

This report is presented as received by IDRC from project recipient(s). It has not been subjected to peer review or other review processes.

This work is used with the permission of The North-South Institute.

© 1999, The North-South Institute.

The Power of Partnership

**Lynne Hatery
The North-South Institute**

Table of Contents

	Acknowledgements	3
	Definitions	4
1.	Objectives	8
2.	Introduction	10
	Partnership trends and tensions	10
	The meaning of partnership	11
	The appeal of partnerships	12
	Southern ownership	12
	Interdependent global problems	14
	Strategic mode of operating	15
	Framing partnership	15
3.	The Evolving Nature of Partnership	19
	The origins of development assistance	19
	Official aid	19
	The development of non-governmental activity	19
	The growth of Southern people's movements	20
	The aid relationship revisited	21
	The Southern non-governmental critique	22
	Redefining partnership	23
	Global compacts	25
4.	Partnership Problematics	26
	Language of partnership	26
	The imbalance of power	27
5.	Menu of Mechanisms	31
	Meaningful Southern engagement	31
	Broadening base of work	34
6.	Concluding Words: A Future Research Agenda	37
	Bibliography	39

Acknowledgements

The Special Programs Unit of the Corporate Affairs Initiatives Division of the International Development Research Centre deserves special recognition for financially and intellectually supporting this work.

I would like to thank Bruce Tate and Peggy Teagle of the Canadian NGO Organizing Committee for the World Summit for Social Development and to the many others who willingly engaged in discussions and were an integral part of this project.

I am grateful to Sherrill Johnson, my co-presenter at the Canadian Association for Studies in International Development (CASID) conference held in Montreal in June, for her clarity and humour. Peta-Anne Baker, currently a Lecturer in Sociology and Social Work at the University of the West Indies, provided valuable and insightful comments as a reviewer.

To my colleagues at the North-South Institute, thanks to Ann Weston, Nona Grandea and others for their comments, Rowena Beamish for editing, Anne Chevalier for the desktop design.

Lynne Hatley
The North-South Institute
Ottawa, Canada

Definitions

Bilateral agency

Governmental aid organization operating on behalf of a single donor government, e.g., the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA).

Charity

The act of providing gifts from one who has (a person, institution or government) to one who is perceived to be in need (a person, institution or government).

Civil society

The sum of all social institutions and associations (excluding the family) which are autonomous, independent of the state and capable of significantly influencing public policy.¹

Empowerment

The process by which individuals attain more control of the decisions that affect their lives. The term is used commonly by donor agencies and organizations to describe their approach of involving the participation of community members in development programming.

Institutional capacity development

Supporting the development of institutions, whether they be government affiliated or not, to operate autonomously, democratically and sustainably so as to have the ability to direct and implement development efforts at the local, national or regional levels.

Multilateral agency

Donor agency supported financially and politically by many governments that provide resources and technical assistance to Southern countries (e.g., the World Bank, the United Nations specialized agencies).

Non-governmental organization

Non-governmental organizations work outside but often alongside the state structure and the for-profit sector. This term encompasses both domestically focused organizations in addition to international development organizations, most often referred to as development non-governmental organizations (NGOs). This term encompasses the over 55,000 registered non-profit voluntary organizations in Canada (not including individual churches or charities associated with hospitals and universities) and approximately 3,000 development NGOs in the OECD donor countries.²

¹ ICHRDD, "Strengthening Democratic Societies", in *Libertas*, 3(4), 1993, p. 3, 4.

² Canadian figures are from David Sharpe, *A Portrait of Canada's Charities: The Size, Scope and Financing of Registered Charities*. Toronto: Canadian Centre for Philanthropy, 1994. Figures referring to NGOs in OECD countries are cited from the United Nations Human Development Report, 1993. New York: UNDP, 1993.

North-South relationships

The relationships that exist between donor countries, primarily OECD countries, and countries receiving official development assistance (ODA). These complex relations operate at a number of levels - between governments (national and local), institutions and people.

Ownership

Control by local people, local institutions, and developing country governments over development policy, planning and programming.

Participation

The involvement of people and organized groups in institutions, organizations and the decisions that impact on their lives.

Solidarity

Working together with the intent of bringing about political, economic or social change.

Agencies funding projects in the third world have an enormous amount of power. One only has to glimpse the files of any agency involved in so-called "development" to recognize the enormous amounts of information they have accumulated about progressive organizations and the amount of power the dispensing of funds gives them over people's lives all over the world. They are able to shape the lives of the organizations they support, not simply because they fund them, but also because of the processes and disciplines they require the organizations to become involved in. The term "partner" currently being used by donor agencies to describe their relationship with recipient organizations only obscures what remains a very real power relation. This egalitarian label does not change the reality.

(Honor Ford Smith, Ring Ding in a Tight Corner: A Case Study of Organizational Democracy 1977-1988. Toronto: Women's Program of ICAE, 1989).

The truth of the matter is that, whatever the rhetoric, donors frequently have little intention of granting "ownership" to local decision-makers unless these decision-makers have, on their own, come up with policies with which the donors agree. Indeed, I have heard an official of one donor agency say that ownership means that "recipients do that which we want but do so voluntarily".

(G.K. Helleiner, Poverty in the South: Northern Responsibilities and a Role for Canada, November 1, 1994, Second Annual Hopper Lecture).

'Out takes on Partnership.....'

Over its 50-year history, the World Bank has become a global partnership in which more than 175 countries have joined together for a common purpose: to improve the quality of life for people throughout the world and meet the challenge of sustainable development (*Lewis T. Preston, former President, The World Bank, 1994*).

Partnership...is intended to help Canadians build a more equitable relationship with the people of developing countries by helping to bring Canada's cooperation into line with major improvements that have taken place not only in the ability of developing countries to carry out development on their own, but also in the capacity of Canada's domestic and international partners as well (*CIDA, 1993*).

Canadians building partnerships so that co-ops and community based groups may build housing - that's the work of Rooftops Canada, the international program of the Cooperative Housing Federation of Canada. Rooftops has established partnerships with co-op housing organizations in Latin America, Africa, Asia, and the Caribbean. Partnership means solidarity not charity. Rooftops programs and partnerships begin with people and focus on their efforts to create improved and sustainable housing for themselves and their communities (*Rooftops Canada, 1995*).

Enhanced partnerships with Canadian organizations and institutions will also be developed...Involvement with other Canadian institutions should look beyond the traditional concept of North-South technical assistance and should focus on the mutual interests of Canada and developing countries (*IDRC, The Canadian Partnerships Division, 1994*).

1. Objectives

The Power of Partnership sets out to explore 'partnership' as it has evolved in international development. The paper examines the problems and the opportunities associated with this concept. Since little work has been done to examine and address the integral role power plays in partnerships, this paper seeks to uncover the inherent imbalances in such linkages. The paper suggests that the fundamental inequities underlying the aid transfer must be explicitly acknowledged and addressed for reasons of both equity and efficiency. A first step in designing a menu of mechanisms to assist donor agencies and organizations in addressing these inequities and in moving forward partnership from rhetoric into reality is presented.

Donor-recipient relationships between Northern donors and Southern institutions and people are surveyed.³ Given the diversity of donors, the varying contexts in which they work and their differing approaches to development problems, the paper does not set out a blueprint on how to attain the ideal partnership. Rather, it seeks to raise questions for donor governments and non-governmental organizations regarding their usage of the language of partnership and their practice of the concept.⁴

This paper challenges donors to rethink partnership and the related concepts of participation, empowerment, ownership and control. Although the primary focus of this paper is NGOs working in the social sector, the questions posed are pertinent for donor agencies as well. They are of particular relevance given that more and more donor governments are following a people-centred development approach that argues that development is about supporting the struggle of women, men and their families to attain their rights and expand their choices. It follows then that the lessons learned by the NGOs in their attempts at redesigning partnerships are important for government agencies as well.

Two broad kinds of partnerships are examined - those that tinker with the conventional aid relationship to make it better and those that attempt to overhaul completely the traditional way of working. While conventional one-way partnerships are characterized as unequal, vertical in structure and motivated by charity, reciprocal partnerships are defined as more equal, horizontal and based on solidarity.

The paper analyzes the important role donors can play by shifting the focus from partnership to the more controversial issues of control and ownership. It explores how reciprocal partnerships can be

³ For the purposes of this paper, the North refers to member countries of the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), excluding Mexico; and the South refers to those countries receiving international development assistance funding.

⁴ This paper primarily examines the activities of Northern-based donor agencies and organizations that transfer resources to the South. Donor agency refers to government funding bodies including bilateral donors like the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and multilateral donors like the World Bank. Donor organization is used to refer to non-governmental groups such as international development non-governmental organizations (NGOs), groups with a domestic issues focus and volunteer-driven organizations that transfer funds and technical assistance to Southern countries.

compatible with Southern demands for ownership and control of their own development initiatives. In response to the growing recognition of the links between the global and the local, the paper suggests that North-South relations have never been so important. It recommends that donors be more responsive to the needs and demands of local populations to ensure that ownership of development initiatives remains in the South and that the scope of development assistance be broadened by working more closely on development issues in their home countries.

The '*Power of Partnership*' raises more questions than it answers. It is hoped that the areas of research identified and proposed in the conclusion will motivate others to build on this work.

2. Introduction

Partnership Trends and Tensions

The term partnership became popular in the early 1980s in the field of international development and continues to be used widely 15 years later. Not only are Northern NGOs using the positive language to describe their relations with Southern institutions and people, donor agencies are climbing on the bandwagon. Consider the 1995 policy statements of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and of the Development Assistance Committee of the OECD.

...this new declaration implies a relationship based upon agreement, reflecting mutual responsibilities in furtherance of shared interests. A true partnership model for development co-operation begins to define a structure for more productive relations between the industrialized and the developing countries into the next century. Further defining and improving that model - with its emphasis on self help, policy coherence, putting people first, efficiency and effectiveness - will be a major focus of the work of the DAC in the coming years (*James H. Michel, The Chair, OECD, 1995*).

Partnership is a two-way street based upon shared rights and responsibilities. Each partner brings different, but complementary, skills, expertise and experiences to a common objective. Each contributes to areas of comparative advantage that complement each other and are fundamentally compatible. (*USAID, 1995*)

One of the greatest criticisms of partnership stems from the apparent Northern origins of the concept. Critics contend that the language serves merely as a ruse for Northern donors to maintain some control over the Southern development agenda. In fact, most Southern organizations and people disassociate themselves from using the term and shy away from calling their Northern counterparts partners. They prefer to call them as they see them - donors and funders operating in an inequitable environment. Similarly, instead of referring to themselves as partners they tend to call themselves recipients or "conduits".⁵

At the same time that donors are singing the praises of partnership, government accountability processes are being tightened and the availability of resources for international development cut back. In the face of domestic deficit reduction strategies and the perceived increasing failure of international development efforts, donor governments are demanding more control over the disbursement of funds, introducing more conditionalities, insisting on more centralized management structures and offering less flexibility.⁶ The emphasis on these concerns overshadows the important concepts associated with partnership - ownership, local participation, empowerment and decentralized control. Although such concepts are gaining wide acceptance with Northern donors,

⁵ Dennis A. K. Muchunguxi and Scott D. Milne. *Perspectives from the South: A Study on Partnership*, AFREDA and CIDA, Ottawa, June 1995, p. 23.

⁶ Jean Bossuyt and Geert Laporte. "Partnership in the 1990's: How to Make It Work Better", *Policy Management Brief*, ECDPM, Dec. 3, 1994.

as evidenced by their usage in policy documents, their practice is limited. All this talk about partnership is not translating into action.

The gap between the theory - what is written in mission statements and what institutions say they are doing - and actual practice is not a new situation for donors. This is partly due to their operational structures - the funding, evaluation, accountability and management systems - that encourage

The challenge is to find new management approaches that leave development initiatives in the hands of local actors, while ensuring results-oriented donor control (Bossuyt & Laporte, 1994, p. 2).

Northern rather than Southern control. For donors, tension exists between creating enabling environments for recipient-driven development strategies and the concepts associated with partnership, and ensuring resource accountability back to donor governments. Concurrently, tension exists for recipients when donors refuse to acknowledge the reverse resource flow - financial, technical and human - from certain regions of the South to the North. Addressing these structural and political constraints may be the most fundamental issues that donors and recipients confront in the coming decade.

The meaning of partnership

The meaning of partnership is as diverse as the institutions involved in international development. Consider the range of Northern players: large multilateral, inter-governmental agencies like the World Bank, the specialized agencies of the United Nations, official aid agencies, private businesses, trade organizations, exporters and importers, foundations, regional development banks, and a host of NGO organizations including women's groups, environmental organisations, community groups, churches, labour unions, cooperatives and research centres.

In light of this diversity, it is virtually impossible to define one kind of partnership. While many use it to refer to the bilateral relations between Northern and Southern NGOs or governments, others, for instance, such as the Canadian International Development Agency, use the term to describe their links with the non-governmental sector.⁷

It is quite useful to think of partnerships as mechanisms by which new value is created through the collaboration of two parties to solve problems and meet each other's needs. These relations operate on the principles of supply and demand - I have something you need and you have something I

Partnership consists of a mutually beneficial relationship between two or more organizations that is based on mutual trust and respect and attempts to move beyond the traditional donor-recipient paradigm (*South Asia Partnership, 1991*).

True partnership is complex, sometimes difficult, and always exciting. It is difficult because each partner needs and must retain, its own identity and uniqueness. Partnership is complex because as individuals and organizations, partners each have their own values and needs. Yet partnership within the co-operative sector is also an exciting opportunity. Common values provide a basis for understanding, and the creative synergy that results is often greater than the sum of the parts (*Canadian Co-operative Association, 1994*).

⁷ It is noteworthy that NGOs refer to their government ties in a similar manner, less frequently.

need. Such relationships are very much like those between people - they depend on trust and mutual respect.

The extent of this combined effort differs from relationship to relationship and depends largely on how the two parties share responsibilities. This division of labour reflects how the partners deal with issues of control and ownership. Is the partnership designed to benefit one party more than the other? Does each party have as much to lose by being part of the relationship? Does one party have more control over decision making? Is this control separate from the consequences of the decision? Is the control of decision making decentralized to local people (do the two parties support anti-poverty projects in which those living in poverty are driving the project's funding, evaluation, or accountability decisions)? Is the partnership as accountable to the beneficiaries as it is to the donors?

The appeal of partnerships

There are a variety of reasons why partnerships are so appealing to such a wide range of development institutions. These can be summarized as follows - to ensure Southern ownership, to better address global interdependent problems, and as a strategic mode of operating.

Southern ownership

One of the most common reasons Northern donors create partnerships with Southern organizations and people is to develop better linkages with the South - not only for equity reasons but also for efficiency. For decades now, Southerners have been demanding the right to control their lives and to have ownership over their development plans and strategies. Southerners feel they have the solutions for what Northern donors have identified as problems. "In their own way they have identified the source of the problem(s)" and "in their own way they have tried and tested alternative solutions".⁸

...the goal should be to move away from the existing relationship of 'donor' and 'recipient'. Southern NGOs want to manage their own affairs and want the North to recognize the important role they play in their own development (Muchunguxi and Milne 1995).

Sustainable development appears more attainable when Southern communities and local people are ensured ownership of their own development. This message has been passed from NGOs to the World Bank: "projects tend to be more sustainable and yield higher returns when they involve those they are intended to help."⁹ This claim is supported by the experience of UNICEF. Over 40 years experience has taught UNICEF "that benefits to people are short-lived unless the people themselves

⁸ Sanjit Roy, in Aaron Schneider and Sanjit Roy (eds.), *Policy from the People: A North-South NGO Policy Dialogue*, CCIC, nd.

⁹ Bhuvan Bhatnagar and Aubrey C. Williams, *Participatory Development and the World Bank. Potential Directions for Change*, 1992, p. iii.

recognize their ownership over the goods and services we help provide and take on the responsibilities that come with ownership."¹⁰

There is some evidence that projects tend to fail when organizations and people at the local level are not central to the design, implementation and follow up.¹¹ These findings provide justification for the bottom-up people-centred approach to development and the imperative of not only establishing linkages with Southern-based organizations but funding the development of Southern institutional capacity.

The evidence... indicates that ownership is strongest when the donor links up with existing developing country institutions and builds on their knowledge and expertise (Heather Baser, CIDA, nd).

The desire to link to local people and their groups has arisen in part from the structural fiscal and debt constraints perceived by donor governments. Deficit reduction strategies are resulting in large spending cuts in domestic and overseas programming. The reality of less money in a context of rising levels of poverty and need is increasingly apparent in both the South and the North. In their search for more efficient mechanisms, donor governments increasingly are collaborating with locally based institutions and people. For instance, World Bank estimates indicate that non-governmental groups in India handle 25 percent of foreign aid.¹²

Governments rely greatly on people and their organizations to carry out responsibilities in the public policy domain - to deliver human services, to promote grassroots economic development, to reduce environmental degradation, or to protect human rights. Despite the heterogeneity of the NGO sector, it is argued that local groups are more cost effective and efficient - they often subsist on shoe-string budgets, they appear to be more in tune with the people and communities in which they are based, they are better able to reach the poorer sectors of the population and are better at involving members of the community.¹³

At the 1994 United Nations Conference on Population and Development in Cairo, governments agreed in principle to support people and their local groups. The 120 heads of state attending the 1995 World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen acknowledged the essential roles of NGOs and pledged to support their efforts to achieve human development objectives. They endorsed the notion that organized people, working outside the state structure, are integral to the development of democratic societies and central to supporting the development of people.

¹⁰ Mary Rachelis, "The United Nations Children's Fund: Experience with People's Participation", in Bhuvan Bhatnagar and Aubrey C. Williams (eds), *Participatory Development and the World Bank. Potential Directions for Change*, 1992, p. 67.

¹¹ Michael Cernea, 1987, in *The World Bank Report on Participation*, 1994, p. 5.

¹² Oxfam U.K., *The Oxfam Poverty Report*, Oxfam: UK and Ireland, 1995, p. 207.

¹³ Numerous authors have documented these comparative advantages including Judith Tendler, 1982; Robin Poulton, 1988; Tim Brodhead, 1988; Ernst and Uphoff, 1984.

While some donor governments work with Northern NGOs linked with Southern-based local groups, other agencies establish direct funding relationships with Southern groups. The success of these activities depends greatly on the ability of the funders to ensure that the Southern based groups control and own their own development planning and decision making. It is not enough for donors to encourage local participation. Recipient ownership will only result when funding, planning and reporting processes are at a minimum equally controlled by recipient institutions.¹⁴

Interdependent global problems

Another reason partnerships are so appealing is the interdependent and complex nature of today's development problems. In an increasingly interdependent world, the traditional model of resource transfers from the developed to the developing countries is no longer seen

One of the values of recognizing the South in the North is that it undermines the concept of northern superiority, and creates new possibilities for working together as equal partners confronting a common problem (French, 1991).

as the sole basis for North-South relationships. Development problems have widened in scope and are not isolated to developing countries only - in fact, some would argue that they never have been.

Poverty, unemployment, insecurity, environmental degradation and population pressures are of concern to both the North and the South. In February 1995, the Canadian government issued its federal foreign policy statement and cited the importance of protecting the security of Canadians within a stable global framework by addressing poverty, inequalities, political oppression, ethnic and religious tensions. Northern-based institutions searching for solutions can no longer afford to work solely in the South. Global strategies are needed to solve global problems. Development cannot be viewed as a continuum leading from poor to rich or developing to developed. The North exists in the South and the South in the North.

For instance, in most parts of the world, it is women and children who are most likely to live in situations of poverty and powerlessness. Women's groups, feminist academics, and government policy makers and officials have realized the tremendous opportunities that come through sharing analyses and strategies with their counterparts in other countries. Forty thousand women from around the world met at the Fourth World Conference for Women in Beijing to do exactly that. Similarly, indigenous groups organize internationally to share their common experiences and develop solutions to issues related to poverty, land ownership, marginalization and violence.

Countries with different languages and cultures than ours used to seem a world away from us. It is now becoming clear that we are living in one global village. What happens to people and the environment elsewhere increasingly affect our lives. Horizons recognizes that new forms of cooperation are needed and is moving to develop relationships with organizations in the South which we call 'partnerships'. We believe that only by working together, North and South, can we build a better future for all (Horizon's of Friendship, 1992).

This trend to link the global and the local has had an impact on the overall frame of reference for development agencies and institutions. Development problems pertinent to the South and the North

¹⁴ CIDA, *Human Resources Development Project, Zambia*. nd.

are being examined simultaneously by institutions focusing on domestic issues and those focusing on international concerns to determine the causes and appropriate solutions. For instance, at the 1995 World Summit for Social Development, problems associated with poverty, unemployment and social exclusion were discussed. The conference brought together representatives of government, advocacy groups, development organizations, anti-poverty organizations, people and institutions from communities and countries throughout the world. The conference themes were discussed in the context of both the South and the North and participants shared their experience and strategies for tackling these problems.

Strategic mode of operating

Within many sectors there is a trend toward building more cooperative alliances and modes of operating for strategic advantage.¹⁵ Many institutions within the field of international development are using the concept of partnership to link themselves more effectively with organizations that they have not worked with in the past.

Partnerships are common in the corporate sector to expand market share to ensure the viability of businesses. Over the last decade, more and more companies have moved to develop alliances, networks and links with other firms around the world.¹⁶ The same is true in the public sector where interorganizational linkages between local groups, the private sector and governments are fundamental to public decision making and local governance.¹⁷ As well, the trend is becoming more common for NGOs as they seek out new private sector funding sources in the face of declining public resources in a context of greater social needs.

Government cannot "do it all", nor can private citizens. Both can do far more if they work in partnership. Sustainable development requires the active engagement of a broad range of development partners and a harnessing of the enormous reserves of creativity and energy of all segments of society through the emergence of a public culture of citizen participation. *USAID, 1995.*

In a climate of decreasing financial resources, the desire to avoid duplication of effort and enhance efficiency is increasingly important. As a result, it is more widely recognized that development problems need cross sectoral strategies that involve a wide range of problem solvers.

Framing partnership

The usage of the terminology of partnership is intricately linked to an institution's understanding of the nature of development and the approach adopted to meet its development objectives. For example, some relationships are based solely on resource transfer from North to South while others

¹⁵ Sandra Powell, *Partners in Dialogue, Approaches that Work in Rural Development, nd.*

¹⁶ Benjamin Gomes-Casseres. "Group versus Group: How Alliance Networks Compete", *Harvard Business Review*, July-August 1994, pp. 62-74; Rosabeth Moss Kanter, *Collaborative Advantage, Harvard Business Review*, July-August 1994, pp. 96-108.

¹⁷ L. David Brown, *Bridging Organizations and Sustainable Development, 1991.*

attempt to build on common agendas and solidarity. While some tinker with the conventional aid relationship to improve it, others attempt to overhaul completely the traditional way of working in favour of a more political agenda that supports Southern ownership and control.

According to the Oxford Dictionary, a partnership is defined as the fact or condition of being a partner in an association or participation with others. The origins of the word date back to the 13th century words 'partener' and 'parcener': to bestow a part or share; to impart some of; to share or partake with a person. "That if any blame happen... it may be also partned with you" (T. Hoby, Castiglione's Courtyer I. 1577).

Although numerous classifications have been designed to analyze and evaluate development approaches and goals, few delineations of the partnership concept exist.¹⁸ The design of a simple framework of partnership is useful for two reasons. It illustrates the association between development philosophy and partnership practice. As well, it is a first step toward understanding the dynamics of control and ownership embedded in partnerships.

For the purposes of this paper, the partnership concept is analyzed from two different perspectives: those that are one-way, unequal and vertical in structure and those that are two-way, more equal and horizontal. This categorization is not meant to be viewed as dichotomous but rather as a simple framework from which various parts of the donor-recipient relationship can be examined. Nor is it meant to be interpreted in a way that disregards the fact that some donors may practice reciprocity in a particular part of their relationship but not as an overall priority. For instance donors may appear to be practising the conventional form of partnership but have introduced innovative mutual agenda-setting techniques.

The more conventional partnership is characterized by a one-way transfer of resources, skills and methods from the donor to the recipient to contribute to the development of the South. This transfer occurs in a vertical or top down manner where the majority of control and decision making power is retained by the Northern donor. Projects often are identified and designed to fit the interests of the donor. Southern recipients channel the resources to an agreed upon target group or program and submit evaluations to fulfil the Northern based reporting criteria. Participation of local people is valued primarily for its contribution to the efficient implementation of the project and any attempts to transfer ownership from the donor occurs only during implementation. One-way relations can hardly be classified as partnerships in the true sense of the word. It is used here because so many donors insist on referring to these sorts of top down, donor-driven linkages as partnerships.

In contrast to one-way relations, the distinguishing factors in reciprocal partnerships are solidarity and a two-way exchange. Although a transfer of resources to the South might be an element in

¹⁸ David Korten, 1987; 1990; Laura Macdonald, 1992; 1994; and Kevin Murchie, 1991 distinguish various NGOs on the basis of their operational approach and their political orientation. Sandra MacLean (1995) categorizes three basic forms of association - issue oriented, bridging institutions, and facilitative networks. Vangile Titi, (1993) describes a partnership spectrum ranging from a working relationship of a few parties to a more complex consortia of many members.

these links, it is not the sole basis of the relationship. Instead, these partnerships are characterized by Northern and Southern activists, researchers and programmers working toward a common end.

The two-way relationship is an explicitly political strategy, in contrast to a more bureaucratic funding relationship. It is demand driven from the perspective of the Southern organization rather than supply driven by the donor funds. It is one that facilitates the organization of people to better their situation most effectively rather than envisioning them only as victims desperate for assistance. These relations are practised more widely by progressive donor organizations than more charity-oriented NGOs and government donor agencies. For example, the Steelworkers Humanity Fund, Common Frontiers and Solidarityworks are three Canadian organizations that have linked up with or are in the process of establishing links with Southern labour unions with the aim of advocating better working conditions for employees within the context of free trade and globalization.

“The Partnership Spectrum”

	Conventional Partnerships	Reciprocal Partnerships
characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • unequal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • more equal
intervention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • charitable top down 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • solidarity
management orientation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • short-term Southern projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • long-term global development programming
decision making	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • vertical and top down • decision making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • horizontal, bottom up, decentralized, authority at site of responsibility
chief parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Northern donor agencies and organizations and recipient governments and groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all those with a stake in the common issue, particularly local peoples and groups
extent of local involvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • implementation phase 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Southern ownership throughout problem identification, design, implementation, evaluation, follow-up phases
accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to donor agencies and funders (taxpayers) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to Southern peoples and organizations involved in programming, in addition to donors
evaluation criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • evidence of positive impact of project; cost effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • those with a stake in the issue (local people and governments and donors) assessed by local peoples, governments and donors successes and failures relative to impact and sustainability

Ownership by Southern peoples of their development initiatives, plans and programs is an essential element of reciprocal partnerships. For instance, the NGO Inter Pares builds relationships that support its own efforts and those of existing Southern groups to bring about change in Canada and the Southern group's country. In Bangladesh, Inter Pares is working with UBINIG, Policy

Research for Development Alternatives, a private policy research organization focusing on alternative development strategies and conducting extensive research in the area of women's health. While UBINIG focuses its efforts on Bangladeshi women, Women's Health Interaction, a sister organization of Inter Pares, monitors Canadian policy and its implications for women's reproductive rights in the South and the North. The two groups have successfully lobbied CIDA to opt out of population control programs in Bangladesh. Inter Pares attests that its most successful and strongest partnerships have been with women, a product of the often political nature of women's organizing that comes from the shared experiences and political goals that bring women together.¹⁹

Organizations may claim to practice reciprocal partnerships when in fact they are merely funders for Southern groups. Although funding is an essential contribution to furthering international development goals, the manner in which donors fund, who they choose to fund and the other roles donors take on are important factors in assessing whether indeed a reciprocal partnership is being established. For instance, the 1995 Partnership Africa Canada evaluation found that the partnership relationship as perceived by African counterparts had the "potential to be constrained by the presence of a field office of a Canadian NGO which may sometimes exhibit a tendency of 'breathing down the necks' of their African partner".²⁰ In other words, the field office seriously impeded the development of the relationship and possibly the autonomy of the African organization itself.

Partners who are engaged in popular and social movements characterized by a strong sense of international solidarity and political alliances have a greater propensity to develop bonds and a higher quality of partnership (Lesson learned from PAC evaluation, PAC, 1995, p.39).

...until the resources traditionally supplied to recipients, such as field experience, organizational capacity, labour, materials and legitimacy are valued equally to those supplied by donors (i.e. money) "true partnership" can never be achieved (Muchunguxi and Milne, 1995).

¹⁹ Karen Seabrooke, *Outline of Presentation to "Putting GAD into Action" Partnership and Gender*, February 25, 1993, 5.

²⁰ PAC, 1995, p. 39.

3. The Evolving Nature of Partnership

The Origins of development assistance

Official aid

The range of relations that have evolved between Northern and Southern governments, organizations and peoples took root in the early years of international development. The provision of resources from Northern donors to Southern recipients to stimulate economic growth created the fundamental relationship and basis for international development thinking and practices. Aid to developing countries can be traced back to the colonial links between Western imperial powers and their overseas territories. These historical links were maintained following independence to promote economic development, to initiate and expand trade relations for commercial interests and for geopolitical reasons.²¹

Billions of dollars were disbursed to war-torn Europe in 1945 under the Marshall Plan. This transfer of funds and technologies from rich to poor countries became the blueprint for interventions in developing countries. The central question for early aid scholars such as Rostow, Chenery, Strout, Rosenstein-Rodan, Hirschman, Singer and Prebisch was how to transform these resource-poor countries into dynamic economies. Spurred by Keynesian economics, donor resources were intended to fill the gaps resulting from shortages of capital, foreign exchange, human resources and food consumption goods.²² The next decade saw the launch of extensive development programs bilaterally and multilaterally from the United States, the United Kingdom, the Nordic countries, Canada and France to countries in Africa, Asia, and Central and South America.

The development of non-governmental activity

A Canadian presence in the South predates direct government involvement under the Colombo Plan of 1950. The origins of Northern voluntary activity lie with religious-based missionary organizations and such service organizations as the YMCA/ YWCA, the Boy Scouts and the Kinsmen who began working in developing countries at the turn of the century. Some contend that these groups played an influential role in the legitimization process of colonialism and claim that modern day organizations are merely sophisticated versions of the same function.²³

By the 1940s, the number of organizations working in international relief and welfare grew substantially. OXFAM was founded in 1942, followed by CARE in 1945, whose original mission was to provide relief to post-war Europe. After this massive rehabilitation effort, attention

²¹ Roger Riddell, *Foreign Aid Reconsidered*, 1987.

²² Roger Riddell, "The Contribution of Foreign Aid to Development and the Role of the Private Sector", *Development*, (1), 1992.

²³ Laura Macdonald, *NGOs and the Problematic of Participation: Cases from Costa Rica*, 1992.

subsequently shifted to other parts of the world. Assistance efforts focused on short-term emergency relief in situations of war, famine and floods. Food, shelter, clothing, health care and financial resources were provided directly to those who were in need. Usually, these provisions were channelled from the Northern-based organization through an intermediary field office staffed with employees from donor countries. Smaller, charitable organizations saw their responsibility as relieving people's needs through service delivery.

A real surge in NGO organizational growth took place in the 1960s through to the 1980s. The establishment of CIDA's Canadian Partnership Branch in 1971 played a significant supporting role in the development of Canadian non-governmental organizations and their relationships with Southern-based groups. Although some of these Northern-based groups continued to provide relief assistance, others began to design and implement social development projects with communities. These projects, including micro credit and income generation, were small in scale and were geared to developing the community's self-help capacity. In most cases, Northern organizations sought out Southern people and groups to participate in the implementation phase and occasionally the design of the projects.

The growth of Southern peoples' movements

Many Southern countries have a rich but diverse history of voluntary action. Whereas much of Northern NGO activity finds its origins in charity, the roots of Southern-based, non-governmental activity are quite different.

In many countries the early voluntary organizations provided service delivery. The majority had origins in the church, largely because the first foreign non-governmental aid groups were religious in nature.²⁴ Throughout the 1970s, existing groups grew and new ones took hold as donors focused on community development and a self-reliant approach to development.

Local initiatives existed early on in many Southern countries. The Jamaica Welfare program, established in 1937 developed out of domestic concerns and was directed at families and individuals living within specific villages and groups. Such initiatives were part of the nationalist movement that later, with independence, were integrated into official government policy and programming. In Jamaica, when it became clear that the government was not able or was unwilling to maintain program delivery, the voluntary sector, both service and activist oriented, reemerged.²⁵

²⁴ Peta-Ann Baker, "Search for Transformative Strategies - A Perspective from the Non-Government Organization Sector", S. Lalta and M. Freckleton (eds.), *Caribbean Economic Development*, 1993, p. 3.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

The aid relationship revisited

A series of comparable but independent critical reports released two decades after the birth of development assistance reflected the growing dissatisfaction with the conventional model of international cooperation. *Partners in Development. A Report of the Commission on International Development* was published in 1968 by a group struck by the World Bank. As chair, Lester Pearson, the former Prime Minister of Canada, was charged with assessing the consequences of development cooperation and recommending future directions for economic development. Similarly, the *World Plan for Development* was released in Sweden in 1971 as part of an evaluation of the first development decade with a view to designing a strategy for the second.

Both sides have learned that cooperation for development means more than a simple transfer of funds. It means a set of new relationships which must be founded on mutual understanding and self-respect. Good development relations also require the acceptance of a continuing review of performance on both sides, not dominated by either the donor's or the recipient's immediate political or economic interests or pressures (Pearson, 1968, p. 6).

The release of these reports represented a turning point in development assistance analyses. Both called for a new model of partnerships that recognized the reciprocal rights and responsibilities of recipients and donors. Increased coordination between both parties based on a clear delineation of obligations was considered essential to sustain positive relations.

The donors of aid have made more grave mistakes both at home and in the field than have the recipients. The less developed countries, after all, have had neither the opportunities nor the means to make too many mistakes. 'Donor' is, by the way, an unfortunate concept, since the value of the donor-recipient relationship is greatest when both sides feel that they have something to give and something to gain (Michanek, 1971, p. 34).

The notion that Southern countries should design and control their own development agendas was not prominent in the early 1970s. Even so, Ernst Michanek, author of *The World Plan for Development*, suggested that "developing countries should be the ones to draw up their own development plans". The design of development strategies was seen as the responsibility of the recipient, yet channels were needed to enable recipients to ask for and receive advice.²⁶ Similarly, according to the Pearson Commission, recipients should not only be willing to ask, but they also had the obligation to thoroughly inform donors of major events and decisions that had implications for the donors.²⁷

The Pearson Commission agreed that "less uncertainty and more continuity" was needed from donors to ensure the delivery of timely and committed assistance so recipients could plan for the future.²⁸ They analyzed the global environment within which aid was transferred, and made several recommendations to donor governments to ensure that development and aid policies and practices

²⁶ Ernst Michanek, *The World Development Plan.- A Swedish Perspective*, 1971, p. 30.

²⁷ Lester B. Pearson, *Partners in Development. Report of the Commission on International Development*, 1969, p. 127.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 128.

were linked to those of trade, monetary policy and private capital movements. The Commission recommended the use of multilateral forums to ensure mutual cooperation and positive dialogue between donors and recipients. Within this organizational structure, clearly defined and accepted channels for reporting, providing advice, carrying out consultations, and debating issues were imperative to sustain positive relations.

The Southern non-governmental critique

By the 1980s, conventional development relations were under attack from another direction. Southern organizations and people dissatisfied with development policies and practice, demanded that they be given full ownership over the development of their countries and themselves. By this time, the number of strong Southern based groups had increased. Although this growth and the reasons for it differs from country to country, the general phenomenon can be attributed to three factors: the increased flow of resources into the South from Northern donors; the opportunity for the growth of political movements and organizations that independence from colonial rule brought; and the numbers of laid-off state employees and the gap in service delivery following the privatization of government institutions that followed the advent of structural adjustment policy.

The issue for the South is not whether to cut its links with the North, but how to transform them. The relationship must be changed from exploitation to shared benefit, from subordination to partnership. (The South Commission, 1987, p. 11)

As a result, Southern groups developed as offshoots of their Northern counterparts, grew out the energies of local activists or delivered needed social services. As these locally based groups matured and caught the attention of Northern development professionals, Southern groups demanded more autonomy and control over the design and delivery of aid programs and insisted that Northern donors redefine their roles and demonstrate their relevance. They began calling for fundamental changes in the donor-recipient relationship. At the same time, within the Southern countries themselves, some organizations, most of them small and rural-based, were pressuring their governments and the larger development institutions to involve them more in setting and carrying out the country's development agenda.²⁹

The demands from these Southern groups grew out of concerns about the difficult economic conditions many developing countries experienced in the 1970s and 1980s as a result of, among other factors, falling primary commodity prices, rising debt loads, shifts to export-oriented production and decreasing social spending. Out of concern that they had little input and influence into the design and implementation of these economic reforms, Southerners aimed their criticisms of structural adjustment policies at Northern donor governments and international financial institutions in particular.

²⁹

Dennis A. K. Muchunguzi and Scott D. Milne. *Perspectives from the South: A Study on Partnership*, AFREDA and CIDA, Ottawa, June 1995.

These concerns voiced by locally based groups were reinforced by prominent Southern institutions. The South Commission, composed of respected expert representatives from Southern countries, was formed in 1987 to analyze the problems Southern countries face, to consider past strategies and to compile a series of learned lessons.

The fate of the South is increasingly dictated by the perceptions and policies of governments in the North, of the multilateral institutions which a few of these governments control, and of the network of private institutions that are increasingly prominent. Domination has been reinforced where partnership was needed and hoped for by the South. (The South Commission, 1987, p.3).

The Commission argued that the responsibility for development and the design of solutions to the many problems in developing countries lay firmly with the South. Since it is the people in the South who most urgently need change it is they who have to take the initiative to make this vision a reality.³⁰ The Commission was mindful of the role Northern governments and donors played in creating and maintaining relationships of dependence and suggested that a more equitable and balanced management of global affairs should replace the current domination by the North.

Redefining partnerships

In response to the Southern pressure and combined with their own growing disillusionment with international development techniques and relations, Northern development professionals were forced to re-examine their roles and responsibilities. Concerns were growing that Northern interventions created or deepened dependence on outside resources.³¹ As a result both donor agencies and organizations began to restructure. One strategy tried by CIDA and the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) involved the decentralization of their programs. SIDA introduced recipient-led approaches to its aid management with the intent of ensuring local ownership of projects and programs. Within two years SIDA's new policy, management authority was moved to the field, half of the procurement of goods and services and the production of training manuals and packages were shifted South, and long-term technical cooperation decreased by 75 per cent. CIDA introduced a similar decentralization policy to enhance the effectiveness of aid programming in the late 1980s. Although its primary intent was to improve project selection and management, it was recognized

It is not enough to support community groups, in the hope that their local efforts alone will add up to significant change. We must also work with them to promote fundamental change in the political and economic structures which perpetuate their poverty and marginalization. (Inter Pares, 1990).

³⁰ The South Commission, *The Challenge to the South*, 1987, p. 10.

³¹ L. David Brown, "Sowing Self-Sufficiency. Non-Governmental Organizations as Development Catalysts", *Foreign Aid*, 1992, p. 19.

that the strategy could address the "fundamental objective of Canadian ODA - to strengthen the institutions and thereby the self-reliance of our developing country partners."³² Such experimentation has been curtailed recently as both agencies seek to gain more control in a more difficult financial climate.³³

Northern NGOs were faced with similar pressure from their Southern counterparts as these increasingly sophisticated groups took on direct project implementation. In response, the partnership phenomenon gained new impetus and the concept of

Southern NGOs ask that we play a less direct role and spend more time as educators, advocates, and supporters of the Southern agenda - that we in effect be brokers, facilitators, catalysts, and, not least, funding channels (Dichter, 1988, p. 184).

sharing control and ensuring ownership was discussed widely in and among Northern organizations.³⁴ But as noted earlier, the meaning and practice varied widely. Some groups began to focus more on policy analysis and advocacy work in the North and less on direct programming in Southern countries. Funds were directed at building the institutional capacity of Southern groups and promoting development education in high schools and community centres in Northern countries. Discussions centred on how locally based groups with country and community expertise could have the responsibility for development planning. The partnership vision that emerged from these discussions was based on a perspective that recognized development problems as global and interdependent. Northern development groups began to widen their work from a focus on North-South relations to one that shared the agenda of anti-poverty groups, trade unions and women's organizations.

A number of innovative funding mechanisms were designed in Canada in the 1980s to address the issues of Southern control. Partnership Africa Canada (PAC) was created in 1986 as a coalition funding mechanism linking Canadian NGOs with organizations in sub-Saharan Africa. Five years later the group received a second five-year \$5 million grant to support the development of African institutional capacity and linkages with Canadian groups. The Philippine Canada Human Resources Development Program was designed in 1989 to strengthen the skills of local organizations in advocacy, networking, development education, and coalition building initiatives. The five-year, \$15 million program was administered by a joint Philippine-Canada committee with the Filipino groups holding majority decision making. South Asia Partnership (SAP) was founded in 1981 to link small village-level organizations in India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka with agencies in Canada to make decisions about projects and programming.

³² Government of Canada. *For Whose Benefit? Report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and International Trade on Canada's Official Development Assistance Policies and Programs*. Ottawa: May 1987, p. 83 (also referred to as the Winegard report, after the chairman, William C. Winegard.

³³ Jean Bossuyt and Geert Laporte, "Partnership in the 1990s: How to Make it Work Better," *Policy Management Brief*, 1994, p. 2.

³⁴ Numerous development organizations have held seminars and been involved in such discussions - Partnership Africa Canada, 1989;1995; The Canadian Council for International Co-operation, 1992; Inter Pares, 1991; The MATCH International Centre, 1992; Inter-Church Fund for International Development, 1990, ESPIRAL, 1992.

Even with these funding mechanisms, the attainment of quality partnership relationships is difficult. Radical organizational change must occur to shift the management focus from a relationship controlled by the North to a more mutually determined one. For instance, South Asia Partnership estimated in 1991 that fewer than 15 percent of SAP projects had moved beyond a relationship based almost exclusively on the disbursement and expenditure of funds to one based on solidarity and characterized by a strong dialogue, and mutual accountability and benefits.³⁵ Of course, not all organizations have willingly adopted a more reciprocal way of operating. Some donors see their primary role as a provider of funds while some recipients' work with donors solely to receive funds.

Global compacts

A new style of development cooperation based on the premise that development policies are equally relevant for both Northern and Southern countries emerged in the 1990s. It was Thorvald Stoltenberg, Norway's Foreign Minister, who in 1989 proposed the concept of 'development pacts'. These innovative contracts are designed to bring a Southern and Northern country together, over a period of years, represented by both government and the 'independent sector', to discuss development policy. Rather than focusing solely on Southern development policy, the responsibilities and implications for both countries are discussed. For instance, tropical forest management would also include an analysis of Northern energy consumption. The government of the Netherlands recently established three initiatives with Benin, Bhutan and Costa Rica, for a cycle of policy discussions over 10 years.³⁶

Constructive partnerships should be based on negotiated "frameworks for policy dialogue" or Development Pacts, involving the government of Canada and governments, as well as inter-governmental bodies and elements of civil society in the developing world (CCIC, 1994).

³⁵ SAP Canada Board, *Resolving the Partnership Conundrum*, August 30, 1991.

³⁶ I am grateful for Tim Draimin's discussion of development pacts in the paper *North-South Relations. From Domination to International Cooperation: Sustainable Development and Reciprocal Cooperation*, Background Paper, #3, 1995.

4. Partnership Problematics

Although many institutions use the language of partnership to describe their relationships with Southern groups and peoples, and much has been written on the subject, little reference has been made to the issues of power and the power imbalance in partnerships. Ironically, the essence of partnership - sharing control and ensuring Southern ownership - lies in sharing power equitably. The failure to acknowledge and sufficiently address this fundamental aspect has serious implications for the practice of reciprocal partnership.

Language of partnership

One of the most serious problems associated with partnership is the language of partnership itself.

Partnership implies sharing decision making and control, working together for the same goals and objectives, mutual respect and trust and equality. It suggests a sharing of comparable and equal benefits and risks between two distinct parties. But there is a real contradiction in using words that imply a balanced relationship between equals to describe a relationship that is more often than not inherently unequal. The words that we

Modern jargon uses stereotype words like children use Lego toy pieces. Like Lego pieces, the words fit arbitrarily together and support the most fanciful constructions. They have no content, but do serve a function. As these words are separate from any context, they are ideal for manipulative purposes. (Majid Rahnema, 1992, p. 116).

choose are crucial because they define our limits and parameters.³⁷ By veiling the imbalance of power with the language of equality, the existence of inequality is ignored and even denied.³⁸ A major consequence has been the failure to thoroughly analyze the ownership and control issues in the aid relationship.

These inequalities are masked not only by language but also by the ambiguity associated with the overuse of the term. The public sector (governments and international government agencies), for-profit private sector and local, national and international non-profit sector, from both donor and recipient countries, are involved in international development. Although there is a broad diversity of actors with differing philosophies of development, partnership is the overarching term used to describe the multitude of relations comprising international development. The tendency to lump the various kinds of partnerships together has diluted and confused the objectives, meaning and outcome of partnership. This is a dangerous trend because such a politically loaded term - the term suggests relations of equality when they do not necessarily exist - is being used in such an

³⁷ Kingston Kajese, "An Agenda of Future Tasks for International and Indigenous NGOs: View from the South", *World Development*, 15, 1987; Pari Johnston, *The Case Against Charity: Analyzing the Problematic Discourse of NGO Partnership and Exploring New Ways of Relating*, 1995; Brian K. Murphy, *Towards the 21st Century. Reflections on the Future of Canadian NGOs*, October 1993.

³⁸ Others who have touched on these issues include Alan Fowler, 1992; Carmen Malena, 1995; Kevin Murchie, 1991; and Piers Campbell, 1989.

uncritical way. The resulting rhetoric partly explains why reciprocal partnerships have been so unattainable.

The language of partnership has received resounding criticism from the South for perpetuating the current unequal relationship. Partnership does not challenge the existing disparities - instead its language masks them. Critics contend that the partnership concept primarily grew out of a Northern response to Southern demands for more autonomy and hence has evolved as a reformist agenda rather than as a transformative, change-oriented one. Although Northern and Southern institutions often design a partnership together, it is clear that when one is a reformer (the funder) and the other a transformer (the recipient) seldom do the two perceive the relationship in the same way.

The imbalance of power

To a great extent, international development assistance operates within a charity framework: Northern countries and people give and Southern countries and people receive. No matter what the intention, the delivery of aid creates beneficiaries and clients and not a relationship between equals.³⁹ Although the language of charity is not as common today as it was 40 years ago, it is important to recognize that these roots are still influential. Consider the fundraising campaigns of some Northern NGOs that portray people living in the South as poor, helpless and dependent on Northern assistance.

Already the UN has launched the Second Economic Decade with the same zeal and fanfare as they did with the first. The same appeal has gone out to the developed countries to be charitable and contribute "one per cent of their national income" for helping the developing countries, as if the population of the world can continue to condone poverty so that the rich can be charitable! (A.M. Babu, 1971).

It is not that all charitable giving is inappropriate. What is important to recognize is that the charity model of assistance sets up a dynamic between givers and receivers in which the one doing the giving is in a position of control. The contribution of capital is seen to be more important to the relationship than the expertise and human resources associated with the recipient.⁴⁰ The resulting reality is that donors can do to recipients what recipients cannot do to donors.⁴¹ Donors are able to define the parameters of the relationship, the partners they want to work with, the conditionalities, the accountability mechanisms and the funding structure. In doing so, donors are often criticized for their propensity to support a donor-driven agenda marked by rigid funding methods, strict reporting mechanisms and one-way information flows.

³⁹ Brodhead, Tim. "Notes for "NGO Futures." Presentation, March 28 1994, unpublished paper.

⁴⁰ Dennis A. K. Muchunguxi and Scott D. Milne *Persepectives from the South: A Study on Partnership*, AFREDA and CIDA, Ottawa, June 1995, p. 22.

⁴¹ Charles Elliott, "Some Aspects of the Relations Between the North and South in the NGO Sector", *World Development*, 15, 1987, p. 65.

Consider the three-tier funding structure in which a donor agency supplies funds to a NGO that then transfers the resources to a chosen Southern group. Accountability systems back to the government and the taxpayer demand that both Northern and Southern NGOs complete financial and descriptive reports on a regular basis during

the project cycle. Evaluation and accountability procedures seldom ensure impact accountability to recipients. And seldom too would recipients risk potential future funds by lobbying for changes to the underlying mechanisms of their funding relationship. As a result of this dependence, recipients become silent accomplices in perpetuating inequitable relations. This is true for both the Southern-based recipients as well as the Northern NGOs responsible for channelling the resources. These constraining relationships with government agencies help explain why many Northern-based organizations develop into mini aid bureaucracies.

Some big NGOs are like the World Bank. They cannot move from their own procedures and they oblige you to follow those procedures without having any input regarding them (Maxide N'Diaye, RADI, Senegal).⁴²

It can be argued that donors are dependent on recipients for the existence of the donor-recipient relationship - "without the South, a number of Northern NGOs - especially those who do not have any projects in the North - would just die a natural death."⁴³ Recipients, however, remain more dependent on donors. This imbalance of control favours the donor. Michanek suggests that this control is maintained by donors' use of both the whip and carrot-on-a-stick technique. They can refuse to help those who cannot fulfil their standards of behaviour and can reward diligent work and good habits such as completing work on time and fulfilling reporting procedures. This manner of operating reflects "the bygone era of social-welfare work" when "friendly ladies working for voluntary charitable organizations demanded of their unfortunate charges a far higher standard of temperance, patience and conscientiousness than they demanded of ordinary people."⁴⁴

Although charity is associated with images of kindness and generosity, it is burdened with subtle yet insidious power inequalities. The fundamental premise of charity, that of helping others, creates a hierarchical relationship in which the donor chooses to help solve the problems of the recipient. Not only do recipients not always realize the existence of these inequities hidden in the act of assistance, donors are often oblivious to them as well. Donors are able to hide behind the belief that they are doing good - they are able to excuse sloppy work and to explain away the lack of self criticism.⁴⁵ This 'elegant power', a phrase coined by Marianne Gronemeyer, is characterized as being unrecognizable, concealed and inconspicuous.⁴⁶

⁴² Lillian Chatterjee, Profile, *Contact*, 10(1), Summer, 1986, CCIC.

⁴³ Executive Director of the Zimbabwe Women Finance Trust. Interview as cited in Muchunguxi, and Milne, p. 24.

⁴⁴ Ernst Michanek, *The World Development Plan*, 1971, p. 33.

⁴⁵ Tim Brodhead, *Notes for "NGO Futures"*, 1994.

⁴⁶ Marianne Gronemeyer, "Helping", in Wolfgang Sachs (ed.), *The Development Dictionary*, 1992, p. 53.

This inequitable relationship tends to discount the knowledge that Southern women and men have about their situations. Instead, much knowledge about the South has been recreated by Northern experts and has been used to inform, organize and expand the practices of international development.

There is a tendency for Northern experts to assume responsibility and initiate

development strategies and programs. This practice has imposed Northern assumptions on to the lives of Southern men and women and has served to perpetuate the unequal balance of power between Northern and Southern organizations and people.⁵² Subsequently, ineffective development models have been perpetuated.

There are many others who could, and probably should bear the title of "expert", when it comes to development. Most likely, many of these people do not belong to known organizations and are to be found in a multitude of out-of-the-way places around the world (Powell, nd, p.66).

⁵² *Ibid.*, p. 3.

5. A Menu of Mechanisms

Partnerships range across a spectrum from conventional one-way links to more reciprocal based, two-way relationships. The following menu of mechanisms is a formula to assist development institutions achieve more reciprocal-based relations. It is likely that institutional and operational constraints may limit a full scale adoption, and given the diversity of development institutions a prescribed blueprint is not appropriate.

These mechanisms fall under two categories - first, how to engage Southerners in a meaningful way by ensuring Southern ownership and control and second, how to broaden international development work from that of a sole focus on Southern development to one that includes Northern development issues and projects a global development agenda.

Meaningful Southern engagement

Development projects appear to be more sustainable and effective if they are designed by local organizations to match the priorities as determined by local people. When local people drive the process, the program has a better chance of being relevant and appropriate and sustainable.

Although the most marginalized or poorest segments of the population have the greatest stake in the very development policies and practices aimed at eradicating poverty, they are the ones most often excluded from the decision making process. As cited in a recent UNICEF report, "The poor remain poor principally because they are underrepresented in political and economic decisions, because their voice is not sufficiently loud in the selection of society's priorities, and because their needs do not weigh sufficiently heavily in the allocation of public resources"⁵³.

By neglecting the priorities as identified by local people, donors risk contributing to project failure. Although a health clinic might be the optimal choice of an outside donor, because of its 'fit' into their thematic area of focus, building a bridge that allows the women to get to market might be more important to the community.

It is much more difficult 'to involve' people if they do not consider the project a priority. The failure to make programming relevant is possibly the greatest obstacle to ensuring people's participation and involvement in a project. The perceived lack of commitment by the local population to the project and its outputs in the long-term might say more about the structure of the donor-recipient relationship than the commitment of the recipients themselves.⁵⁴

⁵³ UNICEF, *The World's Children*, 1995, p. 47

⁵⁴ Ebebe A. Ukpong, A North-South Divide, *AIRD News*, 13(11) Feb 1995, p.7.

Staffing

The argument for Southern input weighs heavily on the composition of staff working in donor offices. There is a stark comparison between the typical middle-class educated professional working in a Canadian donor agency or organization and the local populations (not necessarily those in recipient organizations - often they are equally educated and professionalized) with whom they are trying to work. Although both are working on a common agenda to eradicate poverty and increase opportunities, it is the Southerners who have experienced and more readily understand issues and the realities related to poverty in their own context.⁵⁵ The Northern knowledge and experiential gap provides much support for the need to connect with local Southern populations to ensure projects and programs are designed and implemented in a manner attuned to local priorities.

The lack of lived experience is as much a problem for Northerners working on issues related to poverty in Southern countries as it is for Northerners working on domestic poverty issues. The Canadian group responsible for organizing the NGOs that participated in the 1995 World Summit for Social Development was attuned to the need to involve anti-poverty activists in Canada in their preparations. The group financially supported their attendance at the conference. In fact, for the first time, one of the members of the official Canadian government delegation included a single mother living on social assistance. Although the impact these Canadian representatives had on the meeting is difficult to measure, the intent of this decision by the NGO coordinating group is clear. A poverty conference should be attended by those most informed by first hand experience - those who really understand why people live in poverty and why people have trouble escaping it.

Board representation

Some Northern donors make attempts to include their Southern counterparts in their organization's direction setting decision making processes. The Inter Church Fund for International Development (ICFID) is an ecumenical funding coalition composed of six churches in Canada working with organizations promoting sustainable agriculture and community-based health care in the Americas, Africa, and Asia. Since 1974, ICFID has served to extend the development programs of the Catholic, Anglican, United, Lutheran, Mennonite and Presbyterian Churches.

The Inter Church Fund has actively pursued open dialogue with its Southern counterparts. The board of directors includes representatives from six major churches in addition to three Southern members. Certainly the inclusion of a few Southern representatives does not suggest equitable relationships or wholly shared decision making. However, according to ICFID staff, the Southern representatives bring an entirely different perspective to the decision making process and provide valuable insights to programming. For instance, the controversial document *Diminishing Our Future* released in 1991 criticizing supporters of structural adjustment was conceived as a direct result of Southern input at board meetings.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ Farida Akhter was one of the participants in the Inter Pares coordinated "Women Organizing for Change Workshop" held in May 1989. Her comments are found in the workshop report.

⁵⁶ Bob Fugere, ICFID, interview, 1995.

Participatory methodology

To determine local priorities and needs, many donors have adopted participatory techniques. This bottom-up approach assures a more demand-driven orientation to development assistance. Too often it is donor priorities and the strategic and commercial interests of the donor country that are the primary determining factors used in identifying development projects, programs and the host countries.⁵⁷

Although the participatory method assists in determining local priorities and involving local populations, it can be a political issue. For instance, how can researchers be sure that they are talking to those who are most in need? Even so, many Northern institutions claim that they have used participatory techniques successfully and more are climbing on the participatory bandwagon. The International Development Research Centre has used participatory research techniques fairly extensively with Southern populations to identify problems and research methodologies, to evaluate results of development programming and to design follow-up programming.⁵⁸ The Women in Development and Gender Equity Division at CIDA is developing a more participatory structure and operational procedures to ensure more participatory approaches to projects and programs.⁵⁹

Programming consultations

The MATCH International Centre, a Canadian international development organization working exclusively with and for women in the South and Canada to raise the status of women and the quality of women's lives globally, has experimented with some program determining decision making processes. MATCH raises money to support women's projects in the South and develops programmes together with Canadian and Southern women to strengthen the links among women working on similar issues. Their mandate is grounded in the philosophy that women everywhere are confronted with barriers that block them from contributing economically, socially and politically to their own and their community's development. The problems they are forced to live with - violence, poverty and landlessness - cannot be eradicated unless women themselves are actively involved in the creation and implementation of solutions.

In 1988, MATCH coordinated a consultative process to determine the most appropriate funding criteria for their future programs. Instead of solely debating this issue internally and with their donors in Canada, the organization arranged a meeting with representatives of the Southern women's groups they supported. The overwhelming response from the Southerners was to channel funds to combat violence against women. This occurred at a time when funding work on violence against women, particularly in

⁵⁷ Joe Bolger, "Ownership: The Concept and CIDA's Experience", paper prepared for ECDPM Round Table on "Partnership in development cooperation", June 1994; Stephen Denning, Programme Aid Beyond Structural Adjustment, Paper prepared for World Bank Workshop on New Forms of Programme Aid, Harare, Zimbabwe, Jan 31-Feb 1, 1994.

⁵⁸ William C. Found, "Participatory Research and Development. An Assessment of IDRC's Experience and Prospects." A Report to the International Development Research Centre, May 31, 1995.

⁵⁹ A seminar is scheduled for November 1995 to examine the Institutional Constraints to Participatory Development, memo, Barb Shaw.

Southern countries was almost unheard of. Without this input, it is unlikely that violence would have been adopted as a major programming area.

Reciprocal accountability

Although development projects are geared to assist Southern beneficiaries, it is Northern donors to whom the project is accountable. Treasury Board regulations and comptrollers within multilateral and bilateral aid agencies insist that accountability systems flow in the direction of the donor. Those that spend the funds are accountable to Northern governments and Northern taxpayers. But how can Northern donors delegate and pass on control to the South when Treasury Board has such standards? Seldom are systems put into place that flip the accountability right side up to ensure that interventions by Northern donors are accountable to Southern beneficiaries.

Accountability systems that ensure that programs and projects and all those working on them are accountable to the beneficiaries are needed. Such systems will help ensure that beneficiaries are

Most donors still operate on the basis of a 'transaction' accountability - that is, an elaborate system of controlling the inputs and outputs of the aid planning and delivery system to ensure efficiency and effectiveness. One result of this is an inexorable pressure on donors to lower risk and uncertainty by managing (i.e., controlling) as many project activities as possible." (Morgan and Baser, 1992, 18)

driving the process rather than acting as mere participants or onlookers. Horizons of Friendship and Development and Peace are two examples of organizations that have met with a number of their recipients from a certain region to monitor the success of their work. ICFID and CUSO both have Southern representatives on their board. Ideally, the reporting system at the completion of a project should be reciprocal - just as recipients have to report to donors on how the project funds have been spent and the impact of the project, donors should have to answer to recipients about their involvement. At the least, forums are needed where recipients can provide critical yet valuable feedback to donors about their thematic area of focus, operational mechanisms and management of the relationship. Furthermore, beneficiaries ought to be involved in determining project evaluation criteria and processes to ensure project impacts and possible follow-up programming are relevant and considered sustainable from the perspective of Southern people.

Institutional governance

While many organizations are attempting to construct relationships of equality with other institutions, they have neglected to address their internal governance structures. Do clear systems exist internally for decision making? Are feedback processes in place for organizations with a membership base to be accountable to their publics?

Broadening base of work

Donor involvement with a particular issue or population is at the heart of the shift from a focus on Southern development to one of global development. With it comes a desire to change not only how one is working in the South but how one can work in the North. The activity of donors working to bring

about change in their own community creates a trust and a legitimacy between donors and recipients - essential elements of more equitable relationships.

Donor institutions are focusing more frequently some of their efforts on their home country's domestic development. The work around the World Summit for Social Development provides some excellent examples. The expertise and knowledge gained from work in one's own country can provide the crucial context from which work in another country is analyzed and planned. It is difficult, and perhaps even inappropriate, for Northerners to enter a foreign country and make recommendations about eliminating poverty when these same "experts" have no experience in poverty reduction in their own countries.

It is not only the substantive issues surrounding poverty that Northern professionals can learn about in their own countries. The funding process and the inequities associated with it create similar problems for Canadian government agencies and community groups working on domestic development problems. The funding relationships that exist between the North and the South are merely extensions of domestic charitable giving and social transfers that are commonplace in Northern economies.

Clearly, we can all learn a lot about development in our own countries. Shifting the focus of work from the South to the North provides an appropriate context of expertise and shows respect for the knowledge that Southerners have about

How can you feel pity for me in Africa and let me believe you when you are not doing something about your own people here who are in a third world. Connie Nkomo, ORAP, Zimbabwe, Inter Pares, 1991.

development in their own countries. Outsiders who choose to intervene in Southern countries without this context of expertise risk participating in a Northern-led development agenda that fails to tap into the most important issues and most suitable processes in a Southern context.

Focusing on Northern issues

The Scottish Education Action for Development is aware of these criticisms. SEAD encourages people in Scotland to tackle poverty and unsustainable development at home and to lobby for sound development policies by the UK government abroad. SEAD's uniqueness lies in its analysis of development issues, beginning with the Scottish experience. SEAD researches, runs events and publishes materials to show people in Scotland how they can help set their own development agenda.

The SEAD approach has been welcomed by many of its contacts in the South "who have long since grown tired of northern 'experts' giving advice on everything from sustainable forestry to women's education when they have no comparable analysis on the same issues in their own societies." From their experience with SEAD, community-based groups in Scotland have learned about "challenging the so-called 'experts' who consistently overlook or dismiss the knowledge and experience of the ordinary people who live with the problems of 'underdevelopment' twenty four hours a day."⁶⁰

This manner of operating is not uncommon to Canada. A prime objective of the Steelworkers Humanity Fund is to educate union membership about the South and to make the relationship with the South more tangible for its members. By exploring the differences between solidarity and charity with people whose locals are part of the union, the education program analyzes their ideas about poverty and developing

⁶⁰ Linda Gray, SEAD Annual Report, 1993.

countries and uncovers their "genuinely and deeply felt notions about charity"⁶¹. Moving beyond charity is a recurring theme in the outreach of the Fund. One of its newest programs, the Labour Development Program, was established in 1994 to provide more support to unions and solidarity work. The fund finances, among others, the National Union of Mineworkers in South Africa and the Nampula General Union of Agricultural Cooperatives in Mozambique. The intent, in the long run, is to facilitate and institutionalize the development of practical solidarity linkages with unions from different countries. This is particularly important for the Steelworkers Humanity Fund considering the implications for labour of global economic restructuring.

Since it was founded in 1976, Inter Pares has worked to establish strong ties with Southern groups. Many of these Southern groups are led by the people whose interests they represent. Inter Pares supports their efforts to challenge structural obstacles to change, their struggle for self-determination, and their alternative development approaches. Additionally, Inter Pares learns from these efforts, makes them known to Canadians, and advocates nationally and internationally for global justice and equitable development.

Women's Health Interaction is a feminist collective and sister organization to Inter Pares, that strives to build links among Canadians working for change with counterparts working for change. In 1989 Women's Health Interaction coordinated a visit by six women from Bangladesh, the Philippines, Jamaica, Central America, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Canadians from community groups, the media, churches and service organizations met with these women to hear their experiences in community development and to discuss potential ways to use these strategies to organize women in Canada. The Canadian women shared their experiences with poverty, violence, racism and discrimination and learned new advocacy strategies from their Southern counterparts.

New institutional linkages

Some internationally oriented organizations are choosing to relate to domestic development issues by linking themselves with domestically focused groups. In this way both groups use their comparative advantage to inform each other about the issues and process from their specific perspective. For instance, OXFAM Canada and the National Anti-Poverty Organization (NAPO) co-chaired the Canadian NGO Coordinating Committee for the World Summit for Social Development. This was the first time that these two organizations had coordinated a project together.

⁶¹ Fern Valen, Steelworkers Humanity Fund, interview, 1995.

6. Concluding Words: A Future Research Agenda

Effective international assistance helps people do what they are already trying to do with their own means. It recognizes that what people bring to the struggle - their talents and their courage and their will to live - is far more important than the modest assistance that we offer. Effective assistance, therefore, recognizes and nurtures the qualities of people themselves, and their communities, and supports their strength and vision (Inter Pares, Annual Report, 1993).

This paper poses a number of challenges for donor agencies and NGOs to address in their relations with Southern peoples and institutions. Although first steps have been taken to rethink the concept of partnership, a great deal of work remains to be done, especially in the area of how to implement partnership. The ideas presented here are meant to challenge donors to consider how they relate to Southern institutions and peoples. There is no blueprint offered here nor should there be. What is needed at this point is an expanded collection of experiences, of partnership models that address the issues raised here - the issues of how to ensure ownership and decentralize control and how to broaden the parameters of international development to include work on domestic issues in donor countries.

This paper provides some examples of mechanisms donor agencies and organizations and their Southern counterparts use to address issues of ownership and control. It touches on how donors can open up the decision-making process to ensure the central involvement of those who are most often excluded but the most affected by development policies and programs. But is consultation enough? How can decision makers in donor offices be held accountable for what is realized from consultation?

Although the partnership literature is overwhelmingly Northern-based, the answers to many of the questions raised here are more likely to be found in the South. How can Southern peoples and organizations reclaim ownership? How have Southern institutions designed systems (funding, accountability, agenda setting, evaluation) to enable them to reclaim control? It is quite possible that some of the more insightful analyses and innovative models will come from the South, some of which will be found in South-South linkages.

The paper argues that strategies of solidarity that ensure ownership and build on local priorities are essential to overcome the obstacles that constrain Southern control of development policy, planning and programming. In the search to define solidarity, the paper spends some time discussing how people in the North and South - peoples' movements - can work together to bring about political, economic and social change. How are such movements most effectively organized? What steps or ingredients are desired for political coalition building?

At the same time that donors are citing the importance of empowerment, local participation and Southern ownership, they are tightening their control over programming, disbursements and overall decision making. This tension might interfere with some of the most interesting social experiments in international development (SAP, PAC and PCHRD being three examples). With increasing pressure for accountability, how can donors and recipients ensure that efforts to increase local participation are not reversed?

The paper concludes with a discussion on how donors can shift some of their focus to development problems in their own countries. For many working on international issues, this is a completely new idea. What lessons have donors learned from home that they can link to international development problems? How does this experience better inform their work? What lessons have been learned in the South that can be applied domestically?

The current context for international development brings with it many challenges and opportunities. Perhaps the answers to some of the above questions can help us find these windows of opportunity to address the problems identified by the 1967 Pearson Commission and that, for the most part, remain hidden in partnerships today.

Bibliography

The African Association for Literacy and Adult Education and The Synergos Institute. *Toward a New Development Paradigm: Findings for Case Study Research of Partnerships in Africa*. New York: The Synergos Institute, January 1995.

Ahmed Khan, Niaz. "Towards an Understanding of 'Participation': The Conceptual Labyrinth Revisited." *Administrative Change*, Vol. 20 (1-2), July 1992-June 1993.

Alger, Chadwick F. "Grass-roots Perspectives on Global Policies for Development." *Journal of Peace Research*, 27(2) 1990, pp. 155-168.

Avina, Jeffrey. "The evolutionary life cycles of non-governmental development organizations." *Public Administration and Development*, 13, 1993 pp. 453-474.

Babu, A.M. In Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Washington: Howard University Press 1972.

Bannerji, H; L. Carty; K. Delhi; S. Heald; and K. McKenna. *Unsettling Relations*. Toronto: Women's Press, 1991.

Baser, Heather. *CIDA's "Experience with Technical Cooperation: Selected Lessons Learned."* Presentation to the November 17-18 meeting of the DAC Informal Network on Technical Cooperation, London.

Bhatnagar, Bhuvan and Aubrey C. Williams (eds.). *Participatory Development and the World Bank Potential Directions for Change*. Washington: The World Bank 1992.

Bolger, Joe, "Ownership: The Concept and CIDA's Experience." Paper prepared for ECDPM Round Table on "Partnership in development cooperation", June 1994.

Bossuyt, Jean and Geert Laporte. "Partnership in the 1990's: How to Make It Work Better." *Policy Management Brief*, ECDPM, 3, (Dec. 1994).

The Brandt Commission. *Common Crisis North-South: Co-operation for World Recovery*. London: Pan Books, 1983.

Bratton, Michael. "The Politics of Government-NGO Relations in Africa." *World Development*, 17(4), 1989 pp. 569-587.

Brodhead, Tim. "Notes for "NGO Futures." March 28 1994, unpublished paper.

Brodhead, Tim, et al. *Bridges of Hope? Canadian Voluntary Agencies and the Third World*. Ottawa: The North-South Institute, 1988.

- Brown, L. David. "Sowing Self-Sufficiency, Non Governmental Organizations as Development Catalysts." *Foreign Aid*, (Fall 1992).
- Brown, L. David. "Social Change Through Collective Reflection with Asian Nongovernmental Development Organizations." *Human Relations*, 46(2), (1993), pp. 249-273.
- Brown, L. David. "Bridging Organizations and Sustainable Development", *Human Relations*, 44(8), (1991), pp. 807-831.
- Campbell, Piers. *Relations Between Southern and Northern NGOS: Effective Partnerships for Sustainable Development*. Paper prepared for ICVA's General Conference, March 1989.
- Canadian Co-operative Association. *Model of Co-operative Development*, 1994.
- CCIC. *Canadian Foreign Policy Review Submission*, 1994.
- CCIC. *Partnership and Solidarity*. Discussion paper, March 1992.
- CCIC. *The Critical '90s. CCIC Organizational Review Discussion Paper*. November 1990a.
- CCIC. *The North South Dialogue, NGOs in the 1990s*, conference proceedings, 1990b.
- CCIC. "The Limits of 'Partnership'." *The Political Scene*, May 1989.
- Chambers, Robert. *Rural Development. Putting the Last First*. UK: Longman Scientific & Technical 1983.
- Chatterjee, Lillian. Profile, *CCIC Contact*, 10(1), Summer 1986.
- Childers, Erskine and Brian Urquart. "Renewing the United Nations System." *Development Dialogue*, 1, 1994.
- Christie, Jean. "Solidarity and Partnership: What and Why." unpublished paper, Ottawa, March 1991.
- CIDA. *Partnership. Repositioning the Discussion*. Unpublished paper, no date.
- CIDA. *Human Resources Development Project, Zambia*, no date.
- Curtis, Donald. *Beyond Government. Organisations for Common Benefit*. London: Macmillan., 1991.
- CUSO. *Non-Governmental Organizations in International Development: Mobilization, Partnership and Effectiveness Conference*. Proceedings, Ottawa, CUSO and the North-South Institute, 1986.

Denning, Stephen. *Programme Aid Beyond Structural Adjustment*. Paper prepared for World Bank Workshop on New Forms of Programme Aid, Harare, Zimbabwe, January 31-February 1, 1994.

Department of the Environment. *Partnerships in Practice Partnerships for Change*. London, February 1994.

Diamond, E. "In Search of a Common Agenda," in P. Ingersoll and J. Ingersoll (eds.), *Toward Partnership in Africa. A Joint Project of FOVAD and Inter-Action*. MA: Eusey Press.

Dichter, Thomas W. "The Changing World of Northern NGOs: Problems, Paradoxes and Possibilities." in John Lewis (ed.), *Strengthening the Poor*. Washington. Overseas Development Council, 1988, pp. 177-188.

Drabek, A. G. (ed.). "Development Alternatives: The Challenge for NGOs." *World Development*, (Supplement, Autumn 1987).

Draimin, Tim. *Potential for Partnership- International Cooperation Institutions and Canadian and Latin American NGOs, LACRO Discussion Series I*. Iuruguay: IDRC, July 1994.

Draimin, Tim, *North-South Relations. From Domination to International Cooperation: Sustainable Development and Reciprocal Cooperation*, Backgrounder Paper, #3, 1995.

Edwards, Michael and David Hume. "Scaling-up the developmental impact of NGOs: concepts and experiences." in Michael Edwards and David Hume (eds.), *Making a difference: NGOs and development*, 1992.

Elliot, Charles. "Some Aspects of the Relations Between the North and South in the NGO Sector." *World Development*, (Supplement, Autumn 1987) pp. 57-68.

Esteva, Gustavo. "Regenerating People's Space." *Alternatives*, 12(1),1987, pp. 138-152.

Farrington, John and Anthony Bebbington with Kate Wellard and David J. Lewis. *Reluctant Partners? Non-Governmental Organizations, the State and Sustainable Agricultural Development*. Routledge, New York.: 1993.

Ford-Smith, Honor. *Ring Ding in a Tight Corner: A Case Study of Organizational Democracy in Sistren, 1977-1988*. Toronto: Women's Program of the ICAE, 1989.

Ford-Smith, Honor. "After the Decade: Trends in Funding to Women's Organizations." *Voices Rising*, (Oct/Nov, 1989) pp. 29-31.

Found, William C. *Participatory Research and Development. An Assessment of IDRC's Experience and Prospects*. A Report to the International Development Research Centre, May 31, 1995.

Fowler, Alan. "The Third Sector in a New International Order: The Role of NGDO Centres for Study and Development", unpublished paper, June 18, 1991.

"Building Partnerships Between Northern and Southern Development NGOs: Issues for the Nineties." *Development*, 1 (1990) pp. 16-23.

French, Joan. *Moving for the Missionary Position: NGO Partnership and Policy*. CCIC Annual Meeting, 1991.

Fulavai, S. "Partnership- A Third World Perspective." Paper presented at conference, "Mobilization, Partnership and Effectiveness," Ottawa 1986.

Gaarder, Robert and Carolyn McCommon. "Hershey Foods, Cocoa, and Belize: a collaborative model for third world development." *Public Administration and Development*, 10, (1990) pp. 343-360.

Gardner Richard N. and Max F. Millikan. *The Global Partnership. International Agencies and Economic Development*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968.

Girvan, Norman (ed.). *Working Together for Development*. Kingston: Institute of Jamaica, 1993.

Girvan, Norman. *Working Together for Global Development*. World Hearings on Development, New York, June: 6-10 1994.

Gomes-Casseres, Benjamin. "Group versus Group: How Alliance Networks Compete." *Harvard Business Review*, (July, Aug. 1994), pp. 62-74.

Hall, B.L. "Participatory Research, Popular Knowledge, and Power: A personal reflection." *Convergence*, 14(3) (1981), pp. 6-17.

Helleiner, G.K. "Poverty in the South: Northern Responsibilities and a Role for Canada." Second Annual Hopper Lecture, November 1, 1994.

Heldke, Lisa M. "Food Politics, Political Food" in Wayne W. Curtis and Lisa Heldke (eds.), *Cooking, Eating, Thinking: Transformative Philosophies of Food*. Washington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1992, pp. 301-27.

Herbert-Copley, Brent. Canadian NGOs: Past Trends, Future Challenges, *World Development, World Development, Development Alternatives: The Challenge for NGOs (Supplement, Autumn 1987)*, pp. 21-28.

Horizons of Friendship. Pamphlet, 1992.

ICHRDD. "Strengthening Democratic Civil Societies," in *Liberatas*, 3(4), September 1993.

ICFID. *Journal of Learnings*, (1), May 1994.

ICIFID. *Challenges for Partnership in Development in the 90s. ICFID and Churches Committee on International Affairs of the Canadian Councils of Churches Partnership Consultation*, October 1990.

Ingersoll, P. *Toward Partnership in Africa. A joint project of FOVAD and InterAction*, MA: Eusey Press.

InterNet Consulting Group. *Review of the Applied Economic and Business Policy Linkage (AEBPL) Program. Final Report*. Ottawa, March 22, 1994.

Inter Pares. *The Women Working for Change Tour - What We Learned on the Road to Partnership*. Ottawa: Inter Pares, April 1991.

Inter Pares. Annual Report, 1990.

Inter Pares. "Partnership. What's In it For Us?" *Bulletin*, 10(1), 1988.

Johnston, Pari J. "The Case Against Charity: Analyzing the Problematic Discourse of NGO Partnership and Exploring New Ways of Relating." paper prepared for NPSIA-SID Conference, Feb 4, 1995.

Johnson, Sherrill. "North-South Partnerships: Pitfalls and Potential." Unpublished paper, 1994.

Kajese, Kingston. An Agenda of Future Tasks for International and Indigenous NGOs: View for the South. *World Development, Development Alternatives: The Challenge for NGOs* (Supplement, Autumn 1987), pp. 79-85

Korten, David C. *Getting to the 21st Century. Voluntary Action and the Global Agenda*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press, 1990.

Korten, David C. Third Generation NGO Strategies: A Key to People Centred Development, *World Development, Development Alternatives: The Challenge for NGOs, (Supplement, Autumn 1987)*, pp. 145-159.

Krassowski, Andrzej. *The Aid Relationship*. London: Overseas Development Institute 1968.

Laidlaw, John. "A Framework for Discussion on Practical Means of Establishing Partnerships in Development." Paper prepared for South Asia Partnership Workshop, Yellow Point, Vancouver Island, BC, Aug. 23-26, 1988.

Lalta, S. and M. Freckleton (eds.). *Caribbean Economic Development*. Ann Arbor: Edwards Bros., 1993.

Macdonald, Laura. "NGOs and the Problematic of Participation: Cases from Costa Rica." paper prepared for Canadian Association for Studies in International Development, Charlottetown 1992.

Macdonald, Laura. *Non-Governmental Organizations: Agents of a "New Development"?* Paper prepared for CCIC, Ottawa, 1994.

MacLean, Sandra. "The Possibilities and Problems in Building Partnerships Between Canadian and African Non-Governmental Organizations." CASID, June 1993.

Malena, Carmen. "Relations Between Northern and Southern Non-Governmental Development Organizations." *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 16(1), 1995, pp. 7-30.

MATCH. "Partnership and Gender." Unpublished paper. Ottawa: MATCH International Centre, 1992.

McAfee, Kathy. *Storm Signals: Structural Adjustment and Development Alternatives in the Caribbean*. Boston: Zed Books, 1991.

Michanek, Ernst. *The World Development Plan - A Swedish Perspective*. Uppsala: Dag Hammerskjold Foundation, 1971.

Michel, James H. "Letter to The North-South Institute," May 16 1995.

Mitter, S. "A Game of Unequal Partners." *International Coalition for Development Action News*, (July/August, 1983) pp. 2-3.

Morgan, P. & Baser, H. *Making Technical Cooperation More Effective, New Approaches by the International Development Community*, unpublished paper, 1992.

Moss Kanter, Rosabeth. "Collaborative Advantage." *Harvard Business Review*, (July-Aug. 1994) pp. 96-108.

Muchunguxi, Dennis A. K. and Scott D. Milne. *Persepectives from the South: A Study on Partnership*. Ottawa: AFREDA and CIDA, June 1995.

Murchie, Kevin. "Responses to Structural Adjustment by Progressive NGOs in the Caribbean and Canada." unpublished paper, 1991.

Murphy, Bryan K. "Canadian NGOs and the Politics of Participation." in Jamie Swift and Brian Tomlinson (eds.), *Conflicts of Interest. Canada and the Third World*. Toronto: Between the lines 1991.

Murphy, Bryan K. "Towards the 21st Century Reflections on the Future of Canadian NGOs." unpublished paper, October 1993.

Murphy, Bryan K. "Learning On Our Feet." *New Internationalist*, No. 183 (May 1988).

Nyoni, S. "Indigenous NGOs: Liberation, Self-reliance and development." *World Development*, (Supplement, Autumn 1987), pp. 51-56.

- OECD, DAC. *Development Partnerships in the New Global Context*, Paris, May, 1995.
- Oxfam. *The Oxfam Poverty Report*. UK and Ireland: Oxfam 1995.
- Parikh, Rita. "An Unequal Partnership. The Role of Donor Agencies in Shaping Priorities of Indigenous Women's NGOs." Unpublished paper.
- PAC. *Partnership: Matching Rhetoric to Action. An NGO Discussion Paper*. Ottawa: Partnership Africa Canada, 1989.
- PAC. *Report of the Study of Partnership and Institutional Strengthening*. Prepared by GAS Development Associates Ltd., Accra, Ghana and ET Jackson and Associates Ltd, 1995.
- Pascal, Charles E. "So you want to be my partner?? Some Notes on Partnership and Democratic Administration." unpublished paper. Premiers Council on Health, Well-being and Social Justice, August 1991.
- Paul, Samuel and Arturo Israel. *Non-governmental Organizations and the World Bank. Cooperation for Development*. Washington: The World Bank 1991.
- Pearson, Lester B. *Partners in Development. Report of the Commission on International Development*. New York: Praeger 1969.
- Powell, Sandra. "Partners in Dialogue." *Approaches that Work in Rural Development*, no date.
- Pratt, Brian. "Donor/North Perspectives: Bridges, Myths and Challenges." Presentation to the International Council on Social Welfare, International Seminar, Berlin, 1988, pp. 22-27.
- Rahnema, Majid. in Wolfgang Sachs (ed.), *Development Dictionary. A Guide to Knowledge as Power*. London: Zed Books 1992.
- Riddell, Roger C. *Foreign Aid Reconsidered*. London: Johns Hopkins University & James Currey 1987.
- Riddell, Roger C. "The Contribution of Foreign Aid to Development and the Role of the Private Sector." *Development, 1*, (1992).
- Salaman, Lester M. "The Rise of the Nonprofit Sector." *Foreign Affairs*, 73(4) (July-Aug 1994), pp. 109-123.
- Sarvide, Laura and Gabriela Sanchez. *North-South Cooperation Toward a Society of Citizens of the World*. Mexico: ESPIRAL, 1992.
- Schneider, Aaron and Sanjit Roy. *Policy from the People: A North-South NGO Policy Dialogue*. CCIC, no date.

Seabrooke, Karen. "Outline of Presentation to 'Putting GAD into Action' Partnership and Gender." unpublished paper, February 25, 1993.

SEAD. *Annual Report*, Scotland, 1993.

Smillie, Ian. "Changing Partners: Northern NGOs, Northern Governments," in Ian Smillie and Henry Helmich (eds.), *Non-Governmental Organisations and Governments: Stakeholders for Development*. Paris: OECD, 1993.

Smith, Brian H. "An Agenda of Future Tasks for International and Indigenous NGOs: View from the North." *World Development* (Supplement, Autumn 1987), pp. 87-93.

South Asia Partnership. *Resolving the Partnership Conundrum*. Ottawa, August 30, 1991.

Steering Committee of the Philippine NGO Consultation. *Partnership, the Philippines-Canada NGO Consultation for CIDA's Country Program Review*, Tagaytay, 1988.

Tandon, R. "Dialogue as Inquiry and Intervention." in P. Reason and J. Rowan (eds.), *Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research*. London: Wiley, 1981, pp. 293-302.

Tapper, Salena. "Linkages...an unequal exchange," in *CUSO Journal NGOs and Development*, (1986), pp. 12-14.

Tendler, Judith, *Turning PVOs into Development Agencies: Questions for Evaluation*. Program Evaluation Discussion Paper No. 12, Washington, D.C.: USAID, 1982.

The South Commission. *The Challenge to the South. The Report of the South Commission*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1990.

Titi, Vangile. *Building Partnerships for Sustainable Development*. IISD Technology Cooperation Initiative Working Paper, Winnipeg, May 1993.

Ukpong, Ebebe A. "A North-South Divide." *AIRD News*, 13(11), Feb. 1995, p. 7.

UNDP. *The Human Development Report 1993*. New York: UNDP, 1993.

UNICEF. *The World's Children*. New York, 1995.

USAID. *New Partnership Initiative Report*, 1995.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. "Wise, But Not Tough, Or Is it Correct, But Not Wise?" in The South Centre, *Facing the Challenge. Responses to the Report of the South Commission*. London: Zed Books, 1993.

Werlin, Herbert. "Linking decentralization and centralization: a critique of the new development administration." *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 12, (1992), pp.223-235, 1992.

Women's Health Interaction. *Ten Years of Caring About Global Justice 1983-1993*. Ottawa, 1994.

The World Bank. *The World Bank Report on Participation*, 1994.

Yates, Ian. *Justice in the Aid Relationship: A Dialogue on Partnership*. Background Paper for the International Council on Social Welfare, International Seminar, Berlin, 1988, pp. 5-17.

Ziswa, Valentine. "Recipient/South Perspectives: A Commentary." Presentation to the International Council on Social Welfare, International Seminar, Berlin, 1988, pp. 29-39.