Inda, 2005, Dean, 2010, Rose, 1989). However, individuals and agencies within the education sector shape their tools and practice to adapt to this form of government and in order to meet children's education needs. The research concludes that the rationalities and technologies of humanitarian assistance obscure or obstruct the opportunities that foster the social aspects of being human and that this obstruction produces subjects of with a life of zoe, an existence of ‘bare life’ (Agamben, 1998: 11).
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APPENDICES

Seven different reasons emerged explaining the exclusion of education, all of which relate to the life-saving rationale.

1. Education activities and the language that describes them are not seen to align completely with the life saving criteria for humanitarian funding.
2. Individuals in strategy positions of authority (for example, Humanitarian Coordinators, Emergency Team Leaders, Programme Managers, remove it.
3. As funding is believed to be limited, some life saving interventions are viewed as more important than others, so those believed to contribute less to life saving, are removed / excluded / obstructed.
4. Life saving is believed to appeal more to donors and tax payers.
5. Education needs may not be as visible as other needs and so not well understood.
6. Operationally it is believed to be difficult to assess all needs together (formulating teams comprised of all sectors; analyzing all emerging needs together within a common assessment framework).
7. Emergencies are framed and portrayed in biological, life saving terms, for example, ‘a nutrition crisis’ so needs that are not obviously life threatening, are obscured.