

RESPONDING TO GLOBALIZATION: THE VISION AND PRACTICE OF NEW DAWN ENTERPRISES

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

A final version of this paper is forthcoming in *Revue Économie et Solidarités*, 33 (1), 2002, 57-73.
Please do not cite without permission of the author.

ABSTRACT

This paper is concerned with the prospects of the social economy effecting change in an age of globalization. It attempts to lay out the problematic and then examine the issue from the perspective of a single case, that of New Dawn Enterprises, the oldest community economic development corporation in Canada. The paper begins with an introduction to the historic problem of economic (under)development in non-metropolitan regions and the traditional responses to it by government. Next, an alternative model of community economic development is presented and illustrated with the history of New Dawn. An account of “globalization,” which highlights key implications for community economic development, follows. The paper then examines how New Dawn has been responding to the challenges that globalization presents for community economic development.

At the beginning of the previous century, as all Canadian school children know, Sir Wilfrid Laurier made his famous proclamation about the 20th century belonging to Canada. At the beginning of this new century as we reflect (with a little less hubris it is hoped) on what the future will hold for Canada, the context of our ruminations is inevitably supplied by processes of economic, political and social change commonly conceptualized under the (often nebulous) rubric of “globalization.” For many Canadians, a key issue facing us at the dawn of this new era is whether our economy, and indeed our whole society, is to be dominated by market relations or whether we should impose controls over our economy such that other values (e.g., community, solidarity, justice) are reflected and promoted. In recent years it has become common to conceptualize a range of diverse efforts, designed to alter our economy and society so that they better reflect and support such values, as the “social economy.”

The broad objective of this paper (and others in the volume) is to offer some reflections on the prospects of the social economy effecting change in an age of globalization. The more specific goals of this paper are to examine : 1) how particular actors in the social economy, such as community businesses and community economic development corporations (CEDCs), might form the basis for an alternative model of community economic development (CED) and ; 2) how these actors might confront the new challenges involved in operating in a global economy. In order to make this investigation less speculative in nature, we will draw upon the example of a particular CEDC (New Dawn Enterprises) to illustrate the specific problems and prospects facing CEDCs in non-metropolitan regions in our current age of economic globalization.¹

To highlight how recent processes of globalization have affected the prospects for promoting CED, this paper has been divided into four parts. The first section introduces the historic problem of economic (under)development in non-metropolitan regions and the traditional responses to it. The second section begins by elaborating an alternative model of community economic development and then goes on to illustrate the model by examining the history of New Dawn Enterprises. In third section, we examine what “globalization” is and how it has been affecting the prospects for promoting economic development in non-metropolitan regions. The fourth section then investigates how New Dawn has responded to the challenges that globalization presents.

I. THE HISTORIC PROBLEM OF ECONOMIC (UNDER)DEVELOPMENT IN NON-METROPOLITAN REGIONS

While the concept of (under)development is generally discussed with respect to so-called “third world” countries, underdevelopment and regional disparity are not only *international* problems affecting developing countries. They are also *intranational* problems, occurring within the boundaries of virtually every developed country in the world. The phenomenon of underdevelopment in developed countries is most closely associated with non-metropolitan regions. Examples of such underdeveloped non-metropolitan regions include Lapland in Northern Finland, the Muhlviertal in Austria, the Basque region of Spain, the deindustrialized areas of Northern England, the Pyrennes region of France and Appalachia in the United States. Vast regions of Canada too are afflicted by the problem of underdevelopment. Indeed, outside of the main industrial belt that runs between Montreal and Windsor and the areas surrounding the provincial capitals, the country is largely composed of non-metropolitan areas that all suffer from

underdevelopment to some degree (Douglas, 1994). Cape Breton Island, where New Dawn Enterprises is located, is one such area.

Cape Breton and other underdeveloped regions exhibit several characteristic traits. Traditional sources of employment are on the wane, while there has been an inability to attract and retain new, job-creating investment. In the case of Cape Breton, it is the coal, steel and fishing industries that have declined in recent decades and not been replaced. As a result of such trends unemployment rates in these regions are significantly higher than the national average, frequently topping 20 per cent in Cape Breton. This, in turn, results in a brain drain as talented and ambitious young people migrate to more economically prosperous regions of the country. Moreover, housing and various forms of social services tend to be poorer in these regions. It is also often extremely difficult to attract medical and other professionals to come and set up practice. This combination of conditions generally leads to sentiments of neglect among the local communities and the harbouring of feelings of resentment against national and regional power centres (MacLeod, 1991 ; Hansen et al., 1990).

Non-metropolitan regions are frequently composed of close-knit communities that are ethnically and culturally homogenous. In the case of Cape Breton, the vast majority of the population are descendants of highland Scots who fled after the failed Culloden uprising in 1745 and the subsequent "highland clearances." They have firmly clung to their heritage and culture, in some areas even keeping the Gaelic language alive. In addition, there is also a smaller French speaking community, (the descendants of the *Acadiens* who returned to Nova Scotia after being driven out by the British in the 18th century) as well as a community of indigenous people known as the Mi'kmaq or Micmac.

This feature of relatively homogenous populations lends itself to cultural explanations to the plight of such communities (e.g., lack of a work ethic, lack of an entrepreneurial culture, etc.). Such explanations tend to be quite simplistic as they overlook the structural factors that comprise the primary causes of underdevelopment. Three such structural factors are of particular importance. First, many of these regions are geographically isolated. As development economists such as Herman Schwartz (1994) have explained, this characteristic (*ceteris paribus*) tends to determine the nature of such economies and predispose them to a dependent existence at the fringes of more developed metropolitan areas. Second, such economies are generally resource-based (e.g., agriculture, fishing, forestry, mining). This has left them vulnerable on two fronts. On the one hand, there is the problem of depletion of these finite resources (i.e., arable land, fish stocks, forest land, minerals). On the other hand, technological changes may dramatically reduce the demand for labour in the extraction and processing of such resources. Third, interrelated processes of political and economic centralization have led to a concentration of both private and public sector economic (and administrative) activity around major metropolitan centres (Lipton, 1977; 1993).

For their part, governments in developed countries, regardless of their ideological bent, cannot remain entirely indifferent to the plight of non-metropolitan areas. The logic of electoral politics demands that they at least appear to be doing something. For this reason, if no other, in the post World-War II period all OECD countries have adopted some mix of measures to deal with economically depressed regions (Calingaert, 1996). Between the early 1960s and the early

1980s, the federal government in Canada undertook a range of regional development initiatives, commonly referred to by a virtual alphabet soup of acronyms (viz., ARDA, ADB, ADA, ADIA, DREE, FRED, GDAs, etc.). The underlying basis for such initiatives was clearly Keynesian economics, while the overall approach of the efforts can best be characterized as statist – as policy was primarily developed by government officials with little community input and the general thrust was to intervene in the logic of the market to attract capital whither it otherwise would not go. The basic strategies included efforts to create “growth poles” and develop megaprojects, while the primary tactics consisted of various forms of assistance to private business (e.g., grants, tax incentives, loans, etc.). There was also a range of programmes directly targeted at the unemployed. While many of these efforts (e.g., training programs) were apparently aimed at contributing to regional development by improving the skills and employment prospects of the local workforce, other more market-based approaches (e.g., mobility allowances) were clearly intended to foster outward migration from economically depressed areas (Savoie, 1992 ; Higgins and Savoie, 1995).

Although the government did put significant amounts of effort and resources into regional development during this period, the results were meagre at best. While equalization payments did serve to limit some of the disparities in public services, regional economic development programmes made little or no progress in reducing regional economic disparities. A range of factors probably contributed to this result. Critics have argued, among other things, that the policies had no (compelling) theoretical grounding, the goals to be achieved were unclear and/or seemed to change over time, there was little synergy between different programs and policies, there was not sufficient coordination between federal and provincial governments, a focus was not maintained on the most needy areas, programmes were poorly designed and administered, political considerations determine policy decisions, etc. (Savoie, 1992 ; Douglas, 1994)

II. NEW DAWN – AN EXAMPLE OF A COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT APPROACH

An Alternative Economic Development Model - At the basis of the government’s efforts to promote regional development were large, traditional business corporations. There are strong reasons to question whether such enterprises can provide the foundation for an effective development strategy in non-metropolitan regions. The problem lies with the basic logic of the capitalist firm. The primary commitment of such firms is to increasing the wealth of their shareholders and not to promoting the interests of the local communities in which they operate. The almost exclusive priority given to shareholders tends to have adverse effects on non-metropolitan community on two fronts. On the one hand, when such companies run into financial problems, their first concern will be how to cut the losses to their shareholders and not the effects that their decisions will have on the community in which they operate. As a result, management tends to adopt defensive tactics (e.g., layoffs, bankruptcy, etc.) during times of difficulty rather than seeking more creative solutions that might be equally in the interest of shareholders and the local community.² On the other hand, traditional firms, even when they are financially sound, may make decisions that adversely affect the local community. Because they are primarily interested in maximizing returns to shareholders, traditional firms will, for example, relocate their operations if doing so enables them to earn greater profits (as is often the case when government subsidies run out).

There is, however, an alternative basis for promoting economic development, which is “community businesses.” Community businesses can be loosely defined as enterprises that are locally owned, involve some form of worker/member control, are committed to maintaining and generating employment and demonstrate concern for the local community. Such a definition allows for : 1) a range of enterprise types (viz., cooperatives, worker-owned firms, worker-controlled firms, not-for-profit firms, etc.) that ; 2) may be variously incorporated (e.g., as cooperatives, as traditional joint-stock companies, as companies limited by guarantee) and that ; 3) may operate in various economic sectors, viz., production (e.g., producer co-ops), services (e.g., consumer co-operatives), financial (credit unions), etc. (MacLeod, 1995)

In order for community businesses to provide a basis for an alternative development model, there must be methods and structures that are capable of systematically developing and supporting such firms. In the 1960s and 1970s in North America a variety of experiments were undertaken designed to generate such methods and structures. These can be broadly referred to as Community Economic Development Corporations (CEDCs). The basic goals of these methods and enterprises were to establish new community businesses, support existing community businesses and link community businesses so that they mutually reinforce each other. Typically, the structure of CEDCs consists of an “umbrella organization” (responsible for establishing, supporting and linking businesses) and member community businesses (Broadhead, 1994 ; Swack and Mason, 1994).

A CED model based on community businesses and CEDCs has a number of potential advantages over its rivals (market and government-led approaches). One such advantage involves local ownership. Whereas traditional firms are owned by shareholders who might live anywhere, community businesses and CEDCs either have no shareholders (as is the case with not-for-profit corporations which are controlled by boards made up of local citizen volunteers) or their shareholders are local residents. Local ownership and control means both that the community will have greater access to the firm to raise any concerns that it might have and that ownership will most likely be more responsive to these concerns. A second potential advantage pertains to the use of profits. In the case of traditional firms, profits may either be distributed to private shareholders (most of whom generally live outside of the community in question) in the form of dividends or they may be retained and invested in businesses elsewhere. In either case money that could be used for local development goes elsewhere and is lost to the local economy. In CEDCs, by contrast, profits are used to start new local businesses and improve the life of the local community. In the case of not-for-profit firms this is generally mandated in their memorandum of association. A third advantage relates to the commitment of community owned business and CEDCs to the community. In the case of not-for-profit firms it is explicit in the memorandum of agreement that members serve *pro bono publico*. This commitment should not only make them more sensitive to local community concerns and opportunities for development, but might also lead them to adopt policies and practices that promote and strengthen the local economy (e.g., patronizing local credit unions and businesses rather than large banks and retail chains). Again, this serves to keep money in the local economy and promote employment (Quarter, 1992 ; O’Neill, 1994).

New Dawn as an Example – New Dawn Enterprises is generally considered to be the oldest CEDC in Canada. Its origins go back to 1973 when Fr. Greg MacLeod and a diverse group of concerned citizens organized themselves to form the Cape Breton Association for Co-op Development.³ What brought them all together was frustration with the government's inability to attract industry to the region and a commitment to doing something to change the situation. While the original group was idealistic and full of energy, they were somewhat limited in their practical knowledge, with only one of them having any real business experience. As a result it was decided that more people from the business community needed to be recruited. The first project that the newly expanded group took up was the purchase and renovation of a deteriorating building to provide some desperately needed space for a local handicraft organization. The Association was able to get a bank loan through personal guarantees from the board members and a mortgage from a local credit union. With some help from a government “make work” grant to carry out the renovation, the main floor was refurbished for lease as commercial space while apartments were constructed on the first floor. As a result of the project the handicraft group obtained the space it needed, a number of local jobs were created and a small section of the city received a needed facelift. A number of similar projects were taken up over the next two years (MacLeod, 1991).

Despite the success of these initial projects, it became evident to the members of the Association that a more structured approach was necessary for them to better fulfill their goals. The decision was made to launch a pilot project called “New Dawn Enterprises.” The long-term goal behind founding this new organization was that it would operate as an umbrella structure under which a range of new enterprises could be established and projects taken up to promote community development. Although a co-operative in spirit, New Dawn was incorporated in June of 1976 as a not-for-profit corporation for several pragmatic reasons. Initially, the board decided that New Dawn should focus its energies and resources on housing and construction so as to build on the experience that it had gained in this field. Within a short period of time, however, New Dawn had been approached by numerous community groups with ideas and proposals. As a result the board began studying and approving a variety of new projects and enterprises and by 1981 had adopted the policy of taking on any project that contributed to the community, as long as it was economically viable.

As an organization New Dawn consists of four different groups of people, viz., the board of directors, management, employees and volunteers. Unlike traditional companies, New Dawn has no shareholders, only a board of directors which is mandated to run the corporation in the interests of the local community. Over the years New Dawn has sought to maintain a well-balanced board representing people from all walks of life within the community : lawyers, engineers, business executives, trades people, housewives, pensioners, etc. Recruitment of board members, who are all volunteers, has always emphasized the good of the community and technical competencies. These concerns correspond to the two basic responsibilities of board members, viz., representing community concerns and overseeing the efficient management of economic resources. More specific responsibilities include establishing committees to initiate and develop new proposals, recruiting and hiring management, reviewing the performance of management as well as providing legal, financial and other services. Like any corporation, New Dawn also requires management personal. The management of New Dawn consists of a CEO who is in charge of the umbrella organization as well as the managers of the subsidiary enter-

prises. In recruiting management, the same qualities are sought as for board members (technical competence and a commitment to the development of the local community). Unlike traditional corporations, New Dawn is also dependent upon another group of people, the volunteers who sit on the various committees of New Dawn and its associated enterprises. Without them, no new projects could be developed and existing projects could not be maintained (MacLeod, 1991).

From its inception, Greg MacLeod and the leadership of New Dawn have seen themselves primarily as a “business” enterprise and not a social service provider. This self-understanding is clearly reflected in the two conditions that New Dawn has established for accepting proposals. First, it requires that projects be economically viable. This involves feasibility studies and the stipulation that enterprises be self-financing within three years of their inception. Those that are not are disbanded or allowed to go off on their own. Second, New Dawn requires that its enterprises have a significant impact on the community. For this reason, New Dawn does not fund small, personal growth business projects, as these tend to have a very low turnover and employ few people. This condition reflects a key aspect of the vision of New Dawn – not only to survive, but to grow and transform the economy by bringing an increasingly larger part of it under social or community control.

While the board views New Dawn as a business, it is still committed to a broad conception of community development that incorporates not only economic, but also social and cultural aspects. Initially, this commitment led to the formation of distinct social and cultural committees, but these were soon abandoned, as they seemed to generate more negative than creative tension. Instead, it was recognized that most projects tend to have economic, social or cultural aspects and that these did not need to be artificially separated off.⁴ Again, the only points that the board insisted on were that any project or enterprise to be taken on (whether addressed more to social, cultural or economic aspects of development) had to make a significant contribution to the community and had to turn a profit.⁵ Thus, while New Dawn sees support for social and cultural aspects of development as a key part of its mandate, it does not think that a social service model provides the best basis for meeting these needs in the long term.

Practical Problems – As indicated above, a development strategy based upon community businesses and CEDCs potentially has a number of important advantages over its rivals (market and government-led strategies). In practice, however, the development results spawned by community businesses and CEDCs like New Dawn, although not insignificant, have been relatively modest (especially given the need for development). The basis for these meagre results lies, in the first instance, in the situation of the community businesses themselves which are not infrequently characterized by : 1) a lack of professional management ; 2) limited access to capital ; 3) limited entrepreneurial thrust (e.g., with respect to expansion, introducing new products, introducing new production techniques, developing more effective marketing schemes, etc.) and ; 4) an ambivalent or mixed conception of themselves as both a business and a social service provider. As a result of these characteristics most community businesses are not very dynamic (i.e., they remain small and contribute little to growth and employment) and are susceptible to failure, especially during times of economic downturn (MacLeod, 1991 ; O’Neill, 1994).

While most CEDCs are concerned about these characteristics of community businesses and the problems that arise from them, they have often been unable to go very far in developing effective solutions. Part of the reason for this has to do with a lack of resources. While CEDCs generally understand the needs involved, they frequently lack the human and/or material resources to adequately provide such support services as education, training, consulting, finance, etc. On the demand side, CEDCs commonly discover that community businesses do not always perceive a need to avail themselves of such support services when they are on offer. Another problem is that CEDCs, like community businesses, may have an ambivalent or mixed conception of themselves as a promoter of community businesses and as a social service provider. This ambivalence can lead to situations where CEDCs : 1) are not able and/or willing to encourage the fiscal responsibility necessary to keep community businesses viable and dynamic ; 2) run into financial instability (as their resources are depleted by supporting businesses and services that are not self-financing), and ; 3) find themselves in a state of economic dependency (in the form of reliance on government grants, etc.). Another aspect of the problem is that CEDCs have not been very successful in setting up policies, programs and structures that promote mutually reinforcing cooperation. This is sometimes due to a lack of vision or resources on the part of CEDCs. Under these circumstances, CEDCs tend to take a very ad hoc approach to economic development, rather than elaborating medium and longer term plans. A large part of the problem, however, lies with the community businesses. Many such community businesses are independent and unifunctional (e.g., credit unions, marketing co-operatives, consumer co-operatives) and, despite official pronouncements to the contrary, perceive their only obligation to be promoting the interests of their members. As a result, these businesses (many of which are relatively large and financially successful) show little or no interest in actively participating in programs and structures designed to mutually reinforce the community business sector (Craig, 1993 ; Pell, 1994).

Above we have focussed on practical problems that are, to a large extent, within the control of community businesses and CEDCs to directly address. In addition to these factors, however, government policy can greatly influence the potential of such enterprises for success in a variety of ways (Craig, 1993). While government policies can discriminate against or actively encourage community business and CEDCs, they tend towards the former. Of primary concern to us here is not so much the analysis of individual policies, but the larger trends in economic development policy. In particular, we are concerned with the context in which development policy is currently being framed (processes of economic globalization) and how this is affecting the prospects for CEDCs contributing to local economic development.

III. COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND THE CHALLENGE OF GLOBALIZATION

What is Globalization? - Globalization, like all terms used to describe social phenomena, is inherently open to contestation. In using the term here we are primarily referring to changes in the economy and, in particular, to the “transnationalization” of production and finance. While such processes of transnationalization are primarily associated with the activities of business firms, the origins of these changes are rooted in and have been facilitated by a series of interrelated dynamics across several key areas (production relations, states and the international

economy). For this reason, to understand the nature of globalization and its effects on development efforts, we must investigate each of these realms. In what follows, then, we first examine the origins and interrelated nature of the changes in these different realms and then proceed to discuss their effects on the prospects for economic development in non-metropolitan regions of developed countries.

First, with respect to production relations, the basic thrust of the changes can be conceptualized as a shift from a Fordist model to a **post-Fordist model of accumulation** (Lipietz, 1987). Cox (1994) explains this shift in accumulation strategy in terms of a distinction between core and peripheral aspects of the production process. Increasingly, large firms are retaining only core aspects of the production process on a permanent basis (research and development, finance, accounting, etc.), while contracting out other, more peripheral, aspects of the production process (production of component parts, maintenance, etc.). These changes in production relations are essentially designed to provide corporations with greater flexibility (which provide savings in terms of costs and advantages in capturing markets). While initially occurring within national boundaries, the “outsourcing” of peripheral aspects of production has rapidly spread across borders. Accompanying the transnationalization of production has been a transnationalization of finance. Firms can raise funds across borders with relative ease as international financial markets become increasingly integrated. These changes in production and finance have been facilitated by technological changes (in communications, transport, etc.) associated with the post-industrial revolution and have been initiated through innovations in organizational and financial theory. These factors alone, however, cannot provide a full account of globalization.

A **second** key area that helps to account for globalization involves the analysis of how states have changed in recent years. More specifically, countries around the globe have been “liberalizing” their economies and cutting back on social spending ever since the early 1980s and the Thatcher and Reagan “revolutions.” These changes in the state, which were essential in facilitating the changes in production relations noted above, are conceptualized by Jessop (1994a) as a **shift from a Keynesian Welfare State (KWS) to a Schumpeterian Workfare State (SWS)**. Jessop (1994b) argues that the KWS underwrote the social reproduction of Fordism through : 1) state management of aggregate demand ; 2) competition policy, infrastructure development, transportation and housing policies ; 3) the promotion of full employment and big business and ; 4) the management of social problems and the promotion of mass consumption through welfare rights and social expenditures. The key traits of the SWS, by contrast, include : 1) economic policy focussed on the promotion of innovation driven structural competitiveness and ; 2) social policy designed to enhance business flexibility and competitiveness in a global economy (rather than promote redistribution within the nation-state). (Jessop, 1993) It is important to note that this shift in the form of state (and the associated programs of economic liberalization and government spending cuts) did not just happen as the logical result of a commonly agreed upon, objective analysis of the plight of the economy. Rather, it occurred as part of a conscious, well-financed and highly organized political strategy initiated by business leaders (and sympathetic politicians) in the largest, developed countries of the world.⁶

Shifts in production relations and the changes in states that facilitated them are intimately tied up with a **third** area of change, **the international economy**. Two aspects of the international

economy are of particular importance for our concerns, viz., multilateral economic agreements and international financial institutions. Over the last two decades, as individual countries have liberalized their economies, a range of **multilateral economic agreements** (e.g., NAFTA, the Uruguay round of GATT leading to the WTO, etc.) have been signed. These agreements not only allow for increased flows of capital and goods across borders, but also put in place provisions that severely limit the ability of subsequent governments to (re)impose restrictions. These agreements, of course, have been essential in promoting the transnationalization of post-Fordist production. They have also served as vehicles to encourage reluctant states in the developed world to introduce programs of economic liberalization. Again, the impetus for such agreements came primarily from big business in the dominant economic powers and operated through national governments as well as unofficial multilateral organizations (e.g., the Trilateral Commission, the Mont Pelerin Society, etc.) and official bodies (e.g., OECD, the G-7), etc. (Cox, 1987 ; 1994) While these liberalizing agreements have also served to further incorporate developing economies into the global economy, in many instances the groundwork for their integration was laid by **international financial institutions**. Starting in the 1970s and throughout the 1980s and 1990s, the IMF and the World Bank imposed “structural adjustment” programs on developing countries as a condition for any further loans. As many of these countries (e.g., Mexico, Brazil, India, etc.) were suffering from severe fiscal crises at the time, they had no real option other than to agree to conditions that forced them to dramatically cut government spending and open up their economies to foreign goods and investment and, in effect, adopt a neo-liberal development strategy (Stallings, 1992).

Consequences of Globalization - Globalization, then, characterized as the transnationalization of production and finance, has occurred as the result of a series of interrelated changes in : 1) production relations (from a Fordist to a post-Fordist model) ; 2) nation states (from the KWS to the SWS) and ; 3) the international economy (from a system based on transborder economic flows subject to control and regulation by the state to one in which states serve as agencies for adjusting national economic practices and policies to the perceived exigencies of the global economy). These changes, as noted above, have had a tremendous effect on development strategies and prospects in developing countries. Not surprisingly, they have also affected the prospects for economic development in non-metropolitan regions of developed economies. Here we will briefly highlight three of the most significant consequences of globalization affecting development prospects in these regions.

First, economic globalization and associated factors have increased the need for promoting economic development in non-metropolitan regions. One such aspect of globalization involves changes in organization and the profit strategies of individual firms (e.g., down-sizing, clawbacks, etc.). These changes have resulted in more unemployment, less job security, lower levels of remuneration for workers, etc. Another aspect of globalization involves changes in the structure of the economy (e.g., capital flight and de-industrialization, greater reliance on high tech and service sectors). As a result of these trends there have also been significant job losses, while many of the new jobs created are part-time/insecure and low paying. A third aspect of globalization involves increased competition in domestic markets by large (oligopolistic) foreign firms. The operations of these firms, which threaten the viability of small community businesses, generally have less developmental impact. The reasons for this are that they tend to spend less in the local economy (as production is undertaken elsewhere) and do not reinvest their

surpluses in the region (but rather pay them out as dividends to shareholders who live in other places). (Stubbs and Underhill, 2000)

While none of these factors is specific to non-metropolitan regions, such regions suffer disproportionately from them for two reasons. On the one hand, such regions are more vulnerable to begin with as : 1) they tend to have a narrower economic base (i.e., they are often dependent upon one or two industries, do not enjoying a significant government sector, etc.) and ; 2) they already suffer from high levels of unemployment, poor social services, etc. (Decter, 1989) On the other hand, these regions are less capable of promoting economic development in the new sectors of the economy (information technology, communications, etc.) as they are deficient with respect to a number of essential ingredients for the promotion of innovation, e.g., a pool of skilled and trained technical personnel, research investment, ready physical access to technical support and state of the art equipment, competitively priced technical goods and services, ready access to face to face networks for information sharing, reputation building, developing and nurturing professional contacts, etc. (Gurstein, 2001) The cumulative effect of these factors operating in non-metropolitan regions (especially when combined with cuts in government spending) tends to be a downward spiral in the economy (as there is less demand for local goods and services, less investment to generate employment, etc.) and a greater need for development.

A **second** aspect of globalization that affects the prospects for community economic development relates to the viability of business strategies. As noted above, globalization makes it more difficult for local firms to operate in labour intensive sectors of the economy as they now have to compete against firms producing in developing countries which pay a fraction of their labour costs and which often enjoy a variety of other cost advantages (e.g., tax breaks, lower regulatory costs, etc.). In addition, local firms in all different kinds of markets are subject to increased foreign competition due to trade liberalization. As a result of these pressures, community businesses operating in developed countries generally have to adopt either (or both) of two strategies. On the one hand, they can seek to compete more effectively in traditional sectors of the economy by increasing their use of technology, broadly understood (e.g., more automation in resource based industries, use of information technology in marketing, use of computer design in product development, new financial and organizational arrangements, etc.). On the other hand, they can abandon the traditional sectors of the economy (where they suffer comparative disadvantages with respect to labour costs) and move into newer sectors in the “knowledge-based economy” (e.g., software development, computer assisted design, communications, etc.). The prospects for success under either of these strategies, however, are dependent upon a variety of conditions (as noted above) that are largely determined by policies generated by provincial/state and national governments. Thus, in taking up either of these options, CEDCs face a particularly daunting task if they are not able to mobilize political support and affect government policy and resource allocation.

A **third** effect of globalization, then, has to do with a change in the resources available to promote economic development in non-metropolitan regions. The basic resources with which we are concerned are the material resources that states (do not) supply through various regional development agencies and programs.⁷ Since the early 1980s Canada, like other developed countries, has adopted a new approach to local economic development, a “partnership” or

“community-based” (though not necessarily a CED) approach. The leading initiatives involved in this shift were : 1) the Local Employment Assistance and Development Program (LEAD) established in 1983 ; 2) the Community Futures Program established in 1986 and ; 3) regional development agencies such as the Atlantic Canada Development Agency (ACOA) established in 1987 (which administer federal programmes like Community Futures). What makes these initiatives “community-based” is that they seek to establish partnerships with local business and community groups. The basic functions that these initiatives have served are the promotion of local businesses (e.g., through Business Development Centres) and the encouragement of more local involvement in planning (Savoie, 1992 ; Douglas, 1994).

While from a CED perspective this shift to a more community-based approach to regional development policy would appear to be a positive step, there is room for pause. We do not have space here to review and evaluate all of these initiatives (Savoie, 1992 ; Watson, 1994), but we can offer a conceptual explanation of the basic problems by referring back to Jessop’s notion of the SWS. Two points in particular tend to make one less sanguine about this policy shift. The first point has to do with the fact that this policy shift is occurring in the context of a larger systemic change involving programmes of economic liberalization and spending cutbacks. This helps to account for the relatively modest amounts that have gone into these partnerships and serves to highlight the corresponding decreases in associated social welfare programmes which are complementary to local development efforts (Savoie, 1992). The second point to note is that these new partnership programmes can take several forms. Drawing on Jessop (1993), it is possible to identify three polar extremes with respect to such partnerships, viz., neo-liberal (business dominated), statist (government-dominated) and civil-society or community (NGO/CEDC/labour-dominated) forms, with actual practice tending to be located somewhere in between these poles. Depending on where particular programs lie within this matrix, they are likely to have different development impacts. More specifically, a number of analysts have argued that models which better incorporate community participation tend to be more effective than statist or neo-liberal approaches (Jones, 1998 ; Roy et al., 2000). In the case of Canada, the actual arrangement can be understood to gravitate more to the government pole (especially with respect to planning) or to lie somewhere between the government and business poles (e.g., with respect to the Business Development Corporations). (Savoie, 1992) As a result of this situation, community input into decisions tends to be minimal (and a CED approach to development is not effectively promoted). Under these circumstances, a “community-based” or “partnership” approach to regional economic development tends to appear less as an innovative and effective solution to regional development and more as a strategy by government to download responsibilities and decrease the overall level of resources to be made available for development.⁸

IV. NEW DAWN’S RESPONSE TO GLOBALIZATION

The leadership of New Dawn is composed of a knowledgeable and dedicated group of individuals who are guided not only by deeply held moral values and principles, but a practical vision of what it takes for alternative economic enterprises to respond to the challenges of globalization. In this section we will highlight four interconnected aspects of this vision and briefly indicate the steps that the leadership of New Dawn has been taking to realize them in the new context of globalization. Before beginning, however, it should be pointed out that Greg

MacLeod and the other leaders of New Dawn make no claims of originality with respect to their vision for an alternative approach to economic development. To the contrary, they clearly acknowledge that they are indebted to the experience of other existing institutions, most notably the Mondragon Cooperative Corporation located in the Basque region of Spain (MacLeod 1997).

The **first**, and most important, component of New Dawn's vision for confronting the challenges of a globalized economy is an emphasis on people. The leaders of New Dawn know that if their communities are to survive and flourish, it will be through the efforts of the local people. For this reason, they do not look to "away," but seek to retain and develop local "human resources." Three key groups of people can be distinguished – managers, entrepreneurs and the general public.

With respect to the first of these three groups, New Dawn has long recognized that if community businesses are to grow and prosper they will require professional management. Globalization, however, has made the imperative of developing a cadre of professional managers even more urgent. Globalization introduces competitive pressures that increasingly threaten the very existence of local businesses. Local businesses now have to become globally competitive or they will be forced out of the market. One obvious key to helping managers increase their ability to compete with global challengers is formal management education. Traditional management programs, however, are not entirely adequate for the purposes of CED. While community business managers require the same technical skills as managers in traditional business corporations, they also have a range of other needs (if they do not merely want to devolve into traditional businesses). These include analytic skills for understanding problems of promoting development in non-metropolitan regions, a clearly elaborated conceptual understanding of the sociology and philosophy of community businesses and a theoretical overview of the specific economic problems that tend to confront community businesses, as well as practical opportunities for integrating their academic studies in community business environments. The leadership of New Dawn has been instrumental in developing formal educational programs designed to fulfill these needs. One example of this is the new MBA in CED offered by the University College of Cape Breton (UCCB).⁹ This program is comprised of a range of courses and practical involvement specifically designed for potential community business managers. A similar UCCB option available at the undergraduate level allows students to combine a BA in Community Studies with a Bachelor of Business Administration. In addition to their attention to developing potential new managers, New Dawn has also been promoting opportunities for those already involved in the management of community businesses. These include extension courses, workshops, etc. In this context, it should be noted that New Dawn has always held a participatory approach to management and encouraged the active involvement of all its employees in management functions.

Another key group that New Dawn targets is (potential) entrepreneurs. In the new economy, many traditional sectors are becoming less viable, while opportunities are opening up in new areas. Without the systematic encouragement of entrepreneurship, CEDCs will not be able to effectively exploit the new opportunities that provide the basis for economic regeneration. Historically, New Dawn has been open to and supportive of proposals from entrepreneurs in the community. Up until now, however, they have not had a systematic program for encouraging the development of local entrepreneurs. Currently they are just beginning to take their first steps in

this direction. As part of an action-based research project (funded by the SSHRC) members of New Dawn's leadership are collaborating with other CEDCs in the region. Part of this collaboration involves local CEDCs identifying potential candidates for UCCB's MBA in CED. As part of their program of study, successful applicants are placed in their local CEDC, where they develop and implement plans for creating a new community business. Another important, though less direct, way in which the leadership of New Dawn has encouraged entrepreneurship in CED relates to the conditions for the effective promotion of entrepreneurship in the global, knowledge-based economy. These conditions (an appropriate infrastructure, a facilitating culture and practical programs which support and connect potential entrepreneurs) have recently been theorized in terms of national and regional "innovation systems" (Lundvall, 1992 ; Braczyk et al., 1998). The basic notion involved here is that these (necessary) conditions provide a "platform" on the basis of which innovation can occur through loosely connected networks. In providing an account of the rise of a significant information technology sector in Cape Breton, Michael Gurstein (2001) argues that Cape Breton has managed to develop a "community-based" (as opposed to a national or regional) innovation system. For our purposes it is important to note that of the three initial sources of this new community innovation system (viz., ECBC, local CED efforts and UCCB programs and resources, especially the NSERC/SSHRC Chair in the Management of Technology Program), two are directly related to New Dawn and, in particular, the work of Greg MacLeod (who was largely responsible the establishment of NSERC/SSHRC Chair and who Gurstein acknowledges as the leading proponent of CED in the region). This new "community-based" innovation system that has emerged now provides a necessary platform for CED ventures into new sectors of the knowledge-based economy.

A final group that New Dawn is seeking to target is the local community. Like most CEDCs, New Dawn recognizes that it must actively recruit volunteers from the community (including for its board) to overcome the structural deficit in human resources that it faces. In order for New Dawn to grow, it is essential that it continue to expand its volunteer basis. One approach that New Dawn has adopted in this regard is to target key sectors of the local community that have organizational and material resources, such as business and organized labour. In drawing upon these sectors, New Dawn has not been content to work with them in isolation, but rather has brought them together in a common organization, the Labour-Business Foundation. Another, more populist, approach that New Dawn has adopted to promoting local involvement entails the establishment of a "Mondragon Society." While this society is intended to serve a variety of functions (e.g., connecting researchers in the field), one key role that it will play is to systematize efforts to educate the local community about CED (and inspire people to get involved).

A **second** aspect of New Dawn's vision to meeting the challenges of the global economy is the recognition of the need for creative responses to constraints imposed by the new economy. What this means more specifically is the elaboration of **new competitive strategies**. As noted above, community (as well as traditional) businesses are being forced to adapt to structural changes in the economy by applying new technologies to increase their competitiveness in traditional sectors and/or by moving into new sectors of the "knowledge-based economy." With respect to the former strategy, New Dawn, has attempted to provide educational programs for community businesses to help them understand the need to adapt to the new realities and other support programmes to help them apply available technologies. As regards the latter strategy, New Dawn is in the process of establishing its first entrepreneurial foray into the knowledge-based

economy. In addition, the leadership of New Dawn has been attempting to take an even more proactive, long-term approach to these challenges by promoting increased cooperation between community businesses, universities and government. While such co-operation involving large private-sector corporations is already common (the so-called Triple Helix Model), New Dawn has been trying to extend such co-operation to the community business sector. The goal here is to not only to accelerate the process of technology transfer, but to develop new technologies and commercial applications that can be exploited by community businesses for the purpose of CED (MacLeod et al., 1996).

A **third** element of New Dawn's approach to competing in the global economy involves an increase and a further **institutionalization of co-operation**. Three areas are of particular importance : 1) co-operation among community businesses ; 2) co-operation among CEDCs and ; 3) co-operation with universities and government in research. With respect to the first of these three areas, New Dawn perceives a strong need for the creation of integrated economic units composed of individual businesses and groups that complement and mutually support each other. What this means, in more practical terms, is developing co-operative corporations (or conglomerates) composed of different branches that can provide a complete range of services that member companies need. The importance of developing such structures is that they ensure individual businesses reliable suppliers of inputs, additional purchasers of their products and access to knowledgeable providers of key services (financial, consulting, etc.). These advantages are particularly important in an age of globalization as the traditional vulnerability of community businesses has become amplified due to programs of economic liberalization.

Especially important in integrating community businesses into a corporate structure is the provision of financial services. The key initiative that the leaders of New Dawn have taken in this direction has been the establishment of a financial services provider, Banking Community Assets Holding Ltd. (BCA).¹⁰ While all new and fledgling businesses are vulnerable, community business are particularly so, as traditional financial services providers tend to discriminate against such firms (while community businesses in the financial sector, such as credit unions, ironically often do not see financing community businesses as part of their mandate). BCA is important, then, because it basically operates as a merchant bank for the CED sector. As such it provides start-up and operating capital in the form of loans and equity (through BCA Holdings), venture capital (through BCA Venture Co-op) and consulting services (through Trans-Community Consulting). BCA is able to provide these services to community businesses by accessing funds from local investors who they offer a range of options that mirror traditional financial services (e.g., savings accounts, mutual funds, preferred shares, etc.). In this way, BCA captures capital that would otherwise leave the region and redirects it towards community businesses. This not only serves to increase the number of community businesses, but to diversify the community business sector, which in turn provides greater opportunities for mutually, reinforcing cooperation.

Another key area of co-operation for New Dawn, involves linking diverse community businesses and CEDCs. This is not a new concern, but, again one that takes on increasing urgency in a globalized economy (for reasons explained above). Historically, New Dawn, like many CEDCs has had trouble convincing key types of community businesses (credit unions, marketing cooperatives) in their immediate region (Cape Breton) to develop closer links. This problem still

continues to exist. More recently, the leadership of New Dawn has been broadening its perspective and developing links with other CEDCs through the Atlantic seaboard of Canada. Their efforts have included the establishment of an annual festival where members of different CEDCs can come together and share their experiences. The vision of New Dawn's leadership goes beyond regional co-operation, however, for it realizes that in an age of globalization, CED and the social economy must also become globalized. This realization takes practical form in the links that Greg MacLeod and the leadership New Dawn have established with CEDCs in other parts of the world (e.g., the Mondragon Co-operative Corporation in Spain and co-operatives in Mexico). In addition to sharing information, New Dawn is committed to developing joint ventures in which several CEDCs and community businesses can co-operate. They are currently in the process of establishing their first such joint venture, a tourism enterprise that will offer unique vacation packages across Atlantic Canada. These vacation packages, run by individual community businesses and CEDCs, will take advantage of local cultural traditions and the historic significance of the region to provide such opportunities as study tours at archaeological sites, cultural and linguistic programs, etc. The individual packages will be tied together by a shared marketing program and a common oversight committee (designed to ensure quality and complementarity between the packages).

The third area of co-operation involves establishing closer links with universities and government for the purpose of research. Like all business enterprises in the new global era, community businesses require research not only for the development of new products, but also to assist in the procurement and dissemination of knowledge relating to technological developments, new organizational techniques, market conditions, etc. Unfortunately, few if any community businesses (or small businesses generally) have resources to undertake such work. For this reason, as we noted above, New Dawn has been actively advocating the extension of the "triple helix model" of business-university-government co-operation to community businesses. New Dawn has also been working closely with the Tompkins Institute of UCCB,¹¹ which has largely functioned for New Dawn (and other CEDCs and community businesses) as an instrument of technology transfer (broadly understood to include developments in technology, organization theory, financial practices, etc.). In addition to the standard business problems just noted, CEDCs also require research to help them better understand the specificities of the situations of community businesses including : 1) their perceptions of the problems and opportunities that they face ; 2) the methods they use to confront the problems and opportunities and ; 3) the factors (e.g., size, sector, location, organizational structure) that condition their perceptions, their choice of strategies, the success of their strategies, etc. Again, few CEDCs are in a position to undertake empirical work to investigate these issues. New Dawn has attempted to deal with this problem by establishing links with university researchers and by accessing government research funds. As a result of a successful SSHRC research proposal, the leadership of New Dawn is currently collaborating with several other CEDCs and a number of university researchers to undertake an empirical study of CEDCs operating on the Atlantic seaboard (as well as a secondary study of successful CED practices in other developed countries). The study involves both a traditional business case study method (of investigating organizational structure, financial practices, etc.), as well as an action research component (which places MBA students, as noted above, in community businesses both to help them adopt new technologies and develop new community business opportunities).

The **final aspect** of New Dawn's vision for confronting the challenges of globalization is comprised of political involvement. The leadership of New Dawn is acutely aware that recent changes in the global economy were not merely the logical result of technological advances, but were largely facilitated by a variety of changes to the regulatory framework. Moreover, they recognize that these changes not only have benefited metropolitan over non-metropolitan regions, but largely determine whether their efforts can have any significant effect. As a result, the leadership of New Dawn knows that they must be actively involved in the political process. Their involvement is directed towards ensuring that public policy will be more fair (i.e., entail a more equitable distribution of resources for non-metropolitan regions), more effective (i.e., have a greater development impact on non-metropolitan areas) and will not discriminate against community businesses, CEDCs and local initiatives. Thus, while New Dawn is proud of its record of not relying on government grants in its efforts to promote development, it strongly feels that government does have responsibilities to contribute to development by elaborating and implementing public policy that can facilitate (rather than inhibit) local community initiatives. Key areas where the leadership of New Dawn has been actively involved in trying to influence government policy include government regulations on venture capital funds, government programs to promote research cooperation between business, universities and government (an alternative Triple Helix Model), broader community involvement in the government regional development programs (e.g., ACOA, ECBC), etc. Members of New Dawn have employed a variety of methods in their efforts to influence public policy in these areas, e.g., writing (books, academic papers, opinion pieces, etc.), appearances before government enquiries, participation on local development commissions, etc.

V. CONCLUSION

Recent processes of economic and political transformation, commonly summarized under the term "globalization," threaten contemporary societies with a range of potentially devastating effects (increased economic and social insecurity, increased income polarization, a global division of labour, etc.). This is not an inevitable fate, but rather just one possible scenario that has emerged because of particular policy choices and political strategies that have been adopted by business and political elites in the dominant countries of the world. While community organizations and governments at all levels are constrained in what they can do to promote development as a result of these processes of globalization, they are powerless only to the extent that they believe in the inevitability of their fate. CEDCs, and the Social Economy more generally, represent movements that affirm the possibility of alternatives.

In engaging in the struggle to promote alternatives, it must be acknowledged that actors in the social economy face a daunting task. In this paper we have sought, on the one hand, to explain the nature of the challenges involved in this task as it relates to the specific problem of promoting economic development in non-metropolitan regions. On the other hand, we have recounted how one CEDC is attempting to respond to these challenges. The experience of New Dawn is important not so much because of its size and influence, which by all measures are quite modest. Rather, New Dawn is important because of its practical vision of what it will take to address the challenges posed by globalization. Whether or not the social economy has any realistic chance of providing an alternative to the dominant neo-liberal models currently in place is an open question. The efforts of New Dawn exemplify the basic strategies through which such

possibility might be fulfilled : a) developing local human resources for effective and broad-based participation in the social economy ; b) elaborating viable profit strategies that will enable community businesses to compete in the global economy ; c) increasing co-operation across the social economy (and with universities and government agencies) and ; d) engaging in political activity to limit the power of large corporations and support a CED development model. One final note needs to be added. In a global economy, it is difficult to develop, to turn a phrase, a social economy in one country. While it is unlikely that the social economy will disappear in the global economy, it is quite possible that it will be incorporated in such a way that it only serves a palliative function for the most vulnerable and marginal sectors of society (the urban poor, rural communities, etc.). In order for the social economy to realize its potential as an alternative economic model, co-operation across the social economy and related processes of political organization will have to become global in nature. How this is to be done are lessons that organizations like New Dawn are just beginning to learn.

NOTES

¹ In addition to works cited, much of the information on New Dawn comes from personal conversations with Greg MacLeod and others involved in either the operation or study of New Dawn. As well, members of an on-going SSHRC grant headed by Greg MacLeod (which is investigating CEDCs on the Atlantic seaboard of Canada) have shared the initial results of their work on the recent changes occurring in CEDCs in the region (including New Dawn and associated organizations). Especially helpful in this regard has been Harvey Johnstone of the University College of Cape Breton, who heads up the case study component of the research project.

² Such a failure on the part of management is often evident in the case of worker buyouts, where workers, usually in close co-operation with the local community, have been able to turn around failing industries abandoned by traditional firms. See, for example, the case of Algoma Steel (Quarter, 1995).

³ For more information on New Dawn Enterprises, see their website (<http://www.newdawn.ca>).

⁴ A prime example of this is provided by a unique approach to home care developed by one of the subsidiaries of New Dawn. When a local military base closed down, the government approached New Dawn about taking over the facilities and developing them. Cape Care, a subsidiary of New Dawn, developed a plan to convert the semi-detached housing of the base into a unique home care arrangement. In one side of each of the units they housed two or three senior citizens, while in the unit on the other side a care-giving family resides. This arrangement allows the seniors not only the privacy that they want, but also contact with children and a family. In this way they were not isolated from the larger community, but remained a vital part of it (MacLeod, 1991).

⁵ This commitment of the board to social and cultural as well as economic development is reflected in the range of enterprises and projects that New Dawn has initiated over the years, e.g., a senior citizens guest home, a home care company for senior citizens, group homes for the mentally retarded and post mentally ill, the promotion of traditional folk music concerts and recordings, a division to develop and promote community events, etc.

⁶ Cox (1987; 1994) traces the origins of the shift back to events in the period of 1968-75 (e.g., the collapse of Bretton Woods, the emergence of “stagflation,” the first “oil shocks,” etc.). He recounts how business leaders pushed their new agenda by using business organizations (e.g., the Conference Board) and informal multilateral organizations (e.g., the Trilateral Commission and the Bilderburg Conferences) to influence their own national governments and multilateral bodies (e.g., the OECD).

⁷ It could be argued that there is an even more important resource for promoting development than the material resources that the state can provide, viz., the vision to conceive of an alternative economic development model and an alternative conception of the state (to the SWS). It is beyond the scope of this work to examine how the ideology of globalization undermines the availability of this resource or to investigate in any detail how it might be replenished.

⁸ This is not to say that individual CEDCs cannot take advantage of the programs in this new policy shift or that regional agencies will not support CED projects, as they clearly have (MacLeod, 1995). Rather, the point is that the new “community-based” strategy does not provide sufficient resources and cannot be considered a CED strategy. Rather, it primarily serves a political function within the larger SWS model.

⁹ For more information, see the UCCB website (<http://www.uccb.ns.ca/MBACED>).

¹⁰ It should be noted here that most of the leadership of New Dawn did not see BCA as a viable project when it was initially brought to the board. For this reason, Greg MacLeod and a few other associates developed BCA independently of New Dawn. Now that BCA has proved itself, the two institutions are working closely together. For more information on BCA, see their website (<http://www.uccb.ns.ca/bca>).

¹¹ For more information, see the Tompkins Institute’s website (<http://faculty.uccb.ns.ca/tompkins>).

REFERENCES

- BOADHEAD, Dal. 1994. “Community Economic Development Practice in Canada,” in *Community Economic Development : Perspectives on Research and Policy*, Toronto, Thompson Educational Publishing : Burt Galaway and Joe Hudson, eds.
- BRACZYK, Hans-Joachim et al. (eds). 1998. *Regional innovation systems : the role of governances in a globalized world*, London, UCL Press.
- CALINGAERT, M. 1996. *European Integration : Progress, Prospects and U.S. Interests*, Boulder, CO, Westview Press.
- COX, Robert. 1987. *Production, Power, and World Order*, New York, Columbia University Press.
- COX, Robert. 1994. “Global Restructuring: Making Sense of the Changing International Political Economy,” in *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order*, Toronto, McClelland & Stewart : Richard Stubbs and Geoffrey R. D. Underhill, eds.
- CRAIG, John. 1993. *The Nature of Co-operation*, Montreal, Black Rose Books.

- DECTER, Michael B. 1989. *Diversification and Single Industry Communities : The Significance of a Community Economic Development Approach*, Local Development Paper Series, no. 10, Ottawa, Economic Council of Canada.
- DOUGLAS, David J.A. 1994. "Context and Conditions of Community Economic Development in Canada: Government and Institutional Responses," *Community Economic Development in Canada*, vol. 1, Toronto, McGraw-Hill Ryerson : in David J.A. Douglas, ed.
- GURSTEIN, Michael. 2001. *Forging Community Innovation : With Information and Communications Technology ; Universities, Research, and Economic Development in a Remote and Rural Community*, Sydney, NS, UCCB Press.
- HANSEN, Niles, Benjamin Higgins and Donald J. Savoie. 1990. *Regional Policy in a Changing World*, New York, Plenum Press.
- HIGGINS, Benjamin and Donald J. Savoie. 1995. *Regional Development Theories & Their Application*, New Brunswick, NJ, Transaction Publishers.
- JESSOP, Bob. 1993. "Towards a Schumpeterian workfare state? Preliminary remarks on post-Fordist political economy," *Studies in Political Economy*, vol. 40, 7-39.
- JESSOP, Bob. 1994a. "The transition to post-Fordism and the Schumpeterian workfare state," in *Towards a post-Fordist welfare state*, London, Routledge : R, Burrows and B Loader, eds.
- JESSOP, Bob. 1994b. "Post-Fordism and the state," in *Post-Fordism : A reader*, Oxford, Blackwell : A. Amin, ed.
- JONES, Martin. 1998. "Partnerships as Models of Economic Governance : A Regulationist Perspective," in *Public-Private Partnerships for Local Economic Development*, London, Praeger: Norman Walzer and Brian D. Jacobs, eds.
- LIPIETZ, Alain. 1987. *Mirages and Miracles : The Crisis in Global Fordism*, London, Verso.
- LIPTON, M. 1977. *Why Poor People Stay Poor : Urban Bias in World Development*, London, Temple Smith.
- LIPTON, M. 1993. "Urban Bias: Of Consequences, Classes and Causality," *Journal of Development Studies*, special issue, vol. 29, no. 4.
- LUNDEVALL, Bengt-Åke (ed.). 1992. *National Systems of Innovation*, London, Pinter.
- MACLEOD, Greg. 1991. "Community Business: A Video/Booklet Series." Sydney, NS, Tompkins Institute/ University College of Cape Breton.
- MACLEOD, Greg. 1995. "Atlantic Canadian Roots," in *Community Economic Development in Canada*, vol. 2., Toronto, McGraw-Hill Ryerson : David J.A. Douglas, ed.
- MACLEOD, Greg. 1997. *Mondragon To America: Experiments in Community Economic Development*, Sydney, NS, University of Cape Breton College Press.
- MACLEOD, Greg, Bruce McFarlane and Charles H. Davis. 1996. "The Knowledge Economy and the Social Economy: University Support for Community Enterprise Development as a Strategy for Economic Regeneration in Distressed Regions in Canada and Mexico," a paper presented at the Triple Helix Conference, University of Amsterdam, January 3.
- O'NEILL, Tim J. 1994. "Regional, Local and Community-Based Economic Development," in *Community Economic Development: Perspectives on research and Policy*, Toronto, Thompson Educational Publishing : Burt Galaway and Joe Hudson, eds,
- PELL, David. 1994. "The Third Sector, Sustainable Development and Community Empowerment," in *Community Economic Development in Canada*, vol. 1, Toronto, McGraw-Hill Ryerson : David J.A. Douglas, ed.

- QUARTER, Jack. 1992. *Canada's Social Economy : Co-operatives, Non-profits, and Other Community Enterprises*, Toronto, James Lorimer & Co.
- QUARTER, Jack. 1995. *Crossing the Line : Unionized Employee Ownership and Investment Funds*, Toronto, James Lorimer & Co.
- ROY, Jeffrey et al. 2000. "The Collaborative Challenges of Regional Governance: Innovation, Social Technologies and Civic Entrepreneurs," a paper presented at the research workshop *Challenges And Opportunities Of A Knowledge-Based Economy*, University of British Columbia, Dec. 8-9.
- SAVOIE, Donald J. 1992. *Regional Economic Development : Canada's search for solutions*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- SCHWARTZ, H.M. 1994. *States versus Markets : History, Geography, and the Development of the International Political Economy*, New York, St. Martin's Press.
- STALLINGS, Barbara. 1992. "International Influence on Economic Policy : Debt Stabilization and Structural Reform," in *The Politics of Economic Adjustment*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press : Stephan Haggard and Robert Kaufman, eds.
- STUBBS, Richard and Geoffrey R.D. Underhill (eds). 2000. *Political economy and the changing global order*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- SWACK, Michael and Donald Mason. 1994. "Community Economic Development : An Overview of the U.S. Experience," in *Community Economic Development : Perspectives on Research and Policy*, Toronto, Thompson Educational Publishing : Burt Galaway and Joe Hudson, eds.
- WATSON, Ken. 1994. "A Review of Four Evaluations of CED Programs : What Have We Learned in Two Decades," in *Community Economic Development : Perspectives on research and Policy*, Toronto, Thompson Educational Publishing : Burt Galaway and Joe Hudson, eds.