

Australian and International Aid and Development Funding Shifts:

Public to Private Transformations

Simone L. Francis

The University of Queensland, Australia

Abstract

A long history of the global privatisation of public sectors has shaped the recent shift in funding for aid and development, both overseas and in Australia. Sculpted by the industrialised world led by the United States and ex-colonial powers, aid and development in the present day involves non-state actors, including philanthropists and private corporations. The reduction of state intervention and responsibilities is evident in Australia, one example being the disbanding of AusAID and its merger into DFAT.

A number of key factors has been driving the changes including the evolutionary construct of globalization and neoliberalist style capitalism, uncertainty about aid's effectiveness, social, economic and environmental factors, plus power, agendas and political interests.

There's continued rising criticism about aid and development priorities, who should provide it, and its style of operation and cooperation. Impacts of the shift in funding for aid and development include aid's effectiveness, social and environmental issues, and possible impacts to Australia's foreign aid reputation regarding transparency and accountability.

Recommendations are offered to how we can free ourselves from the reigns of a globalised society, so that funding for aid and development stems from ethical systems, not economic frameworks based upon growth.

Key Words: aid, development funding, Australia, international, shifts, AusAID, DFAT

Table of Contents

Title Page.....1

Abstract.....2

Table of Contents.....3

Introduction.....4

Evidence of the shift from public to private sector funding for aid and development.....5

Drivers of the shift from public to private sector funding for aid and development.....9

Impacts for Australia’s aid and development priorities.....12

Conclusions.....15

Recommendations.....16

Reference list.....17

Appendix A.....21

Appendix B.....24

Introduction

How aid is implemented is important in today's globalised climate, where natural resources are diminishing and people's access to basic needs are becoming limited. Ex-colonial powers and the industrial world led by the United States has sculpted today's society, and has in turn encouraged the collaboration of state and non-state actors. This includes AusAID's 2006 focus on accelerating economic growth for ten years, plus the organisation's disbanding in 2013, when it was merged into the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT).

This report offers a historical perspective of the global privatisation of the public sector, which leads to the uncovering of how a recent shift in funding for aid and development has occurred. The seeding of globalisation, centuries earlier, has continued pushing governments to reach out to non-governmental partners including philanthropists and corporations. This has perpetuated the institutionalising of a market-driven global economy.

Driving the shift includes uncertainty about aid's effectiveness, which has resulted in demands to reconstruct the aid framework, or to even end aid altogether. Other drivers are social, economic and environmental factors, plus power, agendas and political interests. An idea exists that involving non-state actors leads to more effective aid and development outcomes, especially with an expanded scope of aid activities, including climate change and disaster relief. Furthermore, in the capitalistic interest of the state, there have been policy shifts to open the Australian labour market to regional neighbours.

Australia's foreign aid reputation is now at stake as DFAT's ability to effectively deliver transparent activities through manipulation of the market is in doubt. The organisation's professionalism, quality of aid and trust of partner organisations could potentially be destroyed. Frameworks with easily achievable commercial objectives are generally not suitable for international communities.

Recommendations to how society can free itself from the reigns of a globalised society are provided so that funding for aid and development begins to stem from ethical systems. Presented are alternative models to the current mainstream growth-economy structure, which prioritise humanity's basic needs.

Evidence of the shift from public to private sector funding for aid and development

Over the past six or seven decades, shifts have encouraged government aid agencies to collaborate with non-state actors (Natsios, 2009). As interest in modernisation during the 1950s developed, along with emerging classical economic development (Lyons, 2014a), focus was placed on the Third World by politicians who tried demonstrating that sustainable development was possible under a western system (Webster, 1990). Patterns of development thinking also changed from a basic needs to techno-fix approaches. (Schulpen & Gibbon, 2001).

Rostow's model of economic development applies Western economic theory to the third world, and impacts how current aid and development functions. His fifth stage of economic growth; high mass-consumption (Rostow, 1971), coincides with a growth-based development focus. This tunnel-visioned 'Linear-Stage' theory assumes a set path to future development that promotes 'trickle down' economics.

The 1960s and 1970s gave way to "First Wave" environmentalism, which relates to nature conservation and the blaming of industry for environmental problems (Lyons 2014c). The 'Limits to Growth' were recognised in 1972; The limits to growth will arrive in one hundred years if present growth trends in world population, food production, industrialisation, resource depletion and pollution continue unchanged (Meadows, cited in Lyons 2014c).

Globalisation was seeded centuries earlier when explorers, merchants, colonisers, and occupiers began advancing their profit projects in different territories for the Crowns of Europe (Acharya, 2013). Globalisation of the world economy pushed governments to reach out to non-

traditional partners. As trade and investment began to collapse in the 1980s, international businesses arrived in countries previously experiencing limited economic growth and used state intervention to keep out competitors (Natsios, 2009).

Through a period of neoliberalism in the 1980s and 1990s 'Free' Trade emerged. Development policy was conditioned by a shift from the the Washington consensus (which promoted trade liberalisation and privatisation) to the post-Washington consensus, thereby creating a general push to remove the state from the economic sphere (Carroll & Hameiri, 2007). A reduction in state intervention the 1990s saw the dominance of international corporations operating in developing countries and thriving commercialisation within the public sector. The Australian privatisation agenda mutated into an organisational development agenda (Dixon & Kouzmin, 1994).

During the 20th century came 'Second Wave' environmentalism, meaning sustainable development was on the agenda. Technocentrists saw sustainable development as an opportunity to reduce environmental impacts of industry, resource depletion and address pollution, but ecocentrists thought sustainable development ignored the intrinsic value of the environment (Lyons, 2014c).

“Sustainable development encompasses the idea that putting a price on the environment will help protect it, unless degrading it is more profitable” (Beder, 1994, p. 31), and that economic growth should take priority over the environment. This justifies companies' control over natural environments and the privatisation of state sectors. The international corporations operating in developing countries “...made private capital, rather than foreign aid, the main antipoverty tool of the late 20th century” (Natsios, 2009).

'Third Wave' environmentalism arrived during the 21st century, and people began to realise the need to build ^[11] sustainable systems and communities for the future. Yet systems still stemmed from globalisation and were based on market-growth. “Individuals and states celebrate (consciously, subconsciously, or unconsciously) the invasion of market and technology, and enthusiastically adapt themselves to globalization” (Acharya, 2013, pp.938). “The private sector

principle can be applied in all economic activities (including the delivery of public services)” (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECDa], 1995, pp. 7).

While overseas development aid was still administered wholly through The Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID), the focus of the organisation had majorly shifted. This was in line with the changing geopolitical topography associated with the "war on terror" and promotion of the Howard government's grave approaches to the supply of public goods (Carroll & Hameiri, 2007). From 2006 to 2016, the focus of AID delivery has been about accelerating economic growth and “strengthening support for private sector-led rural and business development” (AusAID, 2006, xii).

Over recent years the Australian aid framework, which has been overtaken by private sector principles, has institutionalised the market. Economic determinants including the financial crisis and euro zone turmoil has further led governments to reduce their aid budgets (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECDb] 2013). Since 2010 the distribution of global poverty has shifted from low-income countries towards middle-income countries. However, many donors consider “middle-income country classification itself a reason to be reducing or even ending aid” (Sumner, 2013, pp. 1). The Australian approach to overseas aid delivery derives from a pattern that seeks to “embed liberal markets and set the conditions for capital accumulation and the hierarchical asymmetries this involves” (Carroll & Hameiri, 2007, pp. 411).

From sustainable development came a green economy, which in 2009, started to become firmly established on the international policy agenda of the United Nations (UN) General Assembly (United Nations Environmental Program [UNEP], 2011). The UN's green economic framework places great importance upon growth. “...growth in income and employment are the key components for human well-being” (Rio+20 Policy Brief, 2012, pp. 3). 'Aid for Trade', which aligns with a green economy, aims at gaining benefit from liberalised trade and increased market access (Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Fair Trading [DFAT], n.d.), and

encourages the financialisation of nature.

Although the 2012 Rio+20 summit was a conference organised by the UN, it was the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) that established the G20 CEO Advisory Group to effectively target policy development on a global scale. ICC's efforts to clarify and frame the concept of “green economy” was represented in the 2012 publication of the 'Green Economy Roadmap', and “highlights the essential role of business in bringing solutions to common global challenges” (ICC, 2012, p. 3).

One outcome of Rio+20 was a UN report entailing public-private partnership promotions. “We support national regulatory and policy frameworks that enable business and industry to advance sustainable development initiatives” (United Nations [UN], 2012, pp. 8). This further influenced aid organisations. There “...are emerging opportunities to engage in innovative partnerships that contribute to building knowledge and development practice in the aid program” (Australian Council for International Development [ACFID], 2000-2014, pp. 1).

Soon after the Abbott Government came to power in 2013, AusAID was integrated into DFAT. Australia's aid program continued promoting Australia's primary interest- economic growth. This was solidified in the 2013 Budget; “We will drive the development agenda and focus attention on economic growth in developing countries” (Australia's International Development Assistance Program, 2013, pp. 3). Changes to the aid program demonstrated the Government's interest in linking Australia's foreign affairs and trade policy with aid and development policy (2ser 107.3, 2014). Such changes have lead further towards market-based development approaches including export-led agriculture and carbon trading initiatives.

The current Australian and international consensus stipulates that the private sector guarantees economic growth while the state provides the background conditions for this to transpire. The recent shift from public to private sector funding for aid and development was unavoidable as it was derived from a lengthy history of substantial global public-private

transformations.

Drivers of the shift from public to private sector funding for aid and development

The evolutionary movements towards the current globalised society has shifted states towards corporate capitalism and has opened the doors for funding for aid and development to be reached by the construct of globalization. “The construct of globalization, by its nature, embraces every element of human life... economic, financial, technological, environmental, social, cultural, political, and health-related issues and events... in this new world order, states are functioning as a conduit for corporate capitalism” (Acharya, 201, pp. 968).

There has also been much uncertainty about aid's effectiveness, which has resulted in demands to reconstruct the aid framework, or even to end aid altogether. “Some analysts argue that aid can retard growth by driving up the value of the local currency, which makes the manufacturing sector less competitive” (Arezki & Banerjee, 2014, pp. 49).

Involving non-state actors such as private corporations and philanthropists in development issues can lead to more effective outcomes (Morvaridi, 2012). Yet “philanthropic activities are consciously driven by specific identified goals and strategies, shaped by personal character and qualities, in the social field...and (its) external relations with other 'fields' (eg. business, politics, religion); and its grounding in the class system” (Kidd, 1996, pp. 191). These drivers also play a role in the growing importance of climate change and disaster relief, which has broadened the scope of aid activities vastly into areas where traditional processes have required considerable adjustment (Guy, 2014).

The “...potential for a shift in the Australian government's approach to Overseas Aid Development (ODA) delivery could arguably only come from a change in government” (Carroll & Hameri, 2007, pp. 425). The government effectively captured the Australian donor market, resulting in pressure for change that spurred from financial viewpoints (Brown & Purushothama, 2005).

Australia's public aid agency was swiftly becoming outsourced to the private sector.

In 1996 the Howard government slashed AusAID's running costs budget by 24%. (Wikipedia, 2014). Along with these cuts came the search for new government services based on the need for safeguards for the rural sector, advances in agricultural technology and management of water and energy. The government concluded that "...generating broadly spread and sustainable economic growth is the single most important objective for Australia's region over the next ten years" (AusAID, 2006, pp. 34).

Furthermore the same government made a policy shift to open the Australian labour market to regional neighbours. The policy (suggested by the World Bank), was said to make a huge impact upon development (Carroll & Hameri, 2007), and entailed the establishment of a pilot Asia-Pacific enterprise development program. The program was seen as a vital component of sustainable growth and development and was intended to "capitalise and build upon the deep political, economic, security and people-to-people links between Australia and the region" (AusAID, 2006, pp. 26). Such implementations align with the expansion of commercialisation, as it further applies western economic theory to third world countries. "No public agency is protected from the cold winds of commercialization" (Dixon & Kouzmin, 1994, pp. 60). This commercialisation also applied to AusAID. Their central feature of aid assistance became "partnerships with the private sector as core collaborators and implementers" (AusAID, 2006, pp. 40).

"AusAID's use of 'corporate plans', 'advancement of Australia's interests', 'growth', 'prosperity' and 'security interests', 'memorandum articles of association', 'trust deeds' and 'accreditation' singularly and collectively conjures up a picture of a core-financial and partial-financial milieu" (Brown & Purushothama, 2005, p. 130). Implementation of such economically driven agendas grants the idea that privately managed aid and development is advantageous. Morvaridi (2012) suggests that if private aid sidesteps government bureaucracy then it is more inclined to go to the people who genuinely need it.

Just prior to the disbanding of AusAID, The Independent Review of Aid Effectiveness made a number of critiques and recommended for the organisation; “The aid program lacks a clear and comprehensive overall strategy... is fragmented... is not working well and requires reform” (Australian Government National Commission of Audit, 2014, p. 24). One particular recommendation made is synonymous with the privatisation of funding for aid and development; “...there is scope to make better use of existing partnerships and include new partners, particularly the private sector and community groups” (Australian Government National Commission of Audit, 2014, p. 24).

The 2013-14 Budget confirms that AusAID will persist in establishing partnerships with the Australian business community, and continue identifying common interests to increase the performance of Australian aid (Australia's International Development Assistance Program, 2013). It was also stated that DFAT would commence managing Direct Aid Program grants (Australia's International Development Assistance Program, 2013).

The government's decision to reduce funding for aid and merge AusAID into DFAT set an agenda for the Australian aid program. In September 2013, when the incoming Abbott Government announced the merger to align aid with diplomacy (Wikipedia, 2014), it was clear that continued economic liberalisation was on the agenda. The government cut aid spending by \$4.5 billion over four years and decided to only grow aid by the consumer price index (CPI) (Australian Government National Commission of Audit, 2014) – a tool for measuring markets. This aligns with the neoliberalist view that generating greater economic growth and well being will be delivered by reducing state intervention and letting the market set prices and wages (Lyons, 2014a).

“Under neoliberalism the whole notion of capitalist philanthropy is embedded in the idea of reducing state intervention and responsibilities and devolving power to non-state actors” (Morvaridi 2012). “Of course, “development” was never a national process... Rather it informed an ideological representation of the post colonial world order” (McMichael, 2007, pp. 291).

Overall, in the system of international law and order, states have become soft power and corporate capitalism has become hard power (Morvaridi 2012). This neoliberalist force, delivered within a current globalised system, has not only led to the overall world-wide privatisation of state-owned resources, but has driven Australia's shift from public to private sector funding for aid and development.

Impacts for Australia's aid and development priorities

The recent shift from public to private sector funding for aid and development has great impacts for Australia's aid and development priorities. Some believe that the new generation of development alliances are scalable and sustainable because they identify where development interests and corporate profitability meet (Natsios, 2009). Yet "Serious concerns have been expressed about the independence and effectiveness of the aid program in the years ahead" (Guy, 2014, p. 1).

Although aid has supported poverty reduction and growth in some countries, "Controversies about aid effectiveness go back decades... Some experts charge that aid has enlarged government bureaucracies, perpetuated bad governments, enriched the elite in poor countries, or just been wasted" (Radelet, 2006, pp. 1). Allegations have also arisen that Australian aid services Australian commercial interests by promoting particular economic and trade policies that lack transparency and are detrimental to the poor (Wikipedia, 2014).

Once you mix it up with our trade and diplomatic goals, you lose a focus on what aid is... The reason you have free-standing aid agencies that aren't subsumed under foreign affairs agencies is because you want clarity that aid is actually to deal with absolute poverty. (ABC news, 2013).

Prior to September 2013, trained AusAID staff would consult with various people, agencies and embassies from around the world. Tanya Plibersek stressed "Our experienced AusAID staff are not able to do the work that they are trained to do" (Metherell, 2014, p. 18). Management disaster

risks for DFAT could potentially destroy the organisations professionalism, quality of aid and trust of partner organisations. (Guy, 2014). Australia's international reputation may end up trashed.

Aid is a crucial investment to create safer world, and is a critical part of Australia's Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) commitment. (World Vision Australia, 2012). Archie Law, executive director of charity ActionAid Australia, indicated that Australia's national economic and political interests can't neatly align and that there is a clear clash in objectives. (ABC news, 2013).

It's still uncertain how Australian aid can reach successful outcomes through manipulation of the market. “Even with regulation markets have a way of serving capital, sustaining inequality and reducing democracy, and disembedding social and ecological relationships” (Mcmichael, 2009, P. 253). The market's failure to significantly increase incomes has also led to high levels of poverty, pollution and environmental degradation, and our excessive reliance on it “has gone hand in glove with increasing social frailty, and consequential social conflict, often associated with violence” (Morvaridi, 2012, pp. 1199).

Reliance of the market sits well with Marx's theory of underdevelopment. Frank, (cited in Lyons, 2014b) suggests “...development and underdevelopment are the same in that they are the product of a single, but dialectically contradictory, economic structure and process of capitalism.” Therefore ethical approaches to aid and development go beyond economic growth. Furthermore, if projects are imposed without appropriate assessment of social, cultural and environmental needs, they can have devastating effects on communities. Even research conducted in developing countries can create trust and power imbalances between researchers and participants (Australian Council for International Development [ACFID], 2000-2014).

National policy and regulatory frameworks are continuously being shaped to align with national laws that encourage public and private initiatives (United Nations, 2012). Although the UN states “...linking environmental performance to improved profitability is likely to be effective and

should also prove to be an attractive business model for financial institutions” (United Nations Environmental Program [UNEP], 2011, pp. 603), evaluating governments on their ability to strengthen the nation's gross domestic product raises further ethical, moral and political dilemmas. “States and civil societies are submitting their sovereign authority and political will to the greater good of supranational norms of globalization favorable to corporate capitalism” (Acharya, 2013, pp. 969). And while Australian aid continues to commit itself to a corporate agenda, “the advancement of Australia's interests may not necessarily advance the interests of the poor” (Brown, Purushothama, 2005, pp. 134).

Corporate self-interest and the use of philanthropy to gain symbolic capital through aid activity must also be recognised. Food aid is a blatant example of the use of aid to achieve commercial objectives (White, 1997). The 'Feed the Future' programme bill “effectively makes public money available to corporations for research on agricultural biotechnologies that the corporations can then patent and profit from” (Morvaridi, 2012, pp. 1206). This use of aid is an attempt to advance business and government priorities ahead of traditional non-financial values, yet “...power without responsibility is a form of neo-colonialism that neither substantively helps the recipient states, nor the long-term interests of Australia” (Carroll & Hameri, 2007, pp. 411).

Donors who explicitly assume that developing countries will predominantly be market economies (Schulpen & Gibbon, 2001) automatically undermine the real aspirations of the people, and creates dependency on a Western system. “...the nature of this dependence is highly problematic and can be dichotomized as either "coercive" or "normative" in nature” (Dixon & Kouzmin, 1994, pp. 69). Although plenty of lip-service is paid to 'participation', the community's voice is insufficiently heard in the development discourse (Black, 2003).

Community needs are being directly connected to projects that are in line with liberal market orthodoxy (Dixon & Kouzmin, 1994), and only insiders are able to comprehend the technical policy language that international development is conducted in (Guy, 2014). “Who can translate cash-flow

charts and scintillating boardroom speeches into real stories about real people with real lives” (Roy, 2001, pp. 32). Many people end up left behind if they can't be assisted by the market (Morvaridi, 2012).

Market-driven development and excessive growth has also lead to “much more goods and services than necessary for an economy or society to survive or thrive” (Gomes, 2012, pp. 1061), and has led to accumulation and greed. For many people, especially those from traditional communities, “A recurrent issue concerns the often experienced emptiness of material 'development'” (Gasper, 2004, pp. 14).

The public to private shift in funding for aid and development will almost certainly result in more market driven, westernised projects and programs. In developing countries, children may only gain access to capitalistic style education, farmers may only be able to grow monoculture crops that are genetically modified, and the only employment opportunities available may be economic growth-focused.

Conclusions

Both the public and private sectors have maintained growth as a key driver for development and have been delivering westernised, market-driven projects and programs for quite some time. The public and private sectors are now, evidently, two faces of the same coin. With the institutionalisation of the market into public organisations, the shift of funding from the public to private sector for aid and development has rather been a slight adjustment closer towards a growth economy.

Through the imposition of modernisation and globalisation, stemming from a European history of colonisation, aid and development itself has become embedded in a market-driven, commercialised framework. The self interest of states for growth and corporations for profit is contradictory to the idea of grass-roots development. Therefore projects and programs stemming

from organisations with such interests can only continue delivering unethical, hegemonistic style aid and development that discounts traditional knowledge, the use of local resources and true participatory methodologies.

Recommendations

It shouldn't be about where funding for aid and development comes from that matters, but how aid and development can be implemented within the current global economic system, using non-market values based and degrowth economic methods. A complete overhaul of the system where aid and development has sprung from is imperative. A regressive and holistic approach must be taken to ensure the future survival of humans and other species, and to ensure freedom in this era from the chains of an oppressive and globalised system. By regressive, I mean the rejuvenation of natural and organic environments and the dismantling of rigid, suffocating bureaucracy.

The current model of mainstream Western society is highly unsustainable and needs to be addressed. Education seeks to prepare us for a production consumption society, in which we then work to produce and consume, which in turn rips out our natural resources and leaves us locked up in our own mentally debilitating isolation. Like the slavery evident in colonial times, today's "employment" slavery is only in existence to fill nations' growth quotas and to re-pay debt.

One alternative development model is a social entrepreneurial blueprint called 'Connect, Create, Conserve', which prioritises social and environmental needs over economic (Appendix A). One alternative to development model is called 'Rainbow Gatherings', which invites global participation for a basic needs approach to living (Appendix B). The integration of either or both models would support ethical approaches to development, resulting in the reduction of aid spending.

The methodologies entailed in both models contain holistic, grassroots, bottom-up and basic needs approaches to non-Western development. They also involve participation and empowerment,

local and traditional knowledge, collaboration, transparency, use of internal resources and are small scale.

Implementation is a long-term process involving collaborative transformation of the current economic structure to a system where money gradually disappears as humanities' basic needs become met. The health of ourselves and the planet depends on whether or not we continue down a path of environmental destruction for material gain.

References:

- ABC News. (2013). *Oxfam, World Vision hit out at Government's decision to bring AusAID into the Foreign Affairs Department*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2013-09-19/aid-agencies-criticise-ausaid-realignment/4966924>
- Acharya, U.D. (2013). GLOBALIZATION AND HEGEMONY SHIFT: ARE STATES MERELY AGENTS OF CORPORATE CAPITALISM? *Boston College. Law School. Boston College Law Review*, 54(3), 937-969. Retrieved from:
<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/docview/1528143668?accountid=14723>
- Arezki, R. & R. Banerjee. (2014). *Aid and Oil: Finance and Development*, 51(1) 48-50. Retrieved from: <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/fandd/2014/03/pdf/arezki.pdf>
- AusAID. (2006). *Australian Aid: Promoting Growth and Stability, A White Paper on the Australian Government's Overseas Aid Program*. pp. 1-76. Retrieved from:
<http://aid.dfat.gov.au/Publications/Documents/whitepaper.pdf>
- Australian Council for International Development. (2000-2014). *Ethical Research*. pp. 1. Retrieved from: <http://www.acfid.asn.au/aid-issues/thematic-issues/ethical-research>
- Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Fair Trading. (n.d.). *Aid for trade*. Retrieved from: <http://www.dfat.gov.au/trade/aid-for-trade/>
- Australian Government National Commission of Audit. (2014). *9.14 Foreign aid*. pp. 1. Retrieved from: <http://www.ncoa.gov.au/report/appendix-vol-1/9-14-foreign-aid.html>
- Australia's International Development Assistance Program (2013). *Budget: Effective Aid: Helping the worlds poor*, p. 1-159. Retrieved from: http://www.budget.gov.au/2013-14/content/ministerial_statements/download/AusAid_MS.pdf
- Beder, S. (1994, June-July). *Revoltin' Developments: The Politics of Sustainable Development*. *Arena Magazine*, pp. 37-39. Retrieved from:

<http://www.uow.edu.au/~sharonb/esd/arena.html>

Black, M. (2003) 'The history of an Idea'. In *A No Nonsense Guide to International Development*. *New Internationalist*, pp. 10-30.

Brown, A. M & Purushothama, M. (2005). Public Sector Aid Organisations: Philanthropy or Self Interest? *Journal of American Academy of Business*. 6(2). 128-134. Retrieved from:
<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/docview/222871353?accountid=14723>

Carroll, T. & Hameiri, S. (2007). Good Governance and Security: The Limits of Australia's New Aid Programme. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*. 37(4), 410-430. Retrieved from:
<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/docview/194234711?accountid=14723>

Dixon, J. & Kouzmin, A. (1994). The commercialization of the Australian public sector: Competence, Elitism or Default in Management Education? *The International Journal of Public Sector Management* 7(6), 52-73. Doi:10.1108/09513559410070597

Gaspar, D. (2004) 'What is the Ethics of Development?' in *The Ethics of Development*. Edinburgh. Edinburgh University Press. pp. 1-24.

Gomes, A. (2012) 'Alter-native 'development': indigenous forms of social ecology', *Third World Quarterly*, 33(6): 1059-1073. Doi:10.1080/01436597.2012.681491

Guy, D. (2014, January 28). *AusAID integration: the common-sense upside*. [web log message]. Retrieved from: <http://devpolicy.org/ausaid-integration-the-common-sense-upside-20140128/>

International Chamber of Commerce. (ICC). (2012). pp. 1. *Green Economy Roadmap*.
<http://www.iccwbo.org/products-and-services/trade-facilitation/green-economy-roadmap/>

Kidd, A. J. (1996) Philanthropy and the 'Social History Paradigm'. *Social History* 21(2). 180-192
Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4286339>

Lyons. K. (2014a). *Week three: The Development Project: Modernisation, Neo-liberalism and Economic Growth* [powerpoint slides]. Retrieved from SOCY7120, University of

Queensland Blackboard Online: https://learn.uq.edu.au/bbcswebdav/pid-698365-dt-content-rid-3130480_1/courses/SOCY7120S_6420_22360/Lecture%20Threea%281%29.ppt

Lyons. K. (2014b). *Week four: The Development Project: Structuralism, Dependency and Agro-industrial Development* [powerpoint slides]. Retrieved from SOCY7120, University of

Queensland Blackboard Online: https://learn.uq.edu.au/bbcswebdav/pid-704679-dt-content-rid-3159736_1/xid-3159736_1

Lyons. K. (2014c). *Week ten: The environment and sustainable development* [powerpoint slides].

Retrieved from SOCY7120, University of Queensland Blackboard Online:

https://learn.uq.edu.au/bbcswebdav/pid-766329-dt-content-rid-3497486_1/xid-3497486_1

McMichael, P. (2007) Chapter 1: 'Development and Globalisation: Framing Issues', in

Development and Social Change. A Global Perspective, Pine Forge Press, Los Angeles. pp. 284-303.

McMichael, P. (2007) Chapter 10: 'Rethinking Development' in *Development and Social Change. A Global Perspective*, Pine Forge Press, Los Angeles. pp. 1-24.

McMichael. P. (2009). Contemporary Contradictions of the Global Development Project:

geopolitics, global ecology and the 'development climate'. *Third World Quarterly*. 30(1). 247-262. Doi:10.1080/01436590802622987

Metherell. L. (2014). *DFAT survey shows dissatisfaction among former AusAID employees with*

merger. Retrieved from: <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2014-05-29/survey-shows-staff-dissatisfaction-over-dfat-ausaid-merger/5484860>

Morvaridi, B. (2012) 'Capitalist philanthropy and hegemonic partnerships'. *Third World Quarterly*,

3(7): 1191-1210. DOI: 10.1080/01436597.2012.691827

Natsios, A.S. (Fall 2009). Public/Private Alliances Transform Aid. *Stanford Social Innovation*

Review. Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/docview/217176233?accountid=14723>

- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (OECDa). (1995). *Support of private sector development, Development Co-operation Guidelines Series*. pp.1-42. Retrieved from: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/povertyreduction/36563372.pdf>
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (OECDb). (2013). *Aid to poor countries slips further as governments tighten budgets*. Retrieved from: <http://www.oecd.org/dac/aidtopoorcountriesslipsfurtherasgovernmentstightenbudgets.htm>
- Rio+20 Policy Brief. (2012). *A green economy for a planet under pressure*. (Policy brief 7). pp. 1-8. Retrieved from: http://www.icsu.org/rio20/policy-briefs/GreenEconomy_LR.pdf
- Rostow, W. W. (1971). *The stages of economic growth: a non-communist manifesto*. Cambridge [Eng.]: University Press.
- Schulpen, L & Gibbon, P. (2001). Private Sector Development: Policies, Practices and Problems. *World Development*, 30(1), 1-15. Doi: 10.1016/S0305-750X(01)00097-3
- Sumner, A. (2013). Global poverty, aid, and middle-income countries: Are the country classifications moribund or is global poverty in the process of ‘nationalizing’? (Working Paper No. 2013/062). Retrieved from UNU World Institute for Development Economics Research (UNU-WIDER) website: http://www.wider.unu.edu/publications/working-papers/2013/en_GB/wp2013-062/
- Radelet, S. (2006). A Primer on Foreign Aid. *Center for Global Development*. (Working Paper No. 92) pp. 1-24. Retrieved from: http://www.cgdev.org/files/8846_file_WP92.pdf
- Roy, A. (2001) *‘The Ladies Have Feelings, So ... Shall We Leave it to the Experts?’ Power Politics*, Cambridge: South End Press: pp. 1-34.
- United Nations. (2012). *Report of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Report No. A/CONF.216/16)*. p. 1-120. Retrieved from: http://www.unep.org/greeneconomy/Portals/88/documents/ger/ger_final_dec_2011/Green%20EconomyReport_Final_Dec2011.pdf

United Nations Environmental Program. (2011). *Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication*. p. 1-631. Retrieved from:

http://www.unep.org/greeneconomy/Portals/88/documents/ger/ger_final_dec_2011/Green%20EconomyReport_Final_Dec2011.pdf

Webster, A. (1990). *Modernisation Theory, Introduction to sociology of Development*. London, MacMillan.

White. H. (1997). International aid. *Forum for Applied Research and Public Policy*. 12(4). 45-52.

Retrieved from: <http://search.proquest.com.ezproxy.library.uq.edu.au/docview/235141019?accountid=14723>

Wikipedia (2014). *AusAID*. Retrieved from: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/AusAID>

World Vision Australia. (2012). *Campaign for change*. Retrieved from:

<http://campaign.worldvision.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/Overseas-aid-factsheet.pdf>

2ser 107.3. (2014). AidWorks 5th February 2014. *ACFID's Joy Kyriacou 8 Benchmarks for*

effective Aid. Retrieved from: <http://www.2ser.com/component/k2/itemlist/category/30-aidworks?start=20>

Appendix A

'Connect, Create, Conserve' (CCC) is an alternative to mainstream international aid and development; destructive global economic systems. It is a culturally interchangeable blueprint for global, socio-economics. By implementing project CCC, communities have the ability to regenerate natural environments and community build, while transforming a growth-based economy into a values-based economy.

Through encompassing artistic activities, values-based self and project development, and community building methodologies, highly ethical and passions-based social entrepreneurial businesses can be developed and managed. Long-term sustainability for improved local and

international social and environmental challenges can be achieved.

CCC modules can be implemented by utilising the 'Project Spiral' resource alone, or can be integrated with the 'Study Program Activities List (SPAL)' for a more detailed understanding of social entrepreneurialism.

Implementation materials consist of a daily schedule, icebreakers, 'Project Spiral' and relaxation techniques. When implementing CCC it is extremely important for all people involved in the delivery of this project to undertake initial and ongoing, in-depth cultural integrations for maximum understanding of local customs and traditions. This can be achieved through home stays, language training, and relationship building through attending local community gatherings and events.

Communities are offered demonstration workshops, usually with the assistance of a local partner organisation who can then implement the program. Online contact between the CCC implementers and the local organisation is continued to maintain monitoring and to offer requested assistance, but generally, the local community and local partner organisation remain independent throughout implementation, so that cultural customs and traditions are not altered by outside influences.

Schedules and project time-frames can be arranged by the local community and partner organisation, and in-person visits for evaluations and follow-ups should occur every six to twelve months by the international facilitators.

The daily schedule is an example of how CCC modules can be delivered holistically (Note that times will alter between different communities).

Note. Retrieved from Nomadic Hands. Copyright 2013 by Francis. S. Reprinted with permission.

Daily Schedule	
Icebreaker	15 - 30 mins
Project Spiral	1 - 3hrs
Project Spiral Share	30 mins
Study Program Activity / Guest Speaker	1 - 4hrs
Relaxation Technique	10-20 mins
Reflection and Logbook Entry	40 mins

Reflections
To be filled out after each workshop
What stood out for you?
What learning did you take?
What actions will you take?
What do you need to research?
To be filled out at the beginning of each next workshop
Did you take the action you said you would?
What was the result of those actions?
If you didn't take action, why not?

Project Spiral Questions

Note: Participants can draw, paint, sing, act, write a poem or story etc. as they complete each

Project Spiral Step.

1. Who are you right now?
2. Where do you want to be?
3. What are your values?
4. What is your idea?
5. Who can help?
6. Who has done it before?
7. Does the idea meet a need?
8. How to write my project plan?
9. What do you want to know?
10. Who do you want to talk to?

- 11. How much will it cost?
- 12. Create your action plan

The order of the twenty modules of SPAL can be implemented when the community and local partner organisation feel necessary. The following order however, is a guideline for implementation, in which SPAL modules can begin to be delivered in part or full.

Project Spiral	Study Program Activities List
Step 1	Evaluation and Documentation Action Learning (To be repeated monthly) Scheduling Change- Project and Self Effective Communication
Step 2	Community Needs Community Mapping Leadership
Step 3	Goal Setting
Step 4	Vision, Values, Mission
Step 5	Networking Problem Solving
Step 6	Proposals, Pitching and Presentation
Step 7	Risk Management
Step 8	Financial Planning
Step 9	Mentoring
Step 10	Funding Marketing
Step 11	Social Innovation
Step 12	Strategic Planning Business Plan Actions Social Return on Investment

Note. Retrieved from Nomadic Hands. Copyright 2013 by Francis. S. Reprinted with permission.

For further detail about CCC refer to <http://nomadichands.com/home/2013/11/ccc-alternate-aid/> or <http://nomadichands.com/home/2012/01/project-connect-create-consume/>

Appendix B

Rainbow gatherings are a movement held all throughout the world, and are based upon grassroots, participatory values, with the intention to live minimally in a mainstream system. Everybody is welcome to join the gatherings, regardless of age, race, gender, class, background or economic status. Many people come from the cities, and are generally showered with hugs and “I

love you"s upon arrival.

The community's values include love, peace, non-violence, environmentalism, non-consumerism and non-commercialism, volunteerism, respect for others, consensus process and diversity.

The rainbow family believe that cities, mainstream society, modern lifestyles and systems of government (which are refer to as babylon) are unhealthy, unsustainable, exploitative and out of harmony with the natural systems of the planet.

Great respect for natural environments is paramount, and there is no concept of time or money. The only instance when money is used, is for donations for food from participants, or donations from the community after a show is presented, which goes into a "magic hat". Shows incorporate music, song, dance and circus performances, plus key messages such including saving mother earth and anti-consumerism. The commonly stated one rule is that 'there are no rules', yet some practices such as drinking alcohol, for example, are not well looked upon by the community.

There are usually opportunities to engage in traditional practices with indigenous land owners, including the collection of wild growing fruits and berries, educational tours about firewood or medicinal plants, or to join in ceremonies. As there is only basic living, there are no facilities, so people are encouraged to assist in digging toilet pits. A sacred fire burns for the duration of the month-long gatherings, giving warmth to people who chose to sleep outside instead of a tent.

'Talking circles' are a way for people to talk about particular issues or to just share their feelings. A stick is passed around the circle, and whoever holds the stick is able to speak. This continues to be passed as many times as necessary around the circle, until everybody is finished talking. People are free to join or leave as they please. Anyone can call for a talking circle, and this is usually done after meal time.

Money from the "magic hat" buys food for the participants. Anyone who would like to join

the “food run” to collect the food is also welcome. There are two meals per day, and anyone can help to prepare meals. Prior to meal times, everyone holds hands in a circle and sings and hums together. After singing, everyone sits in a circle to eat. People volunteer themselves to help serve the food and to wash the large cooking pots. Each person usually brings their own store bought bowl to eat from, or makes one naturally (from a coconut for example).

People are welcome to offer workshops to the community. As there is no money exchange during the gatherings, the workshops are always free. Workshops range from sound therapy to massage, yoga and more. As there is no “time” people announce that workshops will be held “after the second meal,” for example.

There are always gatherings simultaneously in operation in various parts of the world. Also, when one Rainbow Gathering ends, another usually begins soon after in a country close by, and people join “caravans” (travelling groups) as a way to get to their new destination. Towards the end of the previous gathering, many talking circles are held for people wanting travel options to the next country. There are sometimes cycling caravans or horse caravans, or sometimes people hitch-hike or busk on public transport. If people don't have money for a passport or their visa, many groups will put on a show in the cities and towns to raise the funds required.

Rainbow Gatherings are made up of communities of people from all walks of life from hundreds of countries, who want an alternative lifestyle to the mainstream. People reminded of what is most important for enhancing a natural way of life.