Partnerships for Development:
Four Models of Business Involvement

Ananya Mukherjee Reed
Department of Political Science
International Secretariart for Human Development
York University
ananya@yorku.ca

and

Darryl Reed
Business & Society Program
Division of Social Science
York University
dreed@yorku.ca

A final version of this paper is forthcoming in the Journal of Business Ethics.
Please do not cite without permission of the authors

ABSTRACT: Over the last two decades there has been a proliferation of partnerships between business and government, multilateral bodies and/or social actors such as NGOs and local community organizations engaged in promoting development. While proponents hail these partnerships as an important new approach to engaging business, critics argue that they are not only generally ineffective but serve to legitimate a neo-liberal, global economic order which inhibits development. In order to understand and evaluate the role of such partnerships, it is necessary to appreciate their diversity with respect not only to the activities that they engage in, but the degree to which they are subject to social control. This paper distinguishes four different types of business partnerships, based upon differing degrees of social control: conventional business; corporate social responsibility; corporate accountability and; social economy. Each type of partnership is described, their basic forms are noted and the conditions and prospects for them contributing to development are examined. By way of conclusion, an analysis is offered of how the different types of business partnerships relate to different conceptions of development and function as policy paradigms to promote different globalization agendas.

KEYWORDS: corporate social responsibility, corporate accountability, social economy, development, co-operatives, Global Compact

ABBREVIATIONS:

CAP	corporate accountability partnership
CBP	conventional business partnerships
CSRP	corporate social responsibility partnership
ETI	Ethical Trading Initiative
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FLA	Fair Labor Association
FLO	Fair Labelling Organization
FSC	Forest Stewardship Council
FWF	Fair Wear Foundation
ICA	International Cooperative Alliance
ICC	International Chamber of Commerce
IFI	international financial institution
ILO	International Labour Organization
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NSMD	non-state, market-driven initiative
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
SAI	Social Accountability International
SEP	social economy partnership
SEWA	Self-Employed Women's Association
TNC	transnational corporation
UCIRI	Unión de Comunidades indígenas de la Regiódel Istmo (Union of Indigenous Communities of the Region of the Isthmus)
UNCED	United Nation Conference on the Environment and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNGC	United Nations Global Compact
WBCSD	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
WCED	World Commission on Environment and Development
WRC	Workers Rights Consortium
WSF	World Social Forum
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WRAP	Worldwide Responsible Apparel Production
WTO	World Trade Organization

The last three decades have seen tremendous changes to the international economy as technological advances and organizational changes in firms have combined with programs of economic liberalization to facilitate an increasing transnationalization of production and finance. One of the many things that has changed along with these processes of economic globalization has been the discourse on development and, more specifically, the question of the role of business in development. Early on in this process, as state-led models began to be replaced by market-driven alternatives, advocates of economic liberalization began to argue that corporations, as the generators of economic growth, were the primary agents of development, not states. When neo-liberal globalization began to engender resistance, however, its advocates started to argue that corporations could contribute to development in other ways. The resources and skills of business, joined with the capacities of development agencies and civil society organizations, could be effectively used to promote health and education, improve livelihood prospects, protect the environment and help ensure respect for labour and human rights. Many civil society actors were and continue to be suspicious of such partnership with business, seeing them as thinly veiled efforts to legitimate a regime of business self-regulation. Others, however, have openly encouraged and embraced these partnerships, seeing them as having significant potential to promote a full range of development goals. Still others have tempered their optimism, while still engaging with corporations to help ensure that they remain accountable to their stakeholders.

There are two basic concerns regarding business partnerships. The first is that at an individual level corporations will be tempted to use partnerships for their own ends (public relations, marketing, etc.) and there will be relatively little contribution to development. The second fear is that as a policy paradigm, partnership will function to legitimate a regime of business self-regulation that will adversely affect development prospects. It is beyond the scope of this paper to evaluate these concerns. Indeed there is probably not adequate empirical evidence for such an evaluation. Rather, what we want to do in this paper suggest is to argue that the reality of partnerships is much more complex than often portrayed. There are not only different types of activities and non-business partners involved, but there are different types of firms that engage in partnerships (including alternative or social economy enterprises) and different power relations between the partners. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to lay out a conceptual map of different types of partnerships and the conditions and prospects for them contributing to development. In doing this we are concerned both with the contributions of individual partnerships to development and as well as with how different types of partnerships function as policy paradigms. In developing the conceptual framework, we will distinguish four different types of partnerships according to the degree of social control they exhibit. We will then investigate the conditions for these partnerships contributing to development. We will also examine how these partnerships relate to different normative conceptions of development and function as policy paradigms in the context of competing approaches to the regulation of the international economy (globalization agendas)

The paper proceeds in the following fashion. The next section offers a brief background to the topic by reviewing the changing role of the business in development and the changing nature of the development discourse over the last few decades. This is followed by an elaboration of four conceptions of development. After this, there is a brief discussion of how business partnerships are best classified. Then the next four sections investigate in turn four different types of partnerships: 1) conventional business; 2) corporate social responsibility; 3) corporate accountability and; 4) social economy. Each type of partnership is described, their basic forms are noted and the conditions and prospects for them contributing to development are examined. Finally, by way of conclusion, an analysis is offered of how the different types of business partnerships relate to different conceptions of development and function as policy paradigms to promote different globalization agendas.

I. BACKGROUND

The Changing Role of Corporations in Development

Corporations under State-led Development – In the immediate post-war period, as former colonies became independent countries, the governments of these (and other Southern) states undertook programs of state-led industrialization. The goal of development in most of these countries was modernization, based on an industrial economy, and supplemented by different degrees of state-mediated redistribution. Many states embarked on policies such as infant-industry protection, import substitution etc. In taking up this task they had to determine strategic directions in which the economy was to grow and provide appropriate support for key sectors. While this strategy of modernization was adopted by many states in Latin America, South Asia and Africa, it was used most efficiently by the developmental states of East Asia. The exercise of control over the business sector was one of the primary sources of the legitimacy of this development state (Amsden 1989).

Transnational corporations (TNCs) were tolerated in the South where Southern businesses were not yet ready to compete or where the consequences of expelling them were likely to be significant. For Southern governments, the problem was not merely the social irresponsibility of individual TNCs (which made companies such as Nestlé the source of international boycotts), but what were perceived to be fundament problems with the regulation of the international economy. In the 1970s, developing countries began to organize within the UN system (through the Group of 77) in order to address this larger problem. Their efforts revolved around a plan to promote a *New International Economic Order*. A key platform of this plan was the regulation of TNCs. As part of their efforts, the G-77 was able to have a special UN commission established which was to develop a Code of Conduct on Transnational Enterprises. After 14 years of negotiations, however, the draft Code was abandoned by the UN in 1992 largely due to resistance from developed countries.[1] (Bair 2007)

Corporations under Neo-liberal Globalization – With the acceleration of processes of economic globalization in the 1980s, the portrayal of the role of the state and the corporation in development began to change significantly. Increasingly states began to be viewed as the problem rather than the solution, a perception that was given some credence by fiscal and development crises in the South. In this context business, conversely, came to be portrayed as the major component of the solution to the problems created by state failure. This dramatic shift in worldview was both a cause and a consequence of the tremendous rise in the power of business – including their increasing ability to organize (nationally and internationally) to interject their agendas through national governments into international institutions and agreements (Evans 1992; Korten 2001)

While the neo-liberal globalization agenda was largely pushed from the North, it was dependent in large part on countries in the South undertaking economic liberalization programs. Whether or not they agreed in principle with such programs (and many did not), the debt crises of the 1980s enabled international financial institutions to force such changes upon countries in the South (most notably in Latin America). They were able to do this as part of structural adjustment programs that these countries had to agree to in order to renegotiate their debts (Stallings 2000).

Economic liberalization programs along with the development of new liberalized trade agreements led to a significant reversal of the stance of many Southern governments toward foreign TNCs. They were increasingly less capable of protecting their domestic markets and firms and had to compete in international markets on the basis of comparative advantage. This meant that rather than trying to keep foreign corporations out, they now had to compete to attract them (on the basis of cheap labour, tax concessions, provision of infrastructure, etc.). (Singh and Zammit 2004)

The Rise of Partnerships for Development – Throughout the 1980s and into the 1990s, the question of whether to more closely regulate TNCs or to provide them greater freedom through the liberalization of trade agreements was highly contested. However, as it started to become clear that the liberalizing forces were going to win this struggle, development actors began to engage more directly with TNCs. One year seems to have had particularly significance in indicating the changing balance in this debate. This was 1992.

As noted above, 1992 was the year in which the UN abandoned its draft Code of Conduct on Transnational Corporations. It was also the year of the UN Conference on the Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro, more commonly referred to as the Earth Summit or the Rio Summit. Southern countries and many environmental and development NGOs saw the summit as an opportunity to address not only issues of conservation, but also the question of justice in the international economy. For them this meant legally binding restrictions on corporate behaviour. For their part, Northern countries were more concerned about gaining access to Southern resources and opening up Southern markets. As a result of these opposed dispositions, no binding treaties were agreed to in the Summit (Murphy and Bendell 1999).

In the light of this impasse, some Northern NGOs felt that it was no longer worthwhile dedicating time to promoting a forest conservation treaty and decided instead that it was more practical to work directly with TNCs. This lead to the formation of the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) in 1993, a multi-stakeholder certification initiative composed of forestry owners, forestry companies, NGOs, local communities and other stakeholders. In a sign of things to come, this provoked the establishment of a number of business-led certification programs. This dynamic of the emergence of competing NGO and business-led certification programs would extend to several other sectors over the next few years (Conroy 2007; Humphries 2001; Murphy and Bendell 1999).

Not only did NGOs begin to change their approach towards working with TNCs during the 1990s, but so too did the UN, most notably starting in 1997 with Kofi Annan's assumption of the office of Director General. In 1997, for example, the UN agreed to accept a pledge made by Ted Turner for $1 billion dollars to support UN activities. To administer the fund the UN established a United Nations Fund for International Partnerships in 1998, which took on the task of promoting new partnerships and alliances in furtherance of the Millennium Development Goals (Utting 2000). In the same year the World Bank established Business Partners for Development, a program designed to assist the Bank in its task of advising governments, particularly with respect to "the social consequences of privatization" (Wolfensohn 1997). In 1999, the Global Compact was launched, with the intention of encouraging greater corporate responsibility, promoting partnerships between the UN and the private sector to the benefit of developing countries, and engaging the private sector in policy dialogues (Kell 2002). Further developments were to come at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) in Johannesburg in 2002. With no major international agreement coming out of the summit, partnerships were hailed as the new way to promote the UN's development work. The establishment of 240 new partnerships was announced, including both public-private and the newly recognized multi-stakeholder (or Type 2) partnerships (Zammit 2003).

The Changing Discourse on Development

In the immediate post-colonial period the notion of development was largely employed as an economic concept, associated with growth and industrialization. In their efforts to promote growth, governments of developing countries employed interventionist policies to develop an industrial base. The basic strategy was to protect new or fledgling domestic firms from foreign competition and provide them with various forms of support. The measures employed to protect emerging industries included the use of high tariffs, overvalued exchange rates, capital controls and often a variety of subsidies. The basic standards to measure development included per capita GDP and industrial capacity (Thornbecke 2007).

In the 1980s as processes of economic globalization began to accelerate, the notion of development continued to be closely associated for many with economic growth. What had changed, however, was the notion that growth was to be attained through state-led policies of industrialization. Rather, development now became associated with the promotion of free markets and the exploitation of comparative advantages. The strategic approach was closely associated with and implemented through structural adjustment programs of the 1980s and 1990s. Per capita GDP, however, remained the key measure of development (Thornbecke 2007).

In response to the inability of governments in developing countries to significantly change the life prospects of the vast majority of their peoples, in the 1980s critiques began to rise of predominantly economic conceptions and measures of development. One of the key concepts around which these critiques were organized was the notion of "sustainable development," a term that was popularized by the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED 1987), more commonly known as the Brundtland Report – after the head of the Commission, former Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland. While the Brundtland Report expressed grave concern over what it saw as an environmental crisis it was decidedly *human-centered* in its focus, placing its greatest emphasis upon meeting the basic needs of people in the developing world (including future generations). Guided by this end, the WCED did not oppose growth, at least not for the developing world. The key problem that it saw was that the North – which had received most of the benefits of past growth – had not proven sufficiently willing to share these benefits. As a result, basic needs in the South were not being met. For this reason the South needed to grow. Sustainability demanded a redistribution of rates of growth (and consumption) among the North and the South. For this to be achieved, developing countries would require increased control by over their resources, as well as structural change in the global economy, including more stringent international regulation.

This basic human-centered orientation towards understanding development that was utilized by the Brundtland Commission has been widely adopted by national and multilateral development agencies, development NGOs and other actors. In adopting the notion of "human development," however, many of these actors have shorn it of its strong redistributional and regulatory implications (UNDP 1990). Most notable in this regard, perhaps, has been the truncated use of the notion by UN agencies. In line with an increasingly pragmatic (some would say uncritical) approach towards addressing the challenges of promoting development, the UN system has tended to propagate its understanding of human development in a very goal oriented fashion. Two instances of this approach have been most prominent. The first of these involved a change in the way that United Nations Development Program (UNDP) measures development. In 1990, the organization inserted three “human development” criteria (viz., literacy rates, infant morality rates and life expectancy) in to its annual reports to supplement its more traditional economic criteria for measuring development. The second instance was the publication in 1995 of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which laid out eight goals (including specific standards) that it challenged the nations of the world to achieve by 2015.[2]

II. Approaches to Conceptualizing Development

Investigating how business partnerships might contribute to development necessarily requires a clear elaboration of what the notion of development entails. Providing such an understanding of development is not an easy task for several reasons. First, there is no one, undisputed notion of development. Different actors have different normative conceptions of what development is. Actors also have different understandings of why there is a problem of development and how this problem might be resolved. Moreover, conceptions of development are often not explicated in a critical (i.e., self-reflective), detailed fashion. Indeed, they are often largely implicit. What this means is that it is necessary to distinguish not one conception of development, but different approaches to conceptualizing the problem of development.

In what follows, four different approaches to conceptualizing development are elaborated. These approaches are based upon four relatively distinct discourses. The first, a neo-liberal conception, is largely an economic notion of development rooted in neo-classical economics.[3] The remaining three models, all of which are reacting to the neo-liberal economic conception, can be understood as three variants of the notion of human development: a) as the enhancement of opportunity, capability and freedom (the capability approach[4]); b) as redistribution and reduction of inequality (the human face approach[5]), and; c) as the reconfiguration of the matrices of social power (the social power approach[6]).

These models are distinguished upon the basis of three main criteria (Mukherjee Reed 2008). The first criterion is their understanding of why there is a problem of development and, more specifically, their understanding of the role of “structure” in determining this problem. Second, there is the conception of social justice that underlies their understanding of development. Here we will draw upon a key distinction made by Iris Young between *distributive* and *enabling* paradigms of social justice. Young defines the understanding of social justice in the former paradigm as “the morally proper distribution of social benefits and burdens among society’s members.” (Young 1990: 16) This would typically include wealth, income and other material resources, but might also include non-material social goods such as rights, opportunities, power and self-respect.[7] By contrast, an *enabling* (or *transformative*) paradigm of social justice does not focus on the distribution of social goods, but rather on power relations within society. It is concerned with ensuring all members of society have an equal opportunity to participate in the decision-making structures of society. The third criterion is agency, i.e., the understanding of which actors are to bring about the desired social change and how. Here we will distinguish between three types of agents: individuals, institutions (including the state and corporations), and collective social actors (such as communities, social movements, and other civil society organizations).

The Neo-liberal Approach

Social Justice – The neo-liberal understanding of development is based upon a distributive conception of social justice involving particular forms of two key institutions. The first institution is the market. For neo-liberals a fair distribution of goods is determined by the market. If ideal market conditions hold, then the resulting distribution of goods through the market is fair. The second key institution is liberal democracy. The role of the state is very limited under this conception of democracy. It is to ensure basic liberal freedoms to all citizens and that basic market conditions hold. The state oversteps its mandate when it seeks to intervene in the economy. For neo-liberals, the proper functioning of these two institutions – the market and liberal democracy - constitutes development. As noted above, this is primarily an economic conception of development, one in which the role of politics is largely to ensure (liberal) economic rights and institutions.

The Problem of Development – For neo-liberals, the problem of development arises because the political institutions, which are charged only with ensuring the legal framework of rights, take up activities that are beyond their mandate. This statement of the problem is most clearly articulated in the "rent-seeking" hypotheses, which has come to dominate development debates since the eighties. The problem according to this analysis is that the state oversteps it boundaries by trying to intervene in the economy. Such politicization of the economic realm has proven to be the greatest impediment to development because it has allowed states to extract "rents" from society. The distributive outcomes that resulted from the rent-seeking state were "unfair" because they did not mirror market outcomes. Instead, gains accrued only to those who could pay the rents demanded by the state. Markets alone, when allowed to work freely, have the ability to generate fair outcomes and displace the processes which generated rents (Bhagwati 1982; Krueger 1974).

Agency – In the neo-liberal model, the private sector (especially corporations and business associations) is the most important agent of development. Its role is two-fold. On the one-hand, it is the engine of growth which generates wealth and creates jobs. On the other, it also plays a key role in containing the extension of state power. It needs to be vigilant so as to inhibit any attempts by government to intervene in the economic realm to promote development. For its part, the state also has an important role to play. As noted above, it is to ensure the smooth functioning of the market and the institutions of liberal democracy. Again, in envisioning such a minimalist role for the state, the neo-liberal paradigm clear parts company with the earlier modernization approach, which assigned a much more extensive role to the state, which included functioning as a regulator between private and public interests.

The Capabilities Approach

Social Justice – The capabilities approach has become the dominant manner of conceptualizing development and informs the strategies of major development organizations such as the UNDP. It has some key similarities and differences with the neo-liberal model. Unlike the neo-liberal approach, it does not conceive of development primarily in economic terms. Rather, development is understood in terms of the enhancement of individual capacities and freedom. Justice requires that all citizens have the opportunity to develop a set of "basic capabilities." Like the neo-liberal approach, the capabilities approach has an understanding of social justice that is based upon a distributive paradigm. Insofar as the goal of social justice is to enable the development of capacities, in this paradigm a wider range of rights and resources must be distributed, namely, those that are necessary for the development of basic human capabilities. This would include certain political, cultural, social (e.g., education, health care) and even economic (e.g., a living wage) rights. While it goes further than the neo-liberal model in the rights and resources that it guarantees, it must be noted that the capabilities approach only guarantees the absolute minimum in terms of basic needs, enough to stave off absolute poverty, to guarantee minimal levels of literacy, etc.[8] The reason for this limitation, Sen (1999) claims, is that because there is not any societal agreement on a substantial theory of justice, this is all the state can do. Other features that this model shares with the neo-liberal approach include a liberal, pluralist notion of the state, a priority of individual freedoms, a formal notion of equality, an emphasis on individual agency and a vision of liberal capitalism as the most appropriate context for promoting human development. These characteristics amount to an understanding of development as the enhancement of individual capability and freedom.

The Problem of Development – The basic problem of development is that people do not have the "basic capabilities" for even a minimal level of economic and political participation. The key question to be addressed is what has prevented states, which are ultimately responsible for this task from guaranteeing such a necessary decent minimum. Unfortunately, this question remains largely unanswered. Sen (1999) provides a largely descriptive account of the problem which points to the absence of an effective legal-institutional framework that can clearly define and provide for the proper distribution of social benefits and burdens. Little social science analysis is offered for why such a framework is lacking. Sen does not provide, for example, an account of how capitalist democracies systematically generate inequalities. Rather, he points out what he sees as moral deficits in state policies and laments the absence of enlightened self-interest. As critics have pointed out, there is an unresolved tension in Sen's account between a normative evaluation of the situation and a critical social scientific account of its causes or, as Bagchi (2000: 4414) puts it, between "moral discourse and the real world of competition, finance and inequality."[9]

Agency – In this approach the primary goal is to develop individual agency. In order for this goal to be achieved, however, individuals must have access to minimum bundles of goods. Ultimately it is the responsibility of the state to ensure that people have access to such bundles, though arguably international institutions also have responsibilities as well. States and international agencies can fulfil these responsibilities either by providing them directly or ensuring conditions that enable people to access these bundles in other ways (e.g., through livelihood policies and programs such as small business development, micro-credit, etc.). There are two basic questions that arise in this context. The first is whether such programs can be effective if states do not address the causes that have led to the lack of development in the first place. If these are structural causes rooted in neo-liberal economic policies, as many critics will contend, then it would seem that more substantial government intervention in the policy realm is required.[10] The second issue here is the degree to which it can be assumed that states and other actors (especially private business, but also international organizations) will be motivated to address this problem (i.e., to expend the resources necessary). The slow progress in achieving the MDGs would seem to indicate that there is a problem in this regard (UNDP 2003).

The Human Face Approach

Social Justice – The human face approach to development shares with the neo-liberal and capacities models a distributional paradigm of social justice. What are to be distributed in this model are basic rights to social protection. This model is essentially Keynesian in nature, positing a role for government both in the promotion of economic development efforts as well as the delivery of social welfare programs. The latter would include social security, compensatory programs for the poor, and targeted social policies to ensure the protection of vulnerable groups. On the political front, this model not only upholds basic political rights at the level of the nation state, but calls for the democratization of international institutions as well as the implementation of other measures that might contribute to ensuring a more just international economy, e.g., social auditing of multinational corporations, a greater emphasis on CSR, debt forgiveness and fairer rules of trade (UNDP 1999; 1996).

The Problem of Development – This approach roots the problem of development in current international political-economic relations as they are manifested in the policies of global institutions. It emerged as a critique of structural adjustment programmes, and more broadly, the imposition of contractionary economic policies on the developing world. From this perspective – as argued in the 1999 Human Development Report, *Globalization with a Human Face* – the problem is not globalization per se, but the manner in which it has been implemented. The neo-liberal variant of globalization has eroded the sovereignty necessary for states to ensure social protection while failing to establish the necessary monitoring mechanisms and institutional frameworks to ensure social protection under conditions of reduced sovereignty. Based in a Keynesian international institutionalism, this approach contends that a framework of managed international capitalism with adequate degrees of state sovereignty is a necessary condition for human development. State sovereignty is considered essential to enable governments to pursue expansionary fiscal policy for protecting the most vulnerable of its citizens from economic shocks. Globalization, in this analysis, has deepened many of the systemic inequalities which already existed between and within nations (UNDP 1999; UNDP 1996). Thus, if globalization is to enable human development, it must have a "human face." In other words, the imposition of neo-liberal economic policy cannot take priority over the basic requirements of those whose quality of life is rendered vulnerable as a result of these policies. What is recommended rather, is an expansionary macro-economics, extensive social protection and social security, compensatory programmes for the poor, and targeted social policy that would protect vulnerable groups from the adverse effects of economic growth (Jolly et al 2004; UNDP 1999).

Agency – The human face relies on two particular types of agents. First, it requires proactive and largely autonomous national states to pursue demand-led policies. Second, it requires an international policy framework which supports such demand-led economic management at the national level. Strategically, this approach is best characterized by a strong reliance on voluntarism and moral appeal (UN 2002). It would seem appropriate to ask if it is realistic to expect states to act on such a basis. Further, like the capability approach, this approach too draws upon a welfarist perspective in which the marginalized play little role in their own development. Rather, development is an outcome of elite action, in particular those elites who have access to the policy process. Finally, while the human face perspective emphasizes the need for national sovereignty, it rarely problematizes the nature of the state and the power relationships which constitute it.

The Social Power Approach

Social Justice – The social power approach to development differs from the other three models in that it is based upon an enabling rather than a distributive paradigm of social justice. A distinction is made in this approach between social, political and economy power (Friedmann 1992). [11] Social power is distinguished from other forms of power by being rooted in different "bases" (see Figure 1). Degrees of social power are determined by the levels of access to and control over these "bases" of power. Empowerment in this framework is constituted by an increase in access to these bases of social power. Although distributive justice is not the primary goal in this approach, it is a desired and intended consequence. The primary goal of this model, however, is a *reconfiguration of the matrices of social power*. The task of human development is not simply to enable people to access basic services, but to foster more fundamental changes to bring about a redistribution of productive resources (e.g., land), the decommodification of basic needs (e.g., water, education) and, most importantly, the creation of alternative structures which foster more equitable social relations (Mukherjee Reed 2008).

Figure 1: Bases of Political, Economic and Social Power

Type of Power	Bases of Power
Political power • state • civil society	 • ability to alter incentive structures of specific social groups and, thereby, inter-group relations; in particular, it is able to define and condition the access of groups to the bases from which their power emanates • access to formal democratic mechanisms; civil disobedience; and informal mechanisms of protest; media
Economic power	• ability to condition people's livelihood possibilities through control over, and access to economic resources
Social power	• defensible life space • surplus time • knowledge and skills • appropriate information • social organization • social networks • instruments of work and livelihood • financial resources

The Problem of Development – In this approach, the problem of development is understood to lie in the unequal power relations that are manifested in institutions and practices which combine to constitute larger social, political and economic structures (Cox 1987). The existence of unequal power relations in a given structure mean that elites in these structures systematically amass and control resources which provide them with "structural power." Elites are able to use the structural power that they derive from one structure (e.g., an economic structure) to exert influence in other structures (e.g., political, legal). The problem of development lies in the fact that elites have been able to systematically exert influence over different social structures in ways which reinforce existing power relations. Of particular importance has been the ability of elites to maintain unequal power relations in the social realm in ways that deny people access to basic sources of social power, as this undermines the basis for marginalized groups to organize for social and political change.

Agency – The notion of agency here diverges sharply from what is assumed in the capabilities and human face approaches. In the social power approach states and institutions are seen as sites of power that are primarily driven by structural interests (rather than moral imperatives). This means that they will develop and effectively implement policies conducive to human development only in response to collective action by marginalized social groups themselves. Agency in this framework exhibits three distinct characteristics. First, it breaks with the welfarist perspective in that the primary agents and beneficiaries of development are the same, not separate. Second, agency primarily involves collective, not individual action. Third, agency entails the mobilization of social and/or political power to transform social structures and the social relations underlying them.

III. CATEGORIZING PARTNERSHIPS FOR DEVELOPMENT

What are partnerships for development? The notion of business engaging with other actors to support marginalized groups is not new. Corporations and other types of business – in the North and the South – have long been involved in philanthropic ventures to support local communities. In their efforts they have often worked with other actors including religious and charitable societies, NGOs, governments and UN organizations among others. What makes such engagements *partnerships* and, more specifically, *partnerships for development* is largely a question of definition. As such it is not easy to provide a simple definition of this term. What is clear, however, is that the involvement of business in such activities has increased significantly over the last two decades and businesses (and their partners) have increasingly drawn upon the notion of *development* to express their involvement (WBCSD 2007).

The interest in such partnerships in recent years is clearly tied to business interests to promote a regime of business self-regulation in the international economy. The crises of the environment and development that were becoming apparent in the mid-1980s were resulting in significant pressure from Southern government governments and citizens in many parts of the globe to regulate corporations. In response to such pressure, the business sector organized itself to directly oppose any legally-binding regulatory measures. This response included the formation of the Business Council for Sustainable Development in 1992 by 48 major companies – later to become the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD) in 1995 – which worked in tandem with the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) to represent business interests at the UNCED. Ten years later, the WBCSD and the ICC would join forces again, this time to create a new organization, the Business Action for Sustainable Development, to prepare the business position for the WSSD in Johannesburg in 2002. Again, the primary goals of this collaboration were to oppose any legally-binding instruments to regulate TNCs and, on the flip side, to promote a self-regulatory alternative focusing on CSR initiatives, included CSRPs (Clapp 2005; Murphy and Bendell 1999).

Among the key players that business has sought to engage in order to promote a self-regulatory regime has been the UN system. As discussed above, since the time of Kofi Annan the UN has been particularly receptive to working with business on its CSR agenda (Zammit 2003). Indeed, it has been the UN system that has most actively advocated and embraced the notion of partnerships, with virtually every UN agencies developing its own public-private partnerships with business. In its enthusiasm, it has been remarked that the UN has applied the term "partnership" to almost every form of business activity and relation, including fundraising, negotiations or public tenders for lower product prices, research collaborations, co-regulatory arrangements to implement voluntary codes of conduct, CSR projects, contracting out of public services, etc. (Richter 2004)

It should be noted that while the UN popularized the notion of business partnerships for development with its own public-private partnerships with large TNCs, the practice is much wider. Indeed, with the recognition of multi-stakeholder initiatives at the WSSD the UN itself encouraged the involvement of small and medium sized firms, along with non-business actors. Of course, there are also many partnerships exist outside of the UN framework. Another aspect of the diversity of partnerships is that they do not all share the self-regulation agenda of the business sector. Indeed, many exist to impose greater control over corporate activities. A final point to be made is that alternative or social economy businesses are also heavily involved in partnerships to promote development. Indeed, many of them have been founded with this purpose specifically in mind (Utting 2005; Garvey and Newell 2005; Davies forthcoming).

As the discussion above indicates, there are obviously a wide variety of types of partnerships that potentially contribute to development. The obvious question that arises is how these partnerships should be classified in order to best facilitate an understanding of their (potential) contributions to development. One approach to classification is employed by the United Nations Global Compact (UNGC), which distinguishes partnerships according to whether they involve: 1) core business activities (which include "initiatives in which companies seek to use their own business operations to contribute to United Nations goals"); 2) advocacy (which includes "initiatives in which companies collaborate with the United Nations to advance a specific cause or promote dialogue on important issues") or; 3) strategic social investment (which includes "a wide array of initiatives in which companies provide funds or in-kind donations to support United Nations projects"). (UNGC 2007: 3-4) A similar approach is offered by Zadek and Radovich (2006) who suggest the categories of service, resourcing and rule-setting. While these approaches, based upon activities, are useful, they are not entirely satisfactory for our purposes of relating partnerships to different understandings of development and to different possible approaches to regulating the international economy. The problem with these approaches is that the same type of activity (e.g., rule-setting, social investment) might be used in quite different ways with significantly different results.

A more useful category for our purposes would be the degree to which societal actors (stakeholders) are able to exert influence in the partnerships and steer them towards their goals and conceptions of development (Utting 2005). Some have expressed concerns that such partnerships are primarily used by corporations for public relations and marketing purposes and that they contribute little to development (Richter 2004). If it can be shown that those forms of partnerships that are most compatible with neo-liberal policies (i.e., those which provide business with the most freedom to pursue their own interests) are able to contribute significantly to development, then this concern may be allayed. It may also go some way to mollifying the larger concern about partnerships, namely, that they primarily serve to justify the neo-liberal globalization agenda (Soederberg 2007). On the other hand, if partnerships that impose greater social control over business are more effective in promoting development, then this would seem to indicate that development actors should be more circumspect in their dealings with corporations and adopt different partnership and regulatory strategies.

In what follows we will distinguish four different types of partnerships – conventional business partnerships (CBPs), corporate social responsibility partnerships (CSRPs), corporate accountability partnerships (CAPs) and social economy partnerships (SEPs) partnerships – based upon the degree of stakeholder influence (social control) and the constraints they places on (conventional) business strategies and goals.[12] On this basis we will examine the conditions and prospects for different types of partnerships contributing to development. This effort represents a preliminary attempt to bring greater conceptual clarity to the nature of the diversity of partnerships and their potential contributions to development. While this work draws upon existing empirical studies, the analysis is primarily conceptual in nature and heuristic in intent, seeking to provide a more informed basis for future empirical work. While we are interested in individual partnerships in this analysis, the underlying concern is how these different types of partnerships function as policy paradigms (Richter 2004).

III. Conventional Business Partnerships

The Partnership Model

For strict advocates of neo-classical economics who hold to strong theories of property rights – which would include most advocates of neo-liberal globalization – there would seem to be little role for business engaging with government (or with other actors) to form partnerships for development. Strong theories of property rights would argue that it is not the role of the firm to promote development and that any use of the firm's resources for anything other than maximizing shareholder value is not to be tolerated. Meanwhile, neo-classical economics would tend to argue that the state is generally not to be involved in any economic activity for this will only lead to rent-seeking behaviour and inefficiencies. These themes, of course, have been most famously argued by Milton Friedman (1970; 1962).

There is, however, one key area in which it might make sense for neo-liberals to consider the possibilities of some form of public-private partnerships. This would be in the realm of public services where two factors come into play which, make completely free market strategies unfeasible. The first of these is the existence of natural monopolies. The second is the reluctance on the part of government to allow completely free market solutions in the provision of basic services (e.g., water, electricity) and social programs (e.g., education, health care). These factors have often led governments in the past to provide these services themselves (Prasad 2007). Although the rise of neo-liberal globalization has brought increasing pressure to privatize these services, governments still feel they need to retain a regulatory role (e.g., in order to ensure "market simulating" results or minimal levels of service to some sectors of society), often as a result of strong citizen opposition to privatization (Hall et al. 2006)

It is in this context that one can speak of CBPs. Here the role of business is to improve the efficiency of the delivery of public services while the regulatory role of government is to ensure that efficiency gains are passed on to the public and that access and affordability are maintained for vulnerable sectors of society (Chisari et al. 2003). Of course, some might suggest that such cases entail a rather weak understanding of the notion of partnership, one which is primarily limited to "contractual relations" (Utting 2000). In such partnerships the business partner is concerned with revenue generation (and not considerations such as public relations). It is not required to demonstrate any specific sense of social responsibility. Such arrangements, however, are commonly understood to be partnerships by the UN and are actually listed as priority areas.[13]

Areas of Activity

Starting in the 1990s there was wide spread privatization of infrastructure in developing countries resulting in CBPs. This development came about in large part not because of the desire of governments in the South to promote public-private partnerships, but as the result of conditions imposed by international financial institutions (IFIs) to privatize these sectors.[14] The lead organization in this regard was the World Bank which from the early 1990s started to require privatization of public utilities as a part of structural adjustment programs (World Bank 1993). The Bank was followed in this practice of promoting privatization by regional development banks (e.g., The Asian Development Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank) and multilateral and bilateral donor agencies (e.g., European Union, DFAIT, USAID), and was supported by multilateral organizations such as the OECD and the WTO (in the General Agreement on Trade in Services). (Magdahl et al. 2006)

IFIs have promoted privatization across all traditional sectors of infrastructure such as water and sewage, electricity, public transportation and telecommunications.[15] In recent years, however, some of these areas have largely lost the nature of a natural monopoly due to technological advances (e.g., telecommunications with the development of cell phones). Of the other sectors, it is water that has proven the most high profile and controversial. The initial results of the privatizations that occurred in the 1990s were mixed at best, especially in water. They did not bring about the hoped for level of investment. While some efficiency gains were reported, these did not consistently result in lower tariffs. There were also many failures as governments cancelled contracts (often due to strong public resistance) or firms themselves have pulled out (Prasad 2007; Magdahl et al. 2006).

Acknowledging difficulties with respect to privatization (and its own "irrational exuberance" in promoting it), the World Bank (2004; 2003) began to alter its position, albeit slightly. Instead of requiring privatization, the Bank suggested that it would look a range of public and private options (though it still retained a strong bias towards privatization). The Bank also began to highlight the nature of the various arrangements as public-private partnerships. In this context the Bank, following the recommendations of the Camdessus Report (WPFWI 2003), began to emphasize the need for governments to control the political and currency risks faced by TNCs and to rely more on private consultants. As part of its general efforts an infrastructure reform, the Bank creates networks of different actors which play different roles. In the case of water, the Bank has been involved with at least 10 different arrangements involving forums, lobby organizations, think tanks and partnerships with other international donors (Magdahl et al. 2006).

Conditions and Prospects for Successful Contributions

The basic goal of CBPs is to increase efficiency in non-competitive markets. The assumption on the part of the financial institutions that impose these arrangements is that state provision of these services is inevitably inefficient (due to some combination of corruption, rent-seeking behaviour, inability to set optimal pricing and/or a tendency to under invest). For their part, however, governments are typically under pressure to ensure that equity considerations (in the form of access and affordability for the poor) do not fall off the agenda in the attempt to increase efficiency.

There are three basic conditions for CBPs contributing to efficiency. The first of these is that firms engage in capital investment, contribute to the elimination of corruption and/or provide more efficient management. The second basic condition is that the partnerships be run on a cost recovery basis. The third condition is the existence of a body (ideally an independent regulator) capable of setting optimal prices such that prices cover total costs (and return on investment compensates capital). (Parker 2002; Beato 2000)

If these three conditions are met, then efficiency gains should follow. In order to ensure that the services remain (or become) accessible to and affordable by the poor, government will have to fulfill other conditions. Most notably they will have to provide some form of subsidy (for access and/or affordability) for those citizens who cannot afford to pay the market price (Prasad 2007; Chisari et al. 2003).

As the discussion above indicates, there is some reason to believe that these conditions do not hold. One basic problem arises with regard to investment. Over the last fifteen years, the private sector has only contributed about 20-25% of the total infrastructure investment in the South. There are a number of reasons for this, including long payback periods, "lumpiness" of necessary investments and political difficulties in collecting cost-recovering tariffs. These various features increase the cost of capital in the South, often making it double the costs in the North. This adds a clear political dimension to the mix as it requires charging higher prices in countries in which the population has considerably less ability to pay, a situation which can act as a further disincentive to investing. Not only has investment not been forthcoming, but critics have argued that firms have basically cherry-picked the best opportunities. Insofar as the best opportunities tend to lie in higher income countries, this means that the countries most in need of investment tend to get less (Estache 2007; Prasad 2007; Bayliss 2002).

With regard to the cost-recovery conditions, this is generally implemented in all CBPs. The problems lie in the impacts of this practice. Specifically, firms have taken a variety of measures to ensure that they receive payment, including the use of prepaid meter, cutting off informal connections, taking defaulters to courts, etc. The effect of these measures combined with higher tariffs has been to effectively cut off large sectors of the poor to essential services, (especially water). In addition, the emphasis on cost-recovery has probably contributed to the failure of firms to live up to service obligations targets (Bayliss 2002; Loftus and McDonald 2001).

The third condition, establishing a regulatory authority that is capable of setting optimal prices, also does not seem to hold consistently. There are several aspects to this condition. First, the goal of establishing independent regulators has fallen well short of the mark, especially in the water sector (Estache 2007). Second, instead of setting prices independently regulatory authorities have been very open to negotiating with firms, allowing for *extra contractual* increases in tariffs as well as surcharges (Loftus and MacDonald 2001). The result of this has been that while contracts typically are based upon a reduction in tariffs, the actual prices has risen substantially (Prasad 2007; Hall et al 2006). In addition, some firms have been able to negotiate agreements where they are guaranteed to earns profits. This is perhaps most wide spread in the electricity sector where the state provides power purchasing guarantees (Bayliss and Hall 2000). In a very notable case in the water sector, a large TNC negotiated a guaranteed15% annual return on its investment, before a strong publish backlash forced the government to cancel the contract and bring the industry back under public control (Hall and Lobina 2002). Third, it is not clear that privatization has had any impact on reducing the role of corruption (Estache 2007). To the contrary, corporate watchdogs and other critics point out that suspicion of corruption and bribery remains very high, though actual evidence is hard to come by (Transparency International 2008; Bayliss 2002; Loftus and McDonald 2001).

The final condition, government taking measures to ensure access and affordability of services to the poor has also not held. Typically economists favour direct subsidies and not cross-subsidies (to help eliminate cherry picking). (Chisari et al. 2003) The basic reality, however, is that most governments do not have the funds to provide direct subsidies and so have to resort to cross-subsidies (and service obligations). These, however, have not proven adequate to ensure access and affordability. While the situation varies across sectors (and countries) it seems particularly dire in the water and sewage, where the poor have consistently been adversely affected through decreased access and less affordability (Maghdal et al. 2006; Loftus and McDonald 2001). Ironically, some studies indicate that investments in infrastructure, especially in water, can lead to tremendous returns for developing countries.[16]

In general, it seems that CBPs have not lived up to the expectations placed upon them. Their record of efficiency improvements has been mixed at best, especially in water. While there have been efficiency gains in some areas and countries, critics have argued that in many cases this has had relatively little to do with privatization. Rather, the results have come about due to increased tariffs and government spending and that similar results could have occurred without privatization (Luftus and McDonald 2001). Indeed, some critics have argued that public sector operators can be just as efficient as private companies (Lobina and Hall 2008; Maghdal et al. 2006). For these various reasons, a wide range of critics has argued that, while privatization is not necessarily inappropriate in some cases, there is no justification for international bodies to actively promote privatization on the basis that it will improve infrastructure deficiencies in the South (Budds 2003).

IV. Corporate Social Responsibility Partnerships

The Partnership Model

CSRPs are defined primarily by two basic features. The first of these is that they are voluntary. Individual corporations are not forced to join them and are not sanctioned if they choose not to join. Typically, firms are not even pressured to join (e.g., by consumer or other civil society groups), but rather are induced by an appeal to the potential benefits. They are only bound by agreements that they freely make. Second, these partnerships are frequently business initiated and always business friendly. There are two aspects to this. On the one hand, corporations (as individual businesses or collective bodies) almost always have a strong, if not dominant, influence over the design of the partnership. On the other hand, there are clear "positive" incentives for individual corporations to participation. In addition, a more general, business-wide motive underlying such partnerships is the desire to inhibit the imposition of legally-binding controls over corporate activities.

As noted above, what actually constitutes a partnership remains largely undefined, with organizations like the UN using the term very liberally (Richter 204; Utting 2000). In speaking about partnerships here, we are primarily concerned with a stricter sense of the term, one that involves at least two parties (one business and one non-business) actively collaborating with each other.[17] This would mean that we would not consider a range of activities that might be recognized by the UN as partnerships. This would include activities that did not have active collaboration with a non-business partner (e.g., donations of money, the elaboration and implementation of company codes of conduct, changing business strategies, etc.). The types of activities that would count as partnerships would include codes of conduct and certification programs designed and implemented with outside partners, resource provision involving active participation by partner groups, developing new business products (e.g., more appropriate technology) and more sustainable production practices in collaboration with local communities and marginalized groups, etc.

Areas of Activity

There are two primary areas in which CSRPs have been implemented. The first is the provision of resources for projects or programs.[18] One key field of activity here includes livelihood initiatives such as job training and entrepreneurial development, with micro-credit programs being particularly popular. The largest partnership in this area is the Global Microcredit Summit (which has been sponsored by the Citigroup, ING Direct, VISA International, the SVG group amongst others). In addition, many large TNCs, especially those faced with community resistance to their corporate activity, have established their own microcredit programs (see Idemudia in this volume).[19] Another prominent area is humanitarian assistance and disaster relief. While historically, corporate participation was limited to philanthropy, corporations are increasingly taking on partnerships roles. The UN's recently established Central Emergency Response Fund, for example, has its own corporate partners, as well as receiving funding through the UNGC and the UN foundation.[20] Social programs, especially health care[21] and education,[22] represent another key area of activity. Here again, corporate involvement has evolved significantly from charitable donations towards community education to full-fledged partnership programs.

The second major area of activity is rule-setting. Rule-setting partnerships primarily entail two basic activities, the development of codes of conducts and second party (i.e., industry based) certifying initiatives.[23] Codes of conduct in business have become very wide spread, having been initiated by a variety of specific industries,[24] apex bodies[25] and ad hoc business groups.[26] Relatively few of the codes, however, entail partnerships (as they lack non-business participation). The most prominent partnership codes are the CERES Principles[27] and the UNGC. One feature that tends to distinguish these codes form other non-partnership codes is that they are not merely aspirational, but involve follow-up activities in the form of reporting.
The nature of reporting required by these codes, however, has come under criticism. The UNGC, for example, relies upon self-reporting which means that there is often little consistency across reports, reporting is not always complete and there is little independent verification (Utting 2005).

In response to such criticism other CSRPs have emerged. One such partnership is the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), which was initiated by CERES and the UN Environment Program in 1997 and became and independent body in 2002. The GRI has established standard indicators which enable an evaluation of a firm's performance against its given standards (its own or industry wide). In line with the general CSR perspective, the GRI does not monitor reporting and relies heavily on dialogue and best practice learning. The effectiveness of the GRI has also been called into question insofar as only a small minority of the over the 400 participating firms report fully "in accordance" with the GRI Guidelines. An additional CSRP designed to address the compliance problem of codes is the AccountAbility 1000 Assurance Standard which seeks to improve the standards of reporting in non-financial audits by developing a single approach based upon three assurance principles. This partnership, like other CSR initiatives, relies upon process rather than performance standards (Graham and Woods 2006; Utting 2005).

In addition to codes of conduct, a number of business corporations, apex business bodies and business related organizations have developed certification programs. Some of these programs go across industries while others are sector/product specific. An example of the former would include the ISO 14000 environmental management standards. Examples of the latter types of programs have arisen in the forestry industry (Bernstein and Cashore 2004), the apparel industry (O'Rourke 2003), the coffee sector (Ponte 2004), etc. One of the features of these programs is that they tend not to have hard targets. Rather, as in the case of most ISO initiatives, they rely on management standards (Clapp 2001). Typically certification CSRPs in specific sectors fall short of the standards of rival programs initiated by civil society groups. They also tend to have weaker reporting, monitoring and enforcement mechanisms.[28] (O'Rourke 2003; Hock 2001)

Conditions and Prospects for Successful Partnerships

The first and most fundamental condition for CSRPs for development to work is that there must be an appropriate form of motivation to induce corporations to participate. In principle a strong commitment to ethical values and principles might be sufficient. The other possibility is that there is pragmatic motivation for corporations to engage in a partnership (Reed 2002). There are several sources of pragmatic motivation for individual corporations, including among others, public relations value and marketing opportunities, as well as gaining sensitive political and market information that can provide advantages over competitors (Richter 2004).

If corporations are reliant upon pragmatic motivation, then a second condition must hold, namely, there must be potential "win-win" scenario in which both the business partner and the other partner(s) can be better off. The notion of a "win-win" scenario based upon pragmatic motivation implies that three other conditions must be met for the scenarios to actually come to fulfillment. First, it is not enough for a corporation that a "win-win" situation exist in order for it to commit to a CSRP. What is also required is that partnership be as beneficial for the corporation as its next best alternative, which might be a philanthropic partnership with no development impact (e.g., sponsoring high culture) or to do nothing. Second, for partnerships to be successful it is necessary that there is an appropriate mix of competencies among the partners. The pragmatic interests of business partners to participate in a given partnership for public relations or marketing benefits does not necessarily mean that it has the appropriate competencies to make the project work effectively for the partners (Partners in Change 2000). Third, there must be some condition(s) in place that neutralize power relations between the partners. If the business partner is relying purely on pragmatic motivation, it will try to capture (almost) all of the benefits of the partnership for itself. Without some power of its own (e.g., pressure from consumers and/or social movements, ability to use the media to shame, etc.) to hold the business partner accountable, the net gains to the partnership may end up to be negligible (Garvey and Newell 2005).

If all these conditions are in place, then there is some prospect that CSRPs might make some contribution to development. There are, however, compelling reasons to believe that these conditions do not generally hold. With regard to the first condition of adequate motivation, there is very little reason to believe that corporations have significant levels of ethical motivation (Zammit 2003). Indeed, the preponderance of evidence seems to point in the other direction of corporations only really being moved by pragmatic motivations. One indication of this would seem to be in the marketing of CSRPs by both business and non-business partner organizations. All appeals to corporations to participate are on the basis of the benefits that they will receive (UNCG 2007; WBCSD 2007). Business, government officials and other partners all seem to be generally agreed that for partnerships to work, there must be benefits for all parties (Graham and Woods 2006). For their part, companies typically justify this approach on the basis of what they see to be their fiduciary obligations to their shareholders (Maitland 1994). Another clear indication of the pragmatic motivation underlying corporate participation in CSRPs can be seen in the timing of such initiatives, which frequently follow immediately in the wake of scandals or in response to the initiation of CAPs (Jenkins et al. 2002).

If firms decide to participate in CSRPs on the basis of pragmatic motivation then the conditions cited above for effective "win-win" partnerships must hold. It is not clear that this is generally the case. The first condition is that the partnership must be the best alternative for the firm (better than non-development partnerships or doing nothing). In the case of rule-setting partnerships, firms will typically benefit only to the degree that they can be held up to public scrutiny in ways that will affect their sales. As Klein (2000) has argued, this is the case with only a small fraction of firms, namely, the largest, branded firms in a few key sectors (e.g., apparel, sporting goods). Other small and medium sized firms in these sectors, as well as the vast majority of firms in other sectors, do not come under any significant scrutiny and, therefore, will have no reason to engage in rule-setting CSRP (much less CAPs). CSRPs are not win-win situations for these firms because they gain very little by participating in them (Vogel 2005; Wells 2004).

The other important condition that does not typically hold relates to power dynamics.[29] In virtually all CSRPs there are huge power differentials between business and non-business partners which make it difficult for non-partners to have much influence. Business partners have many options and significant amounts of resources. This means that they can largely determine the conditions under which they participate in CSRPs and effectively skew the benefits towards their interests (rather than development needs). In the case of rule-setting CSRPs this means that corporations will often initiate partnerships and be able to determine the nature of the standards, which will invariably be below those of rival CA partnerships (Ponte 2004). Also, these partnerships will not typically have external monitoring or auditing. Even in those instances where third party monitoring is established, the impact of the programs remains minimal because of the low standards that have already been set and the lack of significant possibilities for sanctions. It is this situation that underlies accusations of “green washing” and other related charges (Fridell et al. 2008; Hoedeman 2002; Hock 2001).

In the case of resourcing partnerships, power differentials mean that firms can essentially treat CSRPs as investments. As Zammit (2003: 140) has puts it, “companies will invest in CSR until the point at which the cost is no longer matched by benefits.” This can severely limit the development impact of such partnerships. For one, it is likely that the decision to engage in partnerships will be based more upon the returns to corporations than development priorities and impacts. This may be reflected in a number of ways, including partnership being located only in areas close to where firms have operations and being designed to benefit key company stakeholders (including employees) rather than the most needy (Partners in Change 2004, 2000; Venkateswaran 2004). As a result, Jenkins (2005) argues, CSRPs do little to advance the cause of poverty reduction as it is rarely the poorest sectors which benefit from such programs. More generally the concern is that corporations will invest very little in partnerships in relationships to their overall revenues and the amounts invested will be based upon their strategic interests, rather than what is required to establish effective programs (Christian Aid 2004). Moreover, critics will argue, any positive development impact by corporate contributions to CSRPs can be massively offset in the form of lost tax-revenues to developing countries which are incurred in part by the role that CSRPs play in helping to legitimate neo-liberal policies (Bendell 2004).[30]

Figure 2: Main Features of Partnerships for Development

Features / Partnership Type	**Partnership Activities**	**Key Sectors**	**Conditions for Success**	**Benefits for Business Partners**
Conventional Business Partnerships	• core business o improving efficiency	• infrastructure o water o electricity o communications o transportation	• good investment climate • full cost pricing • effective regulation o independence o optimal pricing o reducing corruption	• revenue generation
Corporate Social Responsibility Partnerships	• resource provision o livelihoods o social programs o humanitarian assistance • rule setting o codes o certification	• apparel and sports equipment • resource sectors • food and agriculture • financial services	• win-win situations o best alternative o competencies o power dynamics	• public relations • marketing opportunities • access to strategic information
Corporate Accountability Partnerships	• rule setting o certification • transparency o reporting o tax avoidance o lobby activities	• apparel and sports equipment • resource sectors o forestry o marine • food and agriculture	• social mobilization • compensation of resource deficits • long terms corporate engagement strategy • government and public institution support	• image make-over • recruiting and retention • access to ethical markets o price premium
Social Economy Partnerships	• resource provision o enterprise development • rule setting o certification	• food and agriculture • informal sectors • infrastructure	• support structures for SE enterprises • developing SE networks • strategy for corporate engagement • contact with social movements	• core mission • network benefits

V. Corporate Accountability Partnerships

The Partnership Model

A third type of partnership derives from a basic scepticism of CSR as a policy approach to regulating business activity. Critics of the CSR framework have included development NGOs, social movements, corporate watchdogs, labour organizations, academics and public policy institutes. There complaints can be briefly summarized. First, particular partnerships are not accountable to their purported beneficiaries. Second, they are not effective in that they neither establish appropriate standards nor set up effective monitoring and enforcement mechanisms. Third, critics charge that these partnerships are not even intended to be effective. Rather, at the level of individual firms and industries they function as a mechanism for image washing and greenwashing, while at the level of business as a whole they serve to legitimate a model of business self-regulation (Zadek and Radovich 2006; Bendell 2005; Korten 2005; Bakan 2004).

In response to these deficiencies, CA movements seek to impose greater social accountability over corporations. In contrast to CSRPs, which leaves corporations to decide what social responsibility is and whether they wish to act in accord with such standards, CA movements and partnerships seek to increase societal determination of what appropriate standards are and to strengthen the requirements on corporations to live up to such standards. As such, CA movements are primarily concerned with rule-setting and the related activities of monitoring, reporting and enforcement. In moving away from entirely voluntary measures, CA movements seek to establish a framework that ensures answerability, enforceability and universality (Newell 2002; Utting 2005).

Areas of Activity

In their efforts to impose great control over corporations, CA movements may use a variety of measures, including hard law, soft law, boycotts, protests, shareholder activism, and certification programs. They increasingly mix these different strategies to develop what Utting (2005) has described as *articulated forms of regulation.* While there are several types of CA initiatives that might be considered partnerships, by far the most prominent would be certification programs.[31]

Certification CAPs have tended to focus on two primary concerns, namely labour rights and the environment. Most of the labour rights CAPs (often referred to as "no sweat" or "ethical trade" initiatives) have tended to be concentrated in the apparel, foot ware and sportings goods sectors. Examples would include Fair Labor Association (FLA), the Workers Rights Consortium (WRC), the Ethical Trading Initiative (ETI) and Fair Wear Foundation (FWF).[32] The environmental CAPs have largely been concentrated in resources sectors. Examples would include the FSC, the Marine Stewardship Council, the Rainforest Alliance, etc. Typically, but not always, these CAPs have emerged out of existing social movements and rely heavily on the support of other NGOs and movements (which may or may not have some formal association with the certifying partnerships). These larger movement actors play important roles in pressuring for change (e.g., through protests, campaign, demonstrations) which the formal certifying bodies themselves may not be associated with (Bendell 2004; Bernstein and Cashore 2004).

These CAPs are united by a number of common features, though they demonstrate a certain diversity of practice. First, of all they share a common goal of getting corporations to recognize and live up to appropriate standards. They diverge to some degree, however, with regard to the participation of business in the setting of these standards, with some certification bodies including corporate representation (e.g., FSC, FLA), while others do not (e.g., WRC). Still, non-business partners tend to be in the majority and corporations are not able to dominate standard setting as they do in CSRPs. Second, none of these CAPs rely upon self-reporting for monitoring, but rather employ third party audits, complaint mechanisms, etc. Third, in addition to engaging in public education, all of these initiatives seek to engage governments, multilateral bodies and other public institutions in some way in their efforts to ratchet up standards and strengthen monitoring and enforcement mechanisms. These may include promoting legislation in support of their certification initiatives (market-based incentives, transparency requirements, etc.), incorporating higher standards recognized in hard or soft law, the use of courts to enforce standards, encouraging public purchasing policies, etc. (Bendell 2004; Utting 2005)

Conditions and Prospects for Significant Contributions

Certification CAPs, as noted above, are characterized by three basic goals, namely, answerability, enforcement and universality (Utting 2005; Newell 2002). In order to obtain these goals, there are a number of conditions that CAPs will probably have to meet. First, they will have to be able to mobilize public support. In particular, they need support from consumers (to reward or punish corporations with their purchasing decisions), from dedicated activists (to develop and implement campaign), from other sympathetic social movements (willing to support educational outreach and other campaigns) and, especially in terms of legitimacy, from the communities that are most directly affected by the practices involved.[33] Second, they must be able to compensate for their relative lack of resources (in order to educate and run effective monitoring and enforcement programs). Third, they need long term strategies for working with corporations. Fourth, governments, multilateral bodies and other public institutions must be engaged in ways to support efforts to ratchet up standards and enforcement.

Why are these particular conditions important and to what extent do they hold? To answer this question it may be helpful to refer to a model developed by Bernstein and Cashore and several collaborators based upon their work in the forestry sector (Cashore et al 2007; Bernstein and Cashore forthcoming; 2004). The model seeks to account for how non-state, market-driven initiatives (NSMDs) might be successful. A basic presupposition of their model is that these initiatives exhibit three key characteristics, namely: 1) they can draw upon existing international norms, e.g, International Labour Organization (ILO) norms, International Standards Organization (ISO) standards; 2) they are relatively compatible with the prevailing market-friendly regulatory environment and; 3) they represent a better option for firms than hard law (Bernstein and Cashore forthcoming). The authors argue that initiatives can move through three stages of development. In the initial stage NGOs work with industry bodies that already have relative high standards and who would not be stretched too much by joining the new certification body (and would benefit by capturing a niche market). Most firms, however, will reject the certifying partnership outright. In the second phase of widespread growth, some of the firms that initially rejected the partnership will organize to create industry-led alternatives. Over time, the authors argue, there may be a convergence of standards (and even a consolidation of initiatives) as the industry led-initiatives come under market pressure. In the third phase (which has not yet occurred in any such initiatives), the authors argue that as a result of learning processes the various stakeholders in the process will create a community and that firms will no longer make decisions purely on a strategic basis. This community provides a certain sense of legitimacy for the initiatives which facilitates their higher standards being adopted by other key bodies (e.g., ISO) and incorporated into (soft) law and, thereby, becoming more widely diffused.

In this model, Cashore et al. argue (2007) that there is a key role for government and other public institutions in the transitions from the first to the second phases in the form of ratcheting up standards. Drawing upon Vogel's (2005) understanding of the "California effect," they argue that public policy developed by key institutions can pay a key role in getting more firms to sign onto certification partnerships. One of the most important vehicles in this regard may be public purchasing policies. The strategic goal behind public purchasing policies, in addition to raising public awareness, is to induce key players to raise their standards to access an important market. Once companies have raised their standards for this market, then they may generalize these standards. Public purchasing policies have had an important impact in the apparel industry, especially in the US where hundreds of universities have joined the FLA or the WRC. This has led a number of major retailers to meet higher standards. One limit to such policies is that they tend to be restricted to a small number of products. Another major concern relates to the capacity of the partnerships to effectively monitor and enforce their standards, an capacity which has been called into question (O'Rourke 2006; Hale and Shaw 2001). In the forestry industry public purchasing policies have also been promoted, especially with governments. A key limit of such policies in this sector is that there is relatively little impact on development because the vast majority of the participants of the FSC operate in the North (Cashore et al. 2007).

The proposition of Bernstein and Cashore (forthcoming) that firms and stakeholders can gain political legitimacy speaks to the need of NGOs to develop long-term strategies. While the particular scenario that corporations and stakeholders may form communities is certainly open to contestation, what is clear is that NGOs need to work closely with corporations over time. The exact ways in which they should attempt to collaborate, including the issue of whether corporations should be involved in decision-making bodies, would seem to be open. Such issues of strategy are difficult to assess outside of specific contexts as they depend heavily on the power dynamics and market structures involved (Garvey and Newell 2005).

The question of the power dynamics brings us back to the issue of the power relations involved in these partnerships and the relative lack of resources of NGOs and social movements. Ultimately, the ability of partnerships to move from the first to the second phases (through leveraging public policy) and the second to the third phases (through developing long term relations with corporations) that Bernstein and Cashore postulate depends upon the ability of NGOs to mobilize social movements and consumers. They need to mobilize these groups for three basic reasons. In order to move from the first phase to the second phase they need the support of civil society movements to educate consumers and shame corporations that do not join. They need the cooperation of Southern actors, and here CAPs have not always had a good record, not only for legitimacy, but also to help ensure effective enforcement. They also need the support of consumers to reward best (and punish worst) practices (O'Rourke 2006; Bendell 2005).

This latter group may represent the ultimate limit to the success of corporate accountability movements. If certification CAPs cannot demonstrate that consumers are not only concerned, but are able to effectively distinguish different social accountability labels, then corporations will, at best, remain with their own certification CSRPs. Unfortunately, there is relatively little empirical evidence to indicate that this is the case. Surveys of consumers do increasingly exhibit that consumers are concerned about environmental and social issues. What is less clear is the degree to which they act upon this expressed concern and whether they do so in a knowledgeable manner. Here most of the literature seems to indicate that consumers do not feel well informed or capable of acting effectively upon their beliefs and/or are more concerned with other issues such as price and convenience (Haigh and Jones 2006; Page and Fearn 2005; Uusitalo and Oksanen 2004). It is for these reasons that most advocates of corporate accountability do not believe that individual civil society regulatory bodies alone can be an effective long term solution. Rather the challenge for CAPS is to mobilize support and leverage it in order to embed higher standards in public policy. The larger problem, as discussed above with CSRPs, is that firms in most industries are not really subject to organized consumer pressure, while in those industries that are susceptible it is only branded companies that come under any significant pressure (Vogel 2005).

VI. Social Economy Partnerships

The Partnership Model

A fourth type of partnership involves SE organizations (i.e., non-profits, community economic-development corporations, co-operatives, cooperative development organizations, etc.).[34] While this is a diverse group of actors, they generally share with CA movements a concerns about the efficacy of CSR programs and partnerships and the need to impose greater societal control over corporations. Where they differ from the CA movement is with regard to two key features. The first of these is a greater scepticism about the prospects for the CA movement effectively addressing the plight of the vast majority of the marginalized people in the world. There are two sides to this concern. On the one hand, there is scepticism about the prospects of the CA movement bringing corporations under social control. On the other hand, there is the concern that even if the CA movement proves capable of forcing corporations to live up to appropriate standards, there will still be hundreds of millions of people that are not integrated into the global corporate economy that will still be in need of support to meet their development aspirations. This leads to the second basic point difference with the CA movement and SE actors, namely, that they have a fundamentally different focus. Rather than trying to restrain and redirect corporate behaviour, SEPs promote alternatives to traditional business corporations.

The defining characteristics of SE enterprises are that they have a social purpose (rather than seeking to maximize profits), are democratically controlled and are committed to cooperating with other SE actors. As such, SE enterprises involved in partnerships for development typically do not face the same (motivational) tensions that corporations face, as they are naturally oriented to helping other organizations develop and see this as inherently part of their mandate (rather than as a strategic alliance which must contain a "win-win" proposition). The basic goals of SEPs are to provide support for new and fledgling SE enterprises, to help such enterprises scale up and improve their competitiveness, to link SE enterprises together in mutually supporting networks and to promote a better regulatory and policy environment for the development of the SE (Fall et al. 2004; Defourney and Develtere 1999).

Areas of Activity

There are a number of different forms of SEPs, two of which are most prominent.[35] The first of these provides resources and support for the new and fledgling cooperatives and other SE enterprises. This support is primarily directed toward two sectors. The first, and biggest such area of activity is agriculture, where a wide variety of partnerships occur. At the highest level of organization, the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) works closely with UN agencies such as the ILO and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) to promote cooperative development.[36] National cooperative associations also typically have their own cooperative development organizations which work with new and fledging cooperatives in developing countries. In a number of countries there are also private-public partnerships at the municipal level to promote cooperative development in the South (Fall et al. 2002). Cooperative sectors,[37] other groups of cooperatives[38] and individual cooperatives[39] also have their own programs and/or agencies to promote cooperative development among cooperatives in the South. There are also a variety of local NGOs that also support cooperative development in the South. Partnerships can provide a variety of different types of support for cooperatives and other SE economy actors, including technical, organizational, market access, financial, etc. Strategically, a basic goal of such partnerships is to try to ensure that cooperatives have access to a full range of support services. Some support partnerships also seek to encourage the development of a diverse range of local SE enterprises that can work together in mutually supportive ways (Favreau and Fréchette 2002).

The second key sector, or sectors, in which SEPs are emerging are the informal or "popular sectors" among the urban poor. SE enterprises in these sectors typically involve production or services which require little capital such as recycling (Medina 2005), street vending (Cohen 2000), etc.[40] These initiatives differ from CSRPs such as micro-credit and other small business development programs in a couple of important ways. First, the notion of entrepreneurship is collective, not individual. Second, they usually emerge out of, and/or have strong organic linkages with existing social and political movements. In India, for example, the largest such cooperative of waste-pickers was organized by the Self-Employed Women's Association (SEWA), a union of informal workers (Bhowmik 2006). Third, these arrangements provide their members with more than income. In addition to economic profits, they also generate what Rodriguez-Garavito (2006: 57) refers to as "social profits" which entail a "series of individual and collective benefits – some tangible, some intangible – that albeit seemingly minor, entail profound changes in the lives of recyclers who belong to the cooperative." Through these social profits, cooperatives seek to provide their members with the types of benefits that typically are only available with fulltime employment in the formal sector.

The Fair Trade movement is the primary example of the second type of SE economy partnership, a special form of rule-setting initiative. In some ways the fair trade movement is very similar in form to CA certification partnerships in that it entails rule-setting, monitoring, reporting and enforcement operations. Where it differs from CA programs is in its goals. Its primary purpose is not to encourage more accountable behaviour on the part of corporations. Rather, it uses certification to promote the growth of small producer cooperatives in the South through the establishment of more equitable trade relations. Its rules not only require Northern fair trade organizations (cooperatives, NGOs and social entrepreneurs) to pay Southern producer cooperatives more equitable prices for their products (coffee, bananas, cocoa, tea and more recently cotton being the most widely trade commodities), but seek to encourage long term trading relationships. These relationships involve Northern SE actors providing different forms of support (organizational, technical, financial) to Southern producers. Such support enables Southern producers not only to increase their productive capacity in a given product, but also serves as a catalyst for a broader program of local development. For example, some of the large producer cooperatives, such as UCIRI[41] in Mexico, have used the support that they have received through Fair Trade to establish schools, cooperative stores and new cooperative businesses. Such local development strategies are also intended to stop outward migration from rural communities, as well as to help preserve local culture and language (Vanderhoff Boersma forthcoming).

One of the more controversial developments of Fair Trade in recent years has been the increased role of corporations. While fair trade started off as a purely SE initiative, it began to change when a group of small producers from Mexico initiated a certification mechanism in large part to expand their market (Vanderhoff Boersma 2005). They felt that they could not sell enough of their product through alternative outlets and wanted to get fair trade products onto large supermarket shelves. This was a compromise in which the fair trade vision of an alternative trade system based upon solidarity was compromised slightly in order to gain access to large distributions channels. Subsequently, however, corporations have moved from merely a role in retail to importing and processing Fair Trade products. This development has much further compromised the SE nature of the partnership and the decreased the benefits that go to small producers in terms of support (though in principle they are able to sell more). More ominous for the small producers is the fact that in some product sectors the Fair Labelling Organization is certifying products produced on large plantations. This development could entirely eliminate small producers and SE participation from Fair Trade. If this form of corporate participation – which is being vociferously opposed by producers in the South – is allow to continue, it could change Fair Trade from being a SEP to a CA one (Reed forthcoming-a).

Conditions and Prospects for Successful Partnerships

The first basic condition that confronts SEPs involves the promotion and support of individual SE enterprises, especially new and fledgling ones. Most new enterprises start off very small and are very vulnerable especially in their first few years of operation. SEPs need to provide a range of different support mechanism to help new enterprises to be come viable and endure shocks that can occur in the early years of their development. Such enterprises require access to capital, technical support in production and help with a range of other business activities (marketing, organizational development, accounting, etc.). (Cornforth et al. 1988) A key factor in promoting viability is helping cooperatives and other SE enterprise make effective use of their competitive advantages (e.g., ability to draw upon local social capital, knowledge of local markets, etc.). Conversely, they need to find ways to compensate for some of their potential competitive disadvantages (e.g., problems raising capital, recruiting and retaining skilled management, regulatory discrimination, etc.). (Spear 2000)

A second basic condition for success is the linking of SE enterprises together in networks. This is essential for overcoming some inherent disadvantages of SE enterprises just mentioned and enabling growth in three specific areas. First, there is a need to grow extensively, that it to include more and more marginalized people in SE enterprises. This goal is facilitated by the development of horizontal networks which can provide common services and models for new and fledgling cooperatives. Second, there is a need for SE enterprises to move up the value chain. In the South most SE enterprises operate at the bottom of commodity chains in which they receive very little value added. Networks have the potential to help SE enterprises to move up the value chain by taking on more of the processing, manufacturing and even the distribution and final sale of their products (Harris 2007; Reed forthcoming-a). Third, there is a need to for the diversification of SE economy enterprises at a local level, so that they can develop as mutually supporting network. This entails the development of SE financial institutions (e.g., credit unions), distribution outlets (e.g., cooperative supermarkets), infrastructure provision and a variety of forms of production, both in terms both of products (e.g., different commodities instead of a single agricultural crop) and levels of activity (e.g., processing and manufacture as well as simple agricultural commodity production). Such networks could involve the inclusion of SE enterprises within a single, formal organization (along the lines of the Mondragon Cooperative Corporation in Spain) or more an informal association, such as the La Lega association of cooperatives in Italy (Smith 2001; MacLeod 1997). In a global economy, it is essential that such networks have an international dimension – not only to ensure access to markets, but also to procure the resources and knowledge necessary to remain competitive (Reed forthcoming-b)

A third condition for success is a strategy for engaging with corporations (Reed forthcoming-b). This is especially important for the fair trade movement, which faces two particular challenges. On the one hand, fair trade needs to determine an effective way to gain access to large retail markets without allowing corporations to dominate and change the nature of the partnership. On the other hand, fair trade needs to find effective ways to combat the efforts of conventional business to “fair wash,” that is, attempts to portray themselves as participating in fair trade (e.g., by adopting the language of Fair Trade, developing rival CSR initiatives, etc.) while not living up to fair trade standards (Jaffee 2007; Renard and Pérez-Grovas 2007).

A fourth condition for success is being able to maintain contacts with and draw upon the support of social movements. In the same way that CA movements rely upon social movement support, so too must SE movements. They need to develop consumer support for SE products. They also need activist support, both in the North and the South, for lobbying local and national government on a variety of issues (e.g., public purchasing policies, local economic development policies, legal reforms regarding cooperative land, land reforms, etc.). There is also a strong need to engage national governments to work for reforms to international trade and finance agreements that limit the ability of national and regional governments to pursue development policies that favour SE actors (Birchall 2004; Defourney and Develtere 1999).

The ability of SEPs to meet these conditions so far has been significant, but limited. Fair Trade provides a good example of the successes and limitations. First, at the level of individual cooperatives, Fair Trade provides and example of how it is possible to provide a range of different forms of support for small producers and the impact that this can have. What it has not been able to do yet is expand this system very widely. While the growth in fair trade purchases has been quite sharp as new national markets are opened up, there has been a levelling off after a few years with the fair market share remaining extremely modest. Indeed, it is only in coffee and bananas that fair trade tends to have any significant market share. It is interesting to note, however, that the countries with the largest per capita consumption of fair trade goods (e.g., Switzerland, UK) are those with a strong cooperative retail tradition (Wilkinson, 2006).[42] This speaks to the importance of the second condition above of building SE networks.

With regard to the third condition, fair trade has not yet developed a successful strategy for interacting with corporations, to ensure that fair trade principles are respected. Many would argue that the reason for this has been a professionalization and bureaucratization of the national certifying bodies which has resulted in a lack of input by Southern producer organizations and other movement actors (Barrientos et al., 2007; Vanderhoff Boeresma forthcoming). This situation has been changing in recent years as Southern producers have started to organize into regional groupings in Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean. On this basis they have been able to gain representation on the FLO board (Wilkinson and Mascarenhas, 2007). While critics argue that further reforms are still required in order for fair trade structures to reflect the goals of empowering small producers, they would see such developments as a move in the right direction (Renard and Pérez-Grovas, 2007).

Finally, with regard to the fourth condition of retaining links with social movements and engaging national governments, there is some indication that SEPs are very active. Their engagement with social movements can be under stood in the context of the development of an alternative globalization movement. While resistance to the neo-liberal variant of economic globalization first came to broad public attention with the “battle of Seattle” in 1999 as an anti-globalization movement, there have been alternative and participatory development initiatives operating in the South for many years. What has been changing recently is that these movements, including SE enterprises, are interacting and cooperating more. The major symbol of this new alternative globalization movement has been the World Social Forum (WSF), a summit first organized by Brazilian activists in 2001, as a direct response to the annual World Economic Forum in Davos. While the WSF is still finding its identity, there can be no doubt that it has not only helped to galvanize opposition to neo-liberal policies, but it has provided an important forum for the promotion of alternatives. SE enterprises have been key participants in this movement and the model for alternative forms of production (de Sousa Santos 2003). Similarly, SE actors have been engaged in trying to pressure national governments to change their policy approaches. The most significant developments in this regard, so far, have come in South America, where almost all of the governments are trying to distance themselves from the Washington Consensus in order to create more policy autonomy to pursue alternative development paradigms (Gruegel et al. 2008). Many of these governments, most notably perhaps in Brazil, Venezuela and Bolivia, have undertaken measures that are supportive of the development of the SE (often at the instigation of peasant and other social movements. Most notable in this regard have been policies involving land reform (Veltmeyer 2005) and cooperative development (Harris 2007).

IV. Conclusion – Partnerships and Development

In the discussion above we first laid out four conceptions of development. We followed this by distinguishing and analyzing four models of partnerships for development. By way of conclusion we will briefly indicate how these different forms of partnerships map on to the different conceptions of development and related approaches to understanding the regulation of the international economy (globalization agendas). In this discussion the emphasis is less upon the impacts of individual partnerships and their contributions to development than the larger compatibilities between the partnerships as policy paradigms and the various conceptions of development.

CBPs and Development

CBPs embody the basic conception of neo-liberal development. Their basic goal, to improve efficiency through decreasing the direct role of government in the economy, is based exactly on the neo-liberal conception of the problem of development as over involvement by the state in the economic realm. Underlying such partnerships is a stark conception of social justice focused primarily upon economic liberties (which are justified by a libertarian appeal to property rights or a utilitarian appeal to efficiency), with liberal democracy primarily serving as an instrument to ensure these rights. The libertarian moment and the utilitarian moment of the model are largely assumed to be in harmony, with economic liberties ensuring economic growth. Issues of distribution remain largely ignored, as it is assumed markets distribute goods fairly. Within this model, market actors unintentionally bring about development (in the form of growth) through their business activities, while the state's role is to ensure that markets function as they should (including upholding the basic rights that are necessary for this to occur).

CBPs have functioned as a method for imposing the neo-liberal model on countries in the South. Through structural adjustment programs, the international funding institutions imposed structural adjustment programs on developing countries which required them to liberalize their economies, including privatising public utilities and interjecting market reforms in the delivery of social programs. Insofar as the World Bank was not able to completely eliminate the role of government in these latter areas, CBPs became an important tool to build down the role of government in these sectors.

The CG partnerships, however, have functioned in another way. The direct and immediate impact that these partnerships can have on an entire population have allowed them to serve as tangible symbols of neo-liberal economic globalization. They have become rallying points for civil society activists in many Southern countries. They have sparked political mobilizations that have led to the collapse of neo-liberal governments, most notably perhaps in

Bolivia. They have even given an impetus to the development of alternative economic models. This open opposition in the South along with pressure from anti-globalization activists in the North has called into question the political acceptability of a stark neo-liberal model of globalization. Not only are few Southern governments willing to openly embrace such a model, but TNCs which have been closely associated with the model and who are widely seen as its major beneficiaries have also been feeling the need to pull back from it, at least to some degree.

CSRPs and Development

CSRPs can be understood as having a close affinity to a capabilities approach to understanding development. The understanding of the problem of development in the latter perspective is very similar to the neo-liberal understanding in that both define the problem largely in terms of the lack of fully developed markets. Both positions approach also hold that business – and large corporations in particular – are the primary engines of growth and, thereby, development. Where they tend to differ is in their understanding of what needs to happen in the absence of fully develop markets and the presence of people not able to fully participate in markets (on a temporary or long-term basis). Whereas neo-liberals do not really have a well-developed response to this situation, the capabilities approach holds that some minimal measures at least must be taken to help ensure that the worst forms of deprivation are addressed (abject poverty, natural disasters, etc.) and people have the opportunity to become (re-)integrated into markets.

It is in this context that the role of individual CSR projects can be partially understood. Many CSR projects and programs address the problems of short term dislocation through the provision of humanitarian relief. For their part, livelihood programs focus more directly on integrating actors into the market. Here micro-credit and small entrepreneur programs seem to epitomize the relationship between CSR and the capabilities approach to development. For their part, voluntary corporate codes and certification reflect in a more negative fashion the relationship of CSR to the capabilities approach. Corporate resistance to appropriate, legally enforceable standards (for the protection of workers and the environment) indicates a basic agreement between CSRPs and the capabilities approach on the proposition that only minimal provisions should be provided to the marginalized. The marginalized do not have the rights to claim decent standards of labour and environmental protection as a matter of law.

CSRPs are not merely individual partnerships, however. Both advocates and critics see them as having larger strategic value. Some advocates of CSRPs, such as John Ruggie (1998), former Assistant Secretary-General of the UN and currently the Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General for business and human rights, openly acknowledge that not only have neo-liberal policies created tremendous economic insecurity, but they have undermined the abilities of states to live up to the post-war compromise, or what Ruggie (1982) has called "embedded liberalism." But Ruggie is concerned by the response to this increasing economic insecurity by some sectors of American society which would seek to limit trade liberalization. This would be to throw out the proverbial baby with the bath water. The more prudent response would be to work in a pragmatic ways towards the development of institutions that limit the concentration and abuse of economic power while at the same time reviewing and redesigning social safety nets that are more appropriate in a global economy. In this cause Ruggie (2003) believes that CSRPs, rather than re-enforcing a neo-liberal order, have an important role to play in "re-embedding" the economy back into society (see Figure 3).

Ruggie's optimistic view of the role that CSRPs can play is quite at odds with CSR critics, however. Richter (2004), for example, sees CSRPs functioning as a policy paradigm in entirely different ways. Such partnerships, she claims, represent in effect a claim by corporations that they should be treated as partners and equals by governments, rather than institutions which should be under the authority of democratic states. As a policy paradigm they portray the partnership between business and government – perhaps best represented by the annual World Economic Forum held in Davos – as necessary. It is the only viable why in which the new international order can be governed.

CAPs and Development

CAPs share a common understanding of development with the human face approach. Defined largely in Keynesian terms, the problem of development is seen to emanate from the rise of neo-liberal economic globalization which has undermined the policy autonomy of states. In a neo-liberal global order, individual states can no longer effectively use macro-economic policy to promote full-employment. Nor can they impose sufficiently high levels of taxes on corporations to maintain adequate social programs. They are also losing their ability to protect worker rights and the environment. All of these powers are undermined by the ability of corporation to relocate to other, more business-friendly jurisdictions. Social justice in this paradigm is largely defined in terms of an appropriate distribution of rights of political and social welfare rights. In terms of agency, this model sees the state as primarily responsible for ensuring the rights of people and disciplining business. In the absence of a state taking up these responsibilities, however, some citizens feel the need to step in and force corporations to be responsible. They feel that they must impose social control over corporate power by what means they have available. This is what individual CAPs seek to do, impose greater control over corporations in such areas as labour standards, environmental standards and corporate governance.

Beyond the goals of individual CAPs, collectively they can be understood as a policy paradigm, one which seeks to restore the broader Keynesian agenda of subjecting the market and corporations to democratic control, albeit it in a new context of globalization. There appears to be differing views (albeit not always well articulated in the academic literature) as to the relationships between CAPs and the state. While some define them as entirely separate from the state and even capable of effectively regulating without the state, most would see them as trying to push the state to take up their agenda (Bernstein and Cashore 2004; Vogel 2005). This does not necessarily mean, however, that such partnerships need to fade away as they achieve success. They may retain an important role in partnering with government to develop new approaches to regulation (Gereffi et al. 2001).

This understanding of CAPs opens up onto a larger discussion about the viability of imposing democratic control over corporations in a global economy. As noted above, imposing control over corporations has become increasing difficulty at the national level. This means that the CA agenda needs to be international in its focus, not only at the level of campaigns, but also in terms of developing hard law. Here CAPs are complemented by movements towards what might be called "post-national Keynesianism," that is, efforts to develop supranational forms of democracy that can effectively impose hard law across national boundaries (and thereby undermine the threat of capital flight). While some posit the need for cosmopolitan forms of democracy (Held 1995), others believe that regional democratic groupings would be much more realistic. The European Union, with its increasing levels of economic and political integration, is held up as a possible example of the form such a model could take (Habermas 2001).

SEPs and Development

SEPs generally embody the social power conception of development. They see the problem of development as linked not merely to the recent impact of TNCs during the neo-liberal period, but stretching back deep into the colonial period and its exclusion of people from access to key bases of social power (McMichael 2005; Friedmann; 1992). From this perspective, development is not merely about having basic needs met or being able to claim a set of basic rights. Rather is it about empowerment, about exercising decision-making over the institutions that affect one’s life and community, about more equitable social relations. This means that it is not merely enough to try to constrain corporate behaviour. Rather, development requires organizing to create new economic structures which can provide a firm foundation for continued access to these bases of social power. The primary actors in bring about such development are necessarily local communities themselves. This is not to say that states and other institutions do not have a role. Such institutions, however, cannot be expected to play a truly constructive role in this form of development unless they are changed from the bottom up through social movements. Individual SEPs embody this understanding of development in their efforts to help local actors collectively reclaim bases of social power (and to uses these bases in their efforts for political organization).

SEPs do not just provide individual local communities with access to bases of social power. They too represent a policy paradigm. They model alternatives ways for civil society movements and government to interact with “business” to promote development. SEPs provide replicable forms that can be copied, adapted and linked together in different ways in and across other communities. They can serve as the basis for promoting an alternative approach to development, one in which interconnected local communities control their local economies through democratically controlled businesses, while cooperating with other communities.

As a policy paradigm, SEPs fit in logically with the development of an alterative model of globalization (Fall et al. 2004). While there is no one clearly defined model of alternative globalization, a key feature would be the development of new international financial and trade organizations. In addition to being democratically controlled, such organizations would provide support for the development of local economies based upon SE enterprises and promote closer economic relations between such local economies. While the notion of developing an alternative globalization may appear fanciful, a glance towards South America might reveal what could be some possible moves in this direction. The development of a new regional development bank (Banco del Sur), the strengthening of regional trade bodies and the development of a new regional political body (UNASUR) may provide the basis for the promotion of regional policy alternatives. In addition, such a development may spark the development of other regional groupings in the South, which could in turn exert greater pressure on the dominant multilateral institutions.

Figure 3: Partnerships, Approaches to Development and Globalization Agendas

Form of Partnership	**Conventional Business**	**Corporate Social Responsibility**	**Corporate Accountability**	**Social Economy**
Approach to Development	**Neo-Liberal**	**Capabilities**	**Human Face**	**Social Power**
Globalization Agenda	**Neo-liberal**	**Re-embedded Liberalism**	**Post-national Keynesianism**	**Alternative Globalization**
Weak ←================= Social Control =============== ====→ Strong				

Critic have argued that the increasing influence of CSR programs and partnerships over the last two decades have served to legitimate a neo-liberal form of economic globalization. In the process they have not only changed the practice of development agencies and NGOs, but also the dominant way of understanding what development is (Blowfield 2005). The risk here is that in their efforts to be pragmatic, development actors may be assuming a rather restricted notion of development and that there is only one viable way to proceed in developing partnerships to promote development. In this paper we have tried to indicate that there is a wider range of partnerships than CSRPs and that these partnerships operate, albeit implicitly, on the basis of different understandings of development and pursue different globalization agendas.

Endnotes

[1] Subsequent efforts to revise the notion of a code for TNCs were also defeated. John Ruggie, the Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General for business and human rights has come under especially harsh criticism from developing countries and development NGOs for his role in quashing these efforts (Misereor/Global Policy Forum Europe 2008).

[2] For a list of the goals, see: http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/index.html

[3] In speaking of neo-liberalism, we are referring primarily to the resurgence in influence of economic liberalism (based in neo-classical economics) in policy circles starting in the 1970s. This tradition has a number of prominent exponents, including von Hayek, Friedman, Buchanan, Nozick, among others. The perspective of this tradition has largely influenced policy decisions associated with the emergence of contemporary processes of economic globalization (including trade liberalization, liberalization of financial markets, the transnationalization of production, etc.), which we have referred to as neo-liberal globalization.

[4] The primary conceptual formulation of the capability approach has been developed by Sen (1999). Nussbaum (2000) has been one of the foremost authors to develop the approach from a gender perspective. Haq (1997), best-known for his formulation of the Human Development Index (HDI) and the founding of the *Human Development Reports*, also shared the main epistemological and political premises of the capability approach.

[5] This approach was first formulated in the seminal collection *Adjustment with a Human Face*, with the main proponents of this approach being the editors, Cornia, Jolly and Stewart (1987).

The approach was later developed in some of the Human Development Reports (UNDP 1999; 1996).

[6] The social power approach is rooted in a number of different genres of critical theory, particularly those which emphasize the notion of structure and structural inequality (Bagchi 2000; Cox 1987; Friedmann 1992; Young 2000; 1990).

[7] Rawls (1971), of course, provides the most well known contemporary theory of distributive justice.

[8] The question of what "basic capabilities" are and what level of resources is required to ensure them are obviously open to question. With regard to the latter question Sen (1999) suggests using Adam Smith's standard of a decent social minimum, i.e., the bundle of resources (material and non-material) which enable people to "appear in public without shame." He acknowledges that the exact criteria for what constitutes this threshold level of resources will differ from place to place. For her part, Nussabaum (2000) posits a more precise set of basic capabilities which she believes constitutes a "decent social minimum."

[9] Bagchi (2000) argues that at the heart of this ambiguity lies a failure on Sen's part to clearly delineate those elements of global capitalism that he takes as given and those he wishes to challenge.

[10] One especially pertinent example in this context is the case of the micro-credit movement. While commonly regarded as one of the most successful of human development experiments, its efficacy has come under sharp attack as the poor women involved have begun to accrue large debts as their enterprises falter. Critics have argued that there is a structural problem here in that the stimulation of local economies requires changes that are well beyond the capacity of micro-credit programmes (Bello 2006).

[11] Here we are conceptualizing social power as distinct from economic power and political power, the latter including both state power and power exercised through formal civil society organizations (Friedmann, 1992). In one sense such a distinction is artificial, in that all these forms of power operate simultaneously and often overlap and contradict each other. The distinction is important, however, in recognizing the specific need to understand the nature of agency "from below", i.e., agency exercised by actors who do not typically have access to the other bases of power, including in organized sectors of civil society.

[12] These approaches reflect to some degree Bendell's (2004) categorizations of different responses to corporate power based upon interviews with activists. These are, of course, ideal types and, as O'Rouke (2003) suggests, individual partnerships exist on a spectrum and may move along the spectrum over time.

[13] Interestingly, Amir Dossal (2004), Executive Director, UN Fund for International Partnerships, cites the Water Works Company of Boston, established in 1652, as the first example of a public-private partnership in the US.

[14] Four primary forms of privatization have been used, including concessions, management and lease contracts, greenfield developments and divestiture (Magdahl et al. 2006).

[15] It is not possible to deal with the issue of social infrastructure here, beyond noting that the World Bank does have a range of public-private partnerships in the area of education and health (see www.worldbank.org). These programs generally are based upon countries developing plans that identify policy, capacity, data and funding gaps. One of the key components of these plans is the use of user-fees. This practice has come under severe criticism from development

organizations which claim that the practice has served to limit access to services by the poor. See, for example, Save the Children (2005).

[16] A study by the World Health Organization (WHO) estimated a tenfold return on investment in water and sanitation programs (Hutton et al. 2006, cited in Prasad 2007).

[17] The UN does not provide a definition of partnership. Nelson has suggested a definition for UN partnerships – which is largely applicable to other partnerships – as “a voluntary and collaborative agreement. . . in which all participants agree to work together to achieve a common purpose or undertake a specific task and to share risks, responsibilities, resources, competencies and benefits” (2002: 47, cited in Richter 2004).

[18] The UNGC (2007) encourages business to make changes in its core business operations and provides a few examples of this (primarily in relationship to supply chain managements). There is little indication that these activities are widespread. Nor is it immediately clear that they constitute partnerships in any strong sense of the term.

[19] Critics have raised concerns whether this high level of corporate interest will exacerbate or ameliorate what they perceive to be the limitations of microcredit (Kabeer 2005, 2001).

[20] Another example would be the South Asia Earthquake Relief Fund which was formed by five large TNCs (GE, Pfizer, Xerox, Citi-Bank and UPS) following the devastating earthquake in Pakistan in 2005. See http://www.corporatephilanthropy.org/SAERF/.

[21] In health-related initiatives, corporations and business- related foundations (such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation) and have emerged as major players in the sector and have extensive partnerships with large development organizations and local community groups. See http://www.gatesfoundation.org/GlobalHealth/.

[22] For example, the European Alliance for Corporate Social Responsibility, launched in 2006 (with partners such as IBM, Microsoft, Hewlett Packard and Volkswagen) has a specific goal of engaging corporations in education and research. See http://www.csreurope.org

[23] The UNGC would also include the efforts of individual corporations to improve their own labour and environmental standards (as well as the participation of business groups in policy discussions) but as discussed above these do not seem to be partnerships in any strong sense.

[24] An example would be the “Responsible Care” program launched by the Canadian Chemical Producers’ Association. Launched in 1985, it has since spread to 85 countries. See http://www.ccpa.ca/ResponsibleCare.

[25] An example would be the ICC’s “Business Charter for Sustainable Development” issued in 1990. See http://www.gsdglobal.com/tools.

[26] An example would be the Caux Roundtable, formed by an ad hoc collection of international business leaders. Originally focusing on reducing trade tensions, it later reoriented itself towards corporate social responsibility. In 1994 the group issued the CRT Principles for Business. See http://www.cauxroundtable.org.

[27] The Coalition for Environmental Responsible Economies (CERES) was founded in the wake of the 1989 Exxon Valdez oil spill. This group of social investors, environmental groups, religious organizations and pension fund trustees (later joined by major corporations) issued the Valdez principles in the autumn of 1989, which were later renamed the CERES principles. See http://ceres.org.

[28] In the case of apparel, for example, O’Rourke (2006) characterizes the industry initiated Worldwide Responsible Apparel Production (WRAP) program and the ISO-inspired Social Accountability International (SAI) SA8000 program as “advanced forms” of privatized (rather

than forms of "collaborative" or "socialized") regulation as they predicate certification on having management systems in place (not hard standards) and do not have strong external monitoring and verification.

[29] The second condition regarding competencies would generally seem to be less of a problem. Many firms will be naturally drawn towards areas that overlap with their core competencies. This situation, however, does not hold universally. Corporate sponsors such as Monsanto would seem to have little expertise to bring to the promotion of micro-credit, but openly acknowledge that they have a strong business interest in being associated with programs such as Micro-finance Forum (Neff, 1997).

[30] Bayer, which signed onto the UNGC at its founding meeting in July 2000 and advertises its cooperation with the UN broadly, provides an example. Bayer lists four examples as part of its commitment to the UNGC in its annual report. The Coalition Against Bayer Dangers claims that these expenditures are less than $1 million each, while the taxes Bayer paid declined from about $1 billion in 2000 to $132 million in 2001 (see http://www.cbgnetwork.org/271.html).

[31] A second major area of CAP activities – some would argue the most important – could be referred to as transparency partnerships. Examples would include Transparency International and Publish What You Pay. These organizations may have a variety of different goals, including helping to eliminate corrupt practices by governments (e.g., eliciting bribes from corporations), increasing corporate transparency (e.g., reporting requirements), reducing undue corporate influence through lobbying, eliminating corporate tax evasion and avoidance, etc. (Moran 2006; Bendell 2004).

[32] O'Rourke (2006) places these different initiatives on a continuum, along with WRAP and SAI from privatized to cooperative to socialized regulation. He argues that they can move along this continuum. We would argue that FLA originally had more characteristics of a CSRP, but has become more like a CAP over time as it has enhanced monitoring and enforcement procedures.

[33] In principle, employees and investors could also play a significant role in influencing corporate decisions on these decisions, but in actual fact they rarely do (Haigh and Jones 2006; Vogel 2005)

[34] There is no one universally agreed upon definition of the social economy. See Defourney and Develtere (1999).

[35] One such area is manufacture. In India, for example, some state governments have worked with unions for the conversion of "sick industries" to cooperatives (Bhowmik 2006). For examples of cooperative involvement in infrastructure see Birchall (2004), Muñoz (2005) and Yavari (2005).

[36] For an account of the range of activities, see Birchall (2004).

[37] The World Council of Credit Unions (WOCCU), for example, works with a range of development agencies and organizations in a variety of development activities, especially capacity building among credit unions in the South. See http://www.woccu.org.

[38] In 1985 in the province of Quebec in Canada, for example, a number of local cooperatives and mutual societies formed the Cooperative Society for International Development and the Development of Cooperatives in Africa and Latin America (Favreau and Fréchette 2002).

[39] An example would be the US dairy cooperative Land O' Lakes which works closely with USAID and other partners to help with capacity building in dairy cooperatives in the South (see http://www.landolakesinc.com).

[40] For a list of occupational groups in the informal sector see Women in Informal Employment: Globalizing and Organizing (WIEGO) at http://www.wiego.org
[41] The Unión de Comunidades Indígenas de la Región del Istmo (UCIRI, Union of Indigenous Communities of the Region of the Isthmus) is a coffee producing co-operative of indigenous people in Oaxaca, Mexico. It initiated, with the help of a local priest (originally from the Netherlands) and a Dutch NGO, the first fair trade certifying body, Max Havelaar (see Vanderhoff Boersma forthcoming).
[42] In Switzerland, for example, fair trade has captured almost 50% of the banana market, in contrast to a European average of less than 10% (Nicholls and Opal 2006).

References

Amsden, A.: 1989, *Asia's Next Giant: South Korea and Late Industrialization* (Oxford University Press, Oxford).

Bair J.: 2007, "From the Politics of Development to the Challenges of Globalization" *Globalizations* December, 4(4), 486–499.

Bagchi, A.K.: 2000, "Freedom and Development as End of Alienation?", *Economic and Political Weekly*, *Economic and Political Weekly*, December 9.

Barrientos, S., M.E. Conroy and E. Jones: 2007, "Northern Social Movements and Fair Trade", in L.T. Raynolds, D. Murray and J. Wilkinson (eds.), *Fair Trade: The Challenges of Transforming Globalization*, (Routledge, London and New York), pp. 51-62.

Bayliss, K.: 2002, "Privatization and Poverty: The Distributional Impact of Utility Privatization", *Annals of Public & Cooperative Economics* 73(4), 603-625.

Bayliss, K. and D. Hall.: 2000, "Independent Power Producers: A Review of the Issues, Public Services" International Research Unit Report for Policy Studies Institute, November, (University of Greenwich, London), http://www.psiru.org/reports/2000-11-E-IPPs.doc.

Bendell, J.: 2005, "In whose name? The accountability of corporate social responsibility", *Development in Practice* 15 (3-4), 362-374.

Bendell, J.: 2004, "Barricades and Boardrooms: A Contemporary History of the Corporate Accountability Movement", Programme Paper on Technology, Business and Society, Paper No. 131 (UNRISD, Geneva).

Bernstein, S. and B. Cashore.: Forthcoming, "Can Non-State Global Governance be Legitimate? A Theoretical Framework", *Regulation and Governance*.

Bernstein, S. and B. Cashore.: 2004, "Nonstate Global Governance: Is Forest Certification a Legitimate Alternative to a Global Forest Convention?" in J.J. Kirton and M.J. Trebilcock (eds.) *Hard Choices, Soft Law: Voluntary Standards in Global Trade, Environment and Social Governance* (Ashgate Publishing Company, London), pp. 33-64.

Bello, W.: 2006, "Microcredit, Macro Issues", *The Nation*, October. Available on-line at: http://www.thenation.com/doc/20061030/bello

Bhagwati, J.N.: 1982, "Directly-unproductive (DUP) activities", *Journal of Political Economy* 90 (Oct), 988-1002.

Bhowmik, S.K.: 2006, "Co-operatives and the emancipation of the Marginalized: Case Studies from two Cities in India", in B. de Sousa Santos (ed.), *Another Production is Possible: Beyond the Capitalist Canon* (Verso, London), pp. 70-94.

Birchall, J.: 2004, *Cooperatives and the Millennium Development Goals* (Cooperative Branch & Policy Development Department, ILO, Geneva).

Blowfield, M.: 2005, "Corporate Social Responsibility: reinventing the meaning of development?", *International Affairs* 81(3), 515-524.

Budds, J.: 2003, "Are the debates on water privatization missing the point? Experiences from Africa, Asia and Latin America", *Environment and Urbanization* 15(2), 87-114.

Cashore, B., G. Auld, S. Bernstein and C. McDermott.: 2007, "Can Non-state Governance 'Ratchet Up' Global Environmental Standards? Lessons from the Forest Sector", *Review of European Community & International Environmental Law* 16(2), 158-172.

Chisari, O., A. Estache and C. Waddams Price.: 2003, "Access by the poor in Latin America's utility reform: subsidies and service obligations" in C. Ugaz and C. Waddams Price (eds.), *Utility Privatization and Regulation: A Fair Deal for Consumers?* (Edward Elgar, Cheltenham UK), pp. 25-53.

Christian, Aid.: 2004, *Behind the Mask: The real face of corporate social responsibility* (Christian Aid, London).

Clapp, J.: 2001, "'ISO Environmental Standards: Industry's Gift to a Polluted Globe or the Developed World's Competition-Killing Strategy?", in O. Schram Stokke and Ø.B. Thommessen (eds.), *Yearbook of International Co-operation on Environment and Development 2001/2002* (London: Earthscan Publications), pp. 27–33.

Cohen, M. with M. Bhatt and P. Horn.: 2000, "Women Street Vendors: The Road to Recognition" *SEEDS,* No. 20. Available on-line at: http://www.wiego.org/occupational_groups/

Cornforth, C., J. Lewis and R. Spear.: 1988, *Developing Successful Worker Co-operatives* (Sage, London).

Cornia, G.A., R. Jolly, F. Stewart (eds.).: 1987, *Adjustment with a Human Face* (UNICEF & Oxford University Press, Oxford).

Cox, R.: 1987, *Production, Power, and World Order*. (Columbia University Press, New York).

Davies, I.: Forthcoming, "Alliances and Networks: Creating Success in the UK Fair Trade Market", *Journal of Business Ethics*.

de Sousa Santos, B.: 2003, " Towards a Counter-hegemonic Globalisation", Paper presented at the XXIV International Congress of the Latin American Studies Association, Dallas, 27-27 March. Available on-line at: http://www.tni.org/detail_page.phtml?page=socforum-docs_fm2003boaventura

Defourney, J. and P. Develtere.: 1999, "The Social Economy: The World-wide making of the Third Sector", in J. Defourny, P. Develtere and B. Fonteneau (eds.), *L'économie sociale au Nord et au Sud* (De Boeck, Brussels).

Dossal, A.: 2004, "UN Partnerships: Working Together for a Better World", Presentation given at Columbia University, 18 June. Available on-line at: http://www.un.org/partnerships/Docs/Columbia_180604.pdf

Estache, A.: 2007, "Infrastructure and Development: A Survey of Recent and Upcoming Issues", in F. Bourguignon and B. Pleskovic (eds.), Rethinking Infrastructure for Development: Annual World Bank Conference on Development Economics (World Bank Publications, Washington), pp. 41-82.

Evans, P.: 1992, "The State as Problem and Solution: Predation, Embedded Autonomy and Adjustment", in S. Haggard and R. Kaufman (eds.), *The Politics of Economic Adjustment:*

International Constraints, Distributive Politics, and the State (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ), pp. 139-181.

Fall, A.S., L. Favreau and G. Larose (eds.).: 2004, *Le Sud… et le Nord dans la mondialisation. Quelles alternatives?* (Presses de l'Université du Québec and Karthala, St. Foy, Québec and Paris)

Favreau, L. and L. Fréchette.: 2002, *Mondialisation, économie social, développement local et solidarité international* (Presses de l'Université du Québec, St. Foy, Québec)

Friedman, M.: 1970, "The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits", *The New York Magazine*, September 13.

Friedman, M.: 1962, "The Social Responsibility of Business," *Capitalism and Freedom* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago).

Fridell, M, I. Hudson and M. Hudson.: 2008, "With Friends Like These: The Corporate Response to Fair Trade Coffee", *Review of Radical Political Economics* 40(1), 8-34.

Friedmann, J.: 1992, *Empowerment: the politics of alternative development* (Blackwell, Cambridge, MA).

Gereffi, G., R. Garcia-Johhnson and E. Sasser.: 2001, "The NGO-Industrial Complex", *Foreign Policy* 125 (Jul-Aug), 56-65.

Graham, D. and N. Woods.: 2006, "Making corporate self-regulation effective in developing countries", *World Development* 34(5), 868-883.

Grugel, J., P. Riggirozzi and B. Thirkell-White.: 2008, "Beyond the Washington Consensus? Asia and Latin America in search of more autonomous development", *International Affairs* 84(3), 499–517.

Habermas, J.: 2001, "The Postnational Constellation and the Future of Democracy" in Jurgen Habermas, *The Postnational Constellation: Political Essays* (Polity Press, Cambridge), pp. 58-112.

Haigh, M. and M. Jones.: 2006, "The Drivers of Corporate Social Responsibility: A Critical Review", *The Business Review* 5(2), 245-251.

Hall, D., E. Lobina, and R. de la Motte.: 2005, "Public Resistance to Privatization in Water and Energy", in D. Eade and J. Sayer (eds.), Development and the Private Sector: Consuming Interests (Kumarian Press, Sterling VA), 103-124

Hall, D. and E. Lobina.: 2002, "Water privatisation in Latin America", *PSIRU Reports*, July http://www.psiru.org/reports/2002-06-W-Latam.doc.

Haq, M..: 1995, *Reflections on Human Development* (Oxford University Press, Delhi).

Harris, J.: 2007: "Bolivia and Venezuela: the democratic dialectic in new revolutionary movements", *Race & Class* 49(1): 1–24

Held, D.: 1995, Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance (Cambridge: Polity Press)

Hock, T.: 2001, "The role of eco-labels in international trade: can timber certification be implemented as a means to slowing deforestation?"' *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy* 12, 347–365.

Hoedeman, O., S. Kishimoto and P. Terhorst.: 2005, "Public Water Services: Reversing the tide against public water utilities", *Water & Wastewater International*, 20(3), May.

Hoedeman, O.: 2002, "Rio +10 and the Greenwash of Corporate Globalization", *Development* 45(3), 39-42.

Idemudia, U.: Forthcoming, "artnerships and Community Development in the Niger Delta: Prospects and Limitations", *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Jaffee, D.: 2007, *Brewing Justice: Fair Trade Coffee, Sustainability and Survival* (University of California Press, Berkeley).

Jenkins, R.: 2005, "Globalization, corporate social responsibility and poverty", *International Affair*s 81(3), 525-540.

Jenkins, R., R. Pearson and G. Seyfang.: 2002, "Introduction" in R. Jenkins, R. Pearson and G. Seyfang (eds.), *Corporate Responsibility and Labour Rights: Codes of Conduct in the Global Economy* (Earthscan, London), pp. 1-10.

Kabeer, N.: 2005, "Is microfinance a 'magic bullet' for women's empowerment?: analysis of findings from South Asia", *Economic and Political Weekly* October 29,.4709-4418.

Kabeer, N.: 2001, "Conflicts over Credit: Re-evaluating the Empowerment Potential of Loans to Women in Rural Bangladesh", *World Development*, 29(1), 63-84.

Kell, G.: 2002, "Making Global Responsibility Work for Business and Development", Keynote address, meeting of The UN Global Compact and Swiss Business, Geneva, 29 October.

Klein, N.: 2000, *No Logo* (Flamingo, London).

Jolly, R., L Emmerij, D.Ghai and F. Lapeyre (eds).: 2004, *UN Contributions to Development Thinking and Practice* (Indiana University Press, Bloomington).

Korten, D.: 2001, *When Corporations Rule the World* (Kumarian Press, Bloomfield).

Krueger, A.: 1974, "The Political Economy of the Rent-Seeking Society," *American Economic Review* 64, 291-303.

Lobina, E. and D. Hall.: 2008, **"**The comparative advantage of the public sector in the development of urban water supply" *Progress in Development Studies* 8(1), 85-101.

Loftus, A.J., and D.A. McDonald.: 2001, "Of liquid dreams: a political ecology of water privatization in Buenos Aires", *Environment and Urbanization* 13(2), 179-199.

Magdahl, J. et al.: 2006, "Privatisation of water and Public-private partnerships: do they deliver to the poor?", The Norwegian Forum for Environment and Development. Available on-line at: http://www.forumfor.no/v_bibliotek/264.pdf

Macleod, G.: 1997, *Mondragon to America: Experiments in Community Economic Development* (University of Cape Breton College Press, Sydney, NS).

Maitland, I.: 1994, "The Morality of the Corporation: An Empirical or Normative Disagreement?", *Business Ethics Quarterly* 4(4), 445-458.

McMichael, P.: 2005, "Globalization", in T. Janoski, R. Alford, A.M. Hicks and M.A. Schwartz, (eds.), The Handbook of Political Sociology: States, Civil Societies and Globalization (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).

Medina, M.: 2005, "Waste Picker Cooperatives in Developing Countries." Paper prepared for WIEGO/Cornell/SEWA Conference on Membership-Based Organizations of the Poor, Ahmedabad, India, January. http://www.wiego.org/occupational_groups/

Misereor/Global Policy Forum Europe.: 2008. *Problematic Pragmatism: The Ruggie Report: Background, Analysis and Perspectives* (June).

Moran, T.: 2006, **"**How Multinational Investors Evade Developed Country Laws"**,** Center for Global Development Working Paper No. 79 (Georgetown University Center for Global Development, Washington). Available on-line at: http://ssrn.com/abstract=984044

Muñoz, A.D.:, 2005, "Water Co-operatives in Argentina" in B. Balanyá, B. Brennan, O. Hoedeman, S. Kishimoto and P. Terhorst (eds.) *Reclaiming Public Water: Achievements, Struggles and Visions from Around the World* (Transnational Institute and Corporate Europe Observatory, Amsterdam).

Murphy, D.F. and J. Bendell.: 1999, *Partners in Time?Business, NGOs and Sustainable Development*. UNRISD Discussion Paper No. 109 (UNRISD, Geneva).

Mukherjee Reed, A.: 2008, *Human Development and Social Power: Perspectives from South Asia* (Routledge, London and New York).

Nadkarni, A.: 2004, "From Social Responsibility to Development-driven Business", in D. Reed and S. Mukherjee, eds, *Corporate Governance, Economic Reforms and Development: The Case of India* (Oxford University Press, Delhi), pp. 234-248.

Neff, G.: 1997, "Microsummitting", *Left Business Observer*, May, #77.

Nelson, V., A. Martin and J. Ewert.: 2005, "What difference can they make? assessing the impact of corporate codes of practice", *Development in Practice*, 15 (3-4), 539-545.

Newell. P.: 2005, "Citizenship. Accountability, and Community: the Limits of the CSR Agenda", *International Affairs* 81(3), 541-558.

Newell. P.: 2002, "From Responsibility to Citizenship: Corporate accountability for development", *IDS Bulletin* 33(2), 91-100.

Nicholls, A., and C. Opal.: 2006, Fair Trade: Market-driven Ethical Consumption (Sage, London).

Nussbaum, M.: 2000, *Women and Human Development: The Capabilities Approach* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).

O'Rourke, D.: 2003, "Outsourcing Regulation: Analysing non-governmental systems of labour standards and monitoring", *Policy Studies Journal* 31(1), 1-29.

O'Rourke, D.: 2006, "Multi-stakeholder regulation: privatizing or socializing global labor standards?", *World Development* 34(5), 899-918.

Page, G., and H. Fearn.: 2005, "Corporate Reputation: What Do Consumers Really Care About?", *Journal of Advertising Research* 45, 305-313.

Parker, D.: 2002., "Economic Regulation: a review of issues" *Annals of Public & Cooperative Economics* 73(4), 493-519.

Partners in Change.: 2004, *Third Report on Corporate Involvement in Social Development in India* (Partners in Change, New Delhi).

Partners in Change.: 2000, *Second Report on Corporate Involvement in Social Development in India* (Partners in Change, New Delhi).

Rawls, J.: 2001, *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA).

Reed, D.: Forthcoming-a, "What do Corporations have to do with Fair Trade? Positive and Normative Analysis from a Value Chain Perspective" *Journal of Business Ethics*.

Reed, D.: Forthcoming-b, "Analysing the Internationalization of Cooperatives" in D. Reed and J.J. McMurtry (eds), *Co-operatives Co-operating in a Global Economy* (Cambridge, Cambridge Scholars Publishing).

Reed, D.: 2002, "Employing Normative Stakeholder Theory in Developing Countries: A Critical Theory Perspective," *Business and Society*, 4(2), 166-207.

Renard, M.-C., and V. Pérez-Grovas: 2007, "Fair Trade Coffee in Mexico: At the Center of the Debates", in L.T. Raynolds, D. Murray, and J. Wilkinson (eds.), *Fair Trade: The*

Challenges of Transforming Globalization (Routledge, London and New York), pp. 138-156.

Richter, J.: 2004, "Public-Private Partnerships for Health: A Trend without Alternatives?" *Development* 37 (2), 43-48.

Rodriguez-Garavito, C.A. 2006, "Solidarity Economy and the Struggle for Citizenship in Times of Globalization: A Study of the Cooperatives of Informal Garbage Pickers in Colombia" in B. de Sousa Santos (ed.), *Another Production is Possible: Beyond the Capitalist Canon* (Verso, London), pp. 43-69.

Ruggie, J.G.: 2003, "Taking embedded liberalism global: The corporate connection." in D. Held and M. Koenig-Archibugi (eds.), *Taming Globalization: Frontiers of Governance* (Polity Press, Cambridge).

Ruggie, J.G.: 1998, "Globalization and the Embedded Liberalism Compromise: The End of an Era", in Wolgang Streeck (ed.), *Internationale Wirtshaft, Nationale Demokratie* (Campus Verlag, Frankfurt), pp. 79-96.

Ruggie, J.G.: 1982. "International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order", *International Organization* 36(2), 379-415.

Save the Children.: 2005, *User Fees: Paying for health services at the point of use*, position paper, London: Save the Children UK. Available on-line at: http://www.scfuk.org.uk/scuk_cache/scuk/cache/cmsattach/3314_User_Fees.pdf

Sen, A.K.: 1999, *Development as freedom* (Knopf, NY).

Singh, A. and A. Zammit.: 2004, "Labour Standards and the 'Race to the Bottom': Rethinking Globalization and Workers' Rights from Developmental and Solidaristic Perspectives", *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 20(1), 85-104.

Smith, S.C.: 2007, "Blooming Together or Wilting Alone? Network Externalities and Mondragón and La Lega Co-operative Networks", Discussion Paper No. 2001/27 (UNU/WIDER, Helsinki)

Soederberg, S.: 2007, Taming corporations or buttressing market-led development? A critical assessment of the Global Compact, *Globalizations* 4(4), 500–513.

Spear, R.: 2000, "The Cooperative Advantage", *Annuls of Public and Cooperative Economics* 71(4) 507-523.

Stallings, B. and W. Peres.: 2000, *Growth, Employment, and Equity: The Impact of the Economic Reforms in Latin America and the Caribbean* (Brookings Institution Press, Washington D.C.)

Thornbecke E.: 2007, "The Evolution of the Development Doctrine 1950-2005", in G. Mavrotas and A. Shorrocks (eds.), *Advancing Development: Core Themes in Global Economics* (Palgrave, Basingstoke and New York), pp. 252-272.

Transparency International.: 2008, Global Corruption Report 2008: Corruption in the Water Sector (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).

United Nations (UN).: 2002, Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit, Implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration, Report of the Secretary-General, 31 July, p.20.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).: 2003, *Human Development Report 2003: Millennium Development Goals: A Compact Among Nations to End Human Poverty* (Oxford University Press, New York).

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).: 1999, *Human Development Report 1999: Globalization with a Human Face* (Oxford University Press, New York).
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).: 1996, *Human Development Report 1996: Economic Growth and Human Development* (Oxford University Press, New York).
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).: 1990, *Human Development Report 1990: Concept and Measurement of Human Development* (Oxford University Press, New York).
United Nations Global Compact (UNGC).: 2007, *Joining Forces for Change: Demonstrating Innovation and Impact Through Un-Business Partnerships* (UNGC, Geneva).
Utting, P.: 2005.: "Rethinking Business Regulation: From Self-Regulation to Social Control", Programme Paper on Technology, Business and Society, Paper No. 15 (UNRISD, Geneva).
Uusitalo, O., and R. Oksanen.: 2004, "Ethical consumerism: a view from Finland", International Journal of Consumer Studies 28(3), 214 – 221.
Vanderhoff Boersma, F.: Forthcoming, "*The Urgency and Necessity of a Different Type of Market: The Perspective of Producers Organized Within the Fair Trade Market*", *Journal of Business Ethics*.
VanderHoff Boeresma, F.: 2005, *Excluidos Hoy, Protagonistas Mañana*. Mexico: UCIRI.
Veltemeyer, H.: 2005, "Land Reform in Latin America", in S. Moyo and P. Yeros (eds.), *Reclaiming the Land: The Resurgence of Rural Movements in Africa, Asia and Latin America* (Zed Books, London), pp. 285-316.
Venkateswaran, S.: 2004, "The Role of Business in Society: Business-NGOs Partnerships for Development", in D. Reed and S. Mukherjee (eds,) *Corporate Governance, Economic Reforms, and Development: The Indian Experience* (New Delhi, Oxford University Press).
Vogel, D.: 2005, *The Market for Virtue: The Potential and Limits of Corporate Social Responsibility* (Brookings Institution Press, Washington DC).
Wells, D.: 2004, "How Ethical Are Ethical Purchasing Policies?", *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 2(1), 119-140.
Wilkinson, J., and G. Mascarenhas: 2007, "Southern Social Movements and Fair Trade", in L.T. Raynolds, D. Murray and J. Wilkinson (eds.), *Fair Trade: The Challenges of Transforming Globalization* (Routledge, London and New York), pp. 125-137.
Wolfensohn, J.: 1997, "Business Partners for Development", Speech to the World Bank Group Board Meeting on Corporate Citizenship, Washington, D.C., 21 May.
World Bank.: 2004, *Water resources sector strategy : strategic directions for World Bank engagement*, http://wwwwds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDS_IBank_Servlet?pcont=details&eid=000090341_20040601150257
World Bank.: 2003, *Infrastructure Action Plan*. Available on-line at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTTRM/Resources/InfrastructureActionPlan.
World Bank.: 1993, *Water Resources Management*. Available on-line at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTWRD/214573-1111579063201/20424649/WRMExSumof1993WaterPolicy.pdf
World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD).: 2007, *Doing Business with the World – The New Role of Corporate Leadership in Global Development*. Accessed online at: www.wbcd.org/
WPFWI (World Panel on Financing Water Infrastructure).: 2003, *Financing Water For All*. Chaired by Michel Camdessus, report written by James Winpenny. 3rd World Water

Forum. http://www.financingwaterforall.org/fileadmin/wwc/Library/Publications_and_reports/CamdessusReport.pdf [online: 31.03.2006]

Yavarí, L.F.: 2005, “Management of Basic Drinking Water and Sanitation Services by a Co-operative in Bolivia”, in B. Balanyá, B. Brennan, O. Hoedeman, S. Kishimoto and P. Terhorst (eds.) *Reclaiming Public Water: Achievements, Struggles and Visions from Around the World* (Transnational Institute and Corporate Europe Observatory, Amsterdam).

Young, I.M.: 2000, *Inclusion and democracy* (Oxford University Press, Oxford).

Young, I.M.: 1990, *Justice and the politics of difference* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ).

Zammit, A.: 2003, *Development at Risk – Rethinking UN-business partnerships* (UNRISD, Geneva).

Zadek, S. and S. Radovich.: 2006, “Governing Collaborative Governance: Enhancing Development Outcomes by Improving Partnership Governance and Accountability.” AccountAbility and the Corporate Social Responsibility Initiative, Working Paper 23 (John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Cambridge, MA).