Stakeholders on the Periphery of Citizenship in NGO/Corporate Engagement

One important discussion circulating in non-government organisation (NGO) literature relates to the increasing advocacy role of international NGOs and the political dilemmas that emerge at the nexus of North/South NGO relations. In other words how do "Northern" NGOs act as advocates for "Southern" peoples and not duplicate the wider impositions of a world divided by economic power and influence? Are "Northern" NGOs, by their very nature, inevitably exclusive in their advocacy operations? Can grass roots activists or local people of the South rely on Northern NGOs to improve, empower, or assist their citizenship in crucial negotiations with multinational corporations (MNCs) for example?

Drawing on PhD research completed in 2001, this paper will address these questions, focussing on the joint strategies of corporate citizenship and NGO/corporate engagement (Phillips, 2000). It will explore how Northern NGO advocacy processes risk leaving key stakeholders on the periphery of citizenship. Evidence from a case study on the corporate engagement activities of Oxfam Community Aid Abroad (Oxfam CAA) in the earlier stages of their ongoing ‘Mining Campaign’, reveals a ‘natural’ exclusion of the least powerful stakeholders – the key stakeholders the campaign was aimed at benefiting. It is suggested that this exclusion results from the failure of active corporate citizens pursuing their ‘social bottom line’ and NGOs acting as advocates, to take on board a policy of citizenship based inclusion in their agenda development and decision making processes.

1 Use of the terms “Northern” and Southern”, although geographically inappropriate in their application to Australia, stems from a widely understood Eurocentric, Northern Hemisphere distinction between economically and industrially developed nations of the “North” and less developed or developing nations.
Analysis of the positioning of indigenous and local peoples affected by Australian based mining companies targeted by Oxfam CAA in their campaign revealed a certain level of tyranny of economic, cultural and corporate power over the equal participation of those peoples. This raises larger questions about the role of ‘Northern’ NGOs as advocates for peoples or communities in ‘Southern’ states. In this case, it specifically relates to engagement with multinational ‘corporate citizens’, which, by their very nature, are reluctant power sharers. NGOs need to engage with the issue of what role they can or ‘fail’ to play in contributing to ‘inclusive’ citizenship development for the people whose interests they champion. Attention is often drawn to the importance of the “North” contributing to the democratisation of developing nations. For NGOs, this is achieved indirectly, as it is an apparent characteristic of international development or aid NGOs to sidestep or avoid direct political confrontations with states to ensure access to conduct programmes and development practice. However, given the increasing advocacy activities of such organisations, citizenship status must be a key consideration. Therefore, if inclusive citizenship is to be understood as integral to democratisation, it is argued that it should be a primary policy goal for NGO advocacy, international activism, and global corporate citizenship. It is also argued that it would present a stronger contextual argument in dealing with corporate citizens, drawing on their ideas of social responsibility and reputational capital.

This paper assumes that citizenship is broadly understood as a recognisable political, social and civic status that facilitates a voice and a place in a global, national or local communal context. It also acknowledges the reconceptualisation of citizenship as "supranational citizenship" as proposed by Deacon et al, which further opens up possibilities for citizenship discussions to be part of development and NGO considerations and has influenced the positioning of this paper (1997: 16-18). The key link with this idea is the association between human rights and common social citizenship rights, which were a crucial component of the case study research discussed in this paper. Hence, 'citizenship' can be seen from an aspirational and flexible understanding that should be achievable at all levels of institutional, political and social interaction. Clearly, in the context of some countries, the association of rights and citizenship will vary greatly therefore the wider, functional 'active citizen' is a more applicable understanding of citizenship in this discussion. It follows that the notion of inclusive citizenship, in effect, mitigates exclusion from of the “South”. It is a widely used and understood notion in development and international relations discourses.
power and resource sharing as well as facilitating a voice, or the capacity to be heard. Citizenship inclusion then, captures individuals' and communities' rights to safety, political voice, environmental and economic resources and work, key demands of NGO advocacy in corporate engagement.

**NGO Advocacy Practice**

NGOs as global actors is an under-theorised field of research. It is agreed by many that they have an increasingly significant role in the global context (eg: Deacon, et al, 1997; Held, et al 1999; Simmons, 1998; Higgott et al, 2000 and; O’Brien, et al, 2000), or as Deacon states are "key constructors of the terms of debates about how the world is changing" (1997: 158). Their role in global social policy and local social policy is increasing, therefore their activities and strategies are worthy of closer analysis.

Corporate engagement can emerge in many ways, for example, through foundations funded by corporations and corporate tendering processes that offer funds for projects that are of key interest to NGOs (such as development projects, arts and cultural projects, species preservation projects or environmental rehabilitation projects). It can also relate to ‘partnerships’ between NGOs and corporations on specific projects, however, the key interest in this discussion is corporate engagement as an NGO advocacy strategy.

As Keck and Sikkink note, activists in advocacy networks are concerned with political effectiveness that includes change by “target actors” such as MNCs (1998:23). Keck and Sikkink point out that this is a type of “leverage politics” including both moral and material aims (1998:23). Corporate engagement as an advocacy practice for NGOs relies strongly on gaining moral or material leverage by either using the media, thus “mobilising shame” against or seeking to negotiate positive outcomes with individual MNCs.

NGO advocacy implies a struggle for gain from those with power to improve the capacity of those without power or with little power to determine their own livelihoods. It can also be seen as a means of representing a struggle for equal citizenship at whatever level the process of advocacy takes place.
There is a firmly entrenched social welfare NGO advocacy process towards the state and state institutions, with a long history of NGO participation, particularly in the developed world and increasingly in the developing world (MDS 2000:2). NGO advocacy is also well established in relation to human and environmental rights and issues with governments and international institutions like the World Bank, making links to international policies (Deacon, et al, 1997; Tuijl, 1999; Mathews, 1997; Simmons, 1998; O’Brien, et al, 2000). However, corporate engagement as strategic advocacy is relatively new and presents challenges in terms of power relations between the advocates, the represented interests and MNCs (see Heap, 2000).

With some 25,540 internationally active NGOs, there is huge scope in what these organisations can achieve (Taylor, 2002: 339). Salamon et al, suggest that NGOs are uniquely placed to perform advocacy “to push for changes in societal conditions” (2000: 6). NGOs are outside the market and the state and have the resource capacity of mobilisation of volunteers and public interest. According to Salamon, et al, NGOs are in a position to serve as:

- a link between individuals and the broader political process providing a way to bring group concerns to broader public attention and to push for policy or broader social change, not only on behalf of those belonging to a group but also on behalf of the general public (2000:6).

Although Salamon, et al, are referring to the broadest notion of a ‘nonprofit’ organisation, their description of how they function in advocacy, is applicable to NGOs using advocacy as a strategy for change. The type of “policy advocacy” described by Salamon, et al (2000) and Fisher (1998), although NGO/state or international institution oriented, is the best means of understanding the process of corporate engagement as an advocacy strategy. It is also conducive to making links between advocacy and citizenship, by strengthening public recognition of infringements on rights of citizens and facilitating the voice of citizens.

However, corporate engagement suggests a civic involvement at a global rather than national or state level and, instead of confronting governments, NGOs confront MNCs as advocates for citizens and communities as well as for broad social change.

As Fisher (1998) observes about ‘political advocacy’ (advocacy directed toward the state), that, due to its scope, including “quiet negotiation on limited organizational objectives to mass protests on major issues” it is only possible, as a strategy in reasonably democratic contexts (Fisher, 1998:
For NGOs working with communities with less democratic states, dealing directly with MNCs creates new potential for not only improving immediate human rights and material outcomes but, contributing to a process of democratisation through the empowerment of local communities, thus strengthening citizenship at the local level. This occurs especially when ‘Northern’ NGOs are negotiating for conditions or outcomes based on their country of origin’s democratically informed standards and values. However, it is at this nexus that there is also a risk of exclusion of key stakeholder citizens, such communities or social groups excluded from wider political, civic or economic citizenship.

Fisher breaks down political advocacy for developing country (Southern) NGOs into several techniques. She notes that they can sometimes be used simultaneously and include: “friendly persuasion; ‘acupuncture’; legal and lobbying efforts; electoral politics; networking and mass advocacy” (Fisher, 1998: 109). Although Fisher’s work does not mention NGO/corporate engagement, these techniques can be applied similarly, in the advocacy efforts of NGOs towards MNCs. The “acupuncture” technique, which is defined as “placing a needle at the points of a sick system” [the state] (Fisher, 1998: 110) reflects a key aspect of NGO/corporate engagement. For example, advocacy as ongoing ‘dialogue’ aims to change not only individual MNC policy but collective corporate or industry policy, over a period of time. It also involves mobilising MNCs collectively to self-regulate and modify their behaviour to satisfy NGO advocacy claims, as with the attempts by Oxfam CAA and other NGOs to ensure a wide-ranging code of conduct for mining companies.

In the development and aid field, and to some extent within environmental NGOs from developed countries, adopting an advocacy function is a response to the contemporary globalised context. The heightened priority of human rights issues which, as Lipschutz observes, has “come into existence as a response to the global institutionalisation of norms relating to human rights” has been a key factor (1992: 394). The growth in indigenous peoples’ movements globally, is also a key influence on the growth of advocacy as a role for many social movement NGOs. This is clearly linked to how individual NGOs are placed in terms of their core activities. That is, their contact and involvement with developing countries, human rights organisations and activists and indigenous peoples’ organisations and activists. It is, however, also part of a growing awareness of the fundamental importance of these issues in all spheres of politics and economics. Like their corporate counterparts, NGO activists have sensed the political importance human rights and
indigenous issues have gained in the past decade or so and recognise the crucial links between key
global environmental issues and human rights and indigenous issues. For development NGOs,
these issues have emerged as the politics of development have transformed, along with its
economic and political contexts.

Many development and aid and other social movement NGOs are faced with a series of choices
about how they respond and act in relation to communities or individuals requesting or requiring
citizenship support. Often this is to achieve both human rights and material solutions to their
position of (mostly) extreme disadvantage, displacement, or victimisation. In this instance, the
perception or reality is that MNCs are either the cause of disadvantage and problems or are best
placed to address the grievances of those seeking Northern NGO advocacy.

The resources for effective advocacy are high as it “requires a sharp understanding and analysis of
a concrete problem and a coherent proposal for its solution” (VeneKlasen, 1996: 225). This
suggests a critical need to maximise both short and long-term outcomes in the advocacy process.

Another challenge for ‘Northern’ NGOs that are operating from overseas and with urban-based
local NGOs is that they may not be sufficiently in touch with local communities to be truly
effective. As VeneKlasen observed:

Too often projects are cooked up in the urban headquarters of NGOs by NGO leaders who
assume they know the true nature of the problems faced by poor people in rural or urban
communities. Thus, engaging those who are intended to benefit from advocacy… in the
process of defining and analysing a problem and determining the policy solution is new for
some NGOs (1996: 231).

This issue could be addressed by adopting key citizenship goals in the advocacy process. In other
words, support for ongoing citizenship participation in relation to MNCs must be a key objective
of Northern NGO advocacy. The articulation of an advocacy strategy that embraces inclusive
citizenship would have to be seeking multiple gains, it would have to press for power sharing with
MNCs in relation to decisions about infrastructure, resources, management, compensation and
social welfare. It would also have to be about ensuring a position of strength rather than fear in
relation to the partnerships MNCs develop with governments, in protecting their interests. In some
cases, this may even mean that an operation is significantly modified or even closed down if it
poses a threat to the livelihoods and citizenship of the people or community most affected by
corporate activity. One of the limitations of a human rights based advocacy is it tends to embark on struggles that seek to redress one transgression of rights at a time. What a notion of citizenship inclusion would offer is a set of rights and expectations that are widely understood as being tied together. The corporate citizenship base theory of an economic, social and environmental ‘bottom line’ could been seen as the fundamental framework for inclusive citizenship for peoples affected by MNC activities.

The Case Study
The focus of the data collected in the case study was the emergence, motivation, and progress of the Oxfam CAA Mining Campaign. It was found that the advocacy processes occurred on two levels: at the first level, it was policy driven (by Oxfam CAA internal policy) and at the second level, it was demand driven, by responding to practical problems/issues and requests for help. The beginnings of the campaign were during 1994 and 1995. This occurred when, at the policy level, it was apparent that the idea of engagement with corporations was becoming an important consideration for NGOs, and, at the same time, a strong human rights advocacy focus was emerging in Oxfam CAA. The second level of development of the campaign occurred as this focus became directed at the mining industry in response to demands from ‘the field’\(^2\), and events around mines owned by Australian mining MNCs in the South East Asian and Pacific region.

Data for the case study was drawn from interviews and primary sources from Oxfam CAA and other agencies such as the Minerals Policy Institute (MPI) located in Sydney and the Australian Conservation Foundation (ACF), based in Melbourne. The data not only reflects the shifting nature of stakeholder interaction in the Mining Campaign but also the complex political interface involved in corporate engagement as an advocacy strategy for NGOs. It is at that interface that citizenship issues arise and is therefore the focus of this paper.

The Oxfam CAA Mining Campaign related specifically to the activity of lobbying and negotiating with Australian based mining MNCs (or with a majority Australian ownership), to achieve outcomes for local and indigenous people affected by mining activity, mainly in Indonesia, Papua New Guinea and the Philippines. What emerges clearly from the interview data is that, although

\(^2\) ‘The Field’ in this context refers to work done by Programmes Staff in CAA (Oxfam Australia) (Oxfam Australia) who are running, coordinating and managing development, aid and relief projects in developing countries such as Indonesia, Papua New Guinea and the Philippines.
Oxfam CAA made a strategic decision to embark on a mining campaign, it did not initially set out to form ‘partnerships’ or relationships with the mining MNCs. As part of the campaign, Oxfam CAA engaged in a range of approaches to the MNCs, depending on the specific case or events they were responding to or confronting. This means that sometimes Oxfam CAA worked with mining companies and sometimes against them. However, based on an identified trend toward diminishing autonomy, the closer CAA (Oxfam Australia) got to the mining companies the more aware they became of the danger of losing strategic advantage in their advocacy. This loss of strategic advantage flowed on to the key stakeholders who never really gained citizenship status in the negotiations. This was because of their exclusion from what emerged as an exclusive “North” to “North” dialogue between MNC executives and Oxfam CAA executive level officers.

It should be noted that the Mining Campaign also included Oxfam CAA’s efforts to develop and contribute to codes, ethics and best practice and benchmarks for Australian based mining companies from 1996 to 2000. The establishment of a Mining Ombudsman and a contribution to the development of Commonwealth Government legislation for a Corporate Code of Practice, in 2000, were two broad policy level initiatives within the Mining Campaign. These strategies signalled a more ‘evolved’ direction and are the current focus for the campaign in 2003. ³

Key motivations for and influences on the development of an advocacy policy driving the Oxfam CAA Mining Campaign can be summarised as:

1. Broad Advocacy Influences:
   - An emerging emphasis on human rights and advocacy within Oxfam CAA
   - A range of globally acknowledged events and influences which saw corporations turn to NGOs for advice and engagement.
   - A cumulative lack of success in advocacy campaigns with state and international institutions exercising effective controls over the behaviour of MNCs. This resulted in a shift of advocacy toward the private sector by NGOs.

³ It should also be noted that as the CAA (Oxfam Australia) Mining Campaign developed, it gained an indefinite status, and was ongoing during and at the conclusion of this research. Therefore, this thesis documents the activities of the CAA (Oxfam Australia) project up to November 2000, and should be viewed as a snapshot of an ongoing process. It should also be noted that the Mining Campaign was originally referred to as the ‘Indonesian Mining Campaign’ (IMC). As it evolved and expanded it was referred to, simply, as the ‘Mining Campaign’. This transformation of the name and the nature of the campaign took place during the period of primary research on the case study, from March, 1999 through to November 2000.
A realisation that globalisation meant MNCs were becoming more important players, and national governments became less significant in the global political economy.

2. Specific Mining Issues

- A surge of Australian mining interests in South East Asia in the early to mid 1990s.
- Ok Tedi (Papua New Guinea) events, raising many issues associated with Australian mining MNC operations in developing countries.
- A Oxfam CAA actor’s visit to the Porgera Mine in PNG and Placer Pacific’s response to the publication of a story in Oxfam CAA’s ‘Horizons’ magazine on the visit.
- The emergence of local activism around mining in Indonesia by grass roots NGOs and Oxfam CAA field staff support for a local Indonesian mining campaign.

An important condition for the emergence of the campaign was the high level of awareness in Oxfam CAA and the wider international NGO sector, of the changing global political economy and how Oxfam CAA (Australia), in particular, responded to those changes. The NGO politics surrounding corporate engagement are underpinned by beliefs about how NGOs should respond to the increasingly powerful role of MNCs, particularly in Southern economies.

In the specific context of engaging mining MNCs, Oxfam CAA was challenging the central axis of corporate power in the Australian context as well as the global context. Oxfam CAA’s engagement with the mining industry reflects an engagement with what is fundamental to market dominance within Australia and globally. However, it was also a response to a shift in corporate thinking that embraced a now commonly accepted strategy of ‘corporate social responsibility’.

Background to the Development of the Campaign

Documentation of the emergence of the Mining Campaign reflects transformations within Oxfam CAA towards an increasing advocacy role as part of its core functions, since the establishment of the Public Policy Unit (PPU) set up in 1991. Oxfam CAA has always seen itself as a social change agency and its development programme has always had a strong social justice emphasis, however, it wasn’t until the 1990s that human rights became central to that commitment.

There are numerous, documented human rights violations directly related to mining in the three major sites of Oxfam CAA’s campaign, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea (PNG) and the Philippines.
Derived from information gathered through Oxfam CAA staff from people living around mine sites throughout Oxfam CAA’s entire programme network (including places as far away as Ghana and Chile) a set of consistent environmental and human rights problems related to mining emerged. They environmental effects such as sedimentation in rivers water pollution affecting daily life activities; the disappearance of fish and other fauna; the loss of agricultural land; damaging social effects such as gambling, alcoholism and prostitution; direct human rights abuses at the hands of police or armed forces and so on (Atkinson, 1998: 2).

Because of the cultural importance of land to indigenous people and the economics of life in remote areas of developing countries having a strong reliance on the productive natural environment, it is difficult to distinguish environmental problems from human rights problems (Oxfam CAA, 2000: 3-5). In Indonesia, this is a particularly important issue, as the Indonesian government has no policy that recognises the existence of indigenous people, let alone their rights to traditional lands. The Indonesian government has pursued a policy of assimilation of the diverse indigenous peoples of its remote regions, involving resettlement, transmigration, modernisation, appropriation of customary lands, and the standardisation of agricultural practices (Atkinson, 1998: 20). Oxfam CAA has a clearly stated view on land rights in this context:

    Community Aid Abroad believes that mining companies should recognise and respect those rights, whether required to by law or not. They can and should, where necessary, go beyond the standards set by national law in order to meet the requirements of natural justice.

    …mining companies should accept the rights of land-owners, whether traditional or not, to negotiate access to their land, to determine whether or not exploration or mining takes place on their land, and if it does, under what conditions (Atkinson, 1998A: 3).

This sentiment underlies both how Oxfam CAA programmes are carried out in the field more broadly and the development of Oxfam CAA’s advocacy role as played out in the Mining Campaign. The expectation that MNCs will act responsively to the local community is also embedded in corporate citizenship discourse.

There is significant power in the recognition of citizenship in mining situations, a clear opportunity to pinpoint advocacy claims. There is often an ‘absent-state’ condition of operation for mining companies in developing countries which offers opportunities for MNCs to make very positive contributions to the community in terms of economic and social infrastructure, but also
explains the powerful and potentially tyrannous position they can hold in a local community. Instruments of the state that remain available are those that address political unrest or civil disputes: the local police and in some cases, the military. The use of law enforcement to resolve disputes around mine sites has a long and often violent history in the South East Asia and Pacific regions. Although Oxfam CAA would not support the withdrawal of the state from the provision of basic services and infrastructure, pressure for corporate responsibility is supported by the social justice position Oxfam CAA holds in relation to responsibility for effects of mining on local peoples and communities.

It is important to see a distinction between the work of the campaign that emerged on a case by case basis, according to the effects and impact of individual mines (the first level) and the broader campaign, aimed at the mining industry as a whole (the second level). However, there are important linkages between the different, functional aspects of the campaign, each informing the other as the campaign proceeded. The distinct ‘case by case advocacy campaign’ and the broader industry-targeted advocacy campaign also reflect the difference between the two levels of the campaign as well as illustrating different types of corporate engagement or advocacy practice. The ‘first level’ was the mine-focussed action as it related to work in ‘the field’ and engagement with specific companies. The ‘second level’ of advocacy was the broader campaign, relating to policy linked to human rights and equity principles, and linked to and reflecting a global NGO trend toward corporate engagement. Both levels of the campaign can be seen to be encouraging “strategic global” corporate citizenship ‘goals’ in the operation and practices of the corporations targeted by the campaign. Arguably this it is opportune to introduce the notion of inclusive citizenship into the advocacy process.

Whether to work with or against MNCs is a wider question that is at the crux of controversial NGO politics around corporate engagement and emerged as a persistent issue throughout the research, however it will not be addressed in this paper.

**Human Rights Policy and Advocacy Development Toward the Mining Campaign**

As mentioned above, despite Oxfam CAA’s social justice commitment in the past, the adoption of a human rights policy position and an advocacy role beyond the state were relatively new to the organisation. This is surprising in many respects, and some Oxfam CAA actors argued that they
had always been doing “human rights” activities or that human rights was an inappropriate policy direction for Oxfam CAA to pursue.

According to Mike Evans, a member of the Oxfam CAA National Executive (and involved in the organisation since 1973) the Roses Gap National Conference, held in the Grampions, Victoria in 1990, is when contemporary human rights issues were put firmly on Oxfam CAA’s organisational agenda. The organisation decided it would focus more resources on public policy and education and set up the Public Policy and Education Unit (PPE, previously referred to as the PPU). It was seen as having a direct advocacy aspect to it as well as a community educational role to raise awareness generally in Australian society. Evans observed of the time:

I don't think at that stage the actual form that the advocacy would take was all that clear. It was more a general view that this was a direction that CAA [Oxfam CAA] needed to move in if we were going to make a more significant impact in development. It had to be through advocacy and campaigning and we couldn't rely solely on development (Evans, M., 1999: 30/6).

The introduction of advocacy into the core functions of Oxfam CAA related to progressing from asking for more aid and bigger aid budgets toward a focus on sustainable environment, improving communities for people to live in and improved human rights. According to Evans, in its broader sense, it offered a vision for human rights.

I think it all started to grow from that point - we realised that you couldn't always make an adequate impact through the government sector and that there was a private sector that could also make an impact. Therefore, it was appropriate that we should take some advocacy positioning towards the private sector - certainly given Australia's particular situation with mining companies (Evans, M. 1999: 30/6).

In establishing the PPE unit, it was also agreed that Oxfam CAA would move away from short sharp campaigns to longer, thematic, strategic campaigns. Based on this principle, the Basic Rights Campaign emerged, as did the Mining Campaign as a strategic aspect of it (Evans, M. 1999: 30/6).

Henderson, a past long-term Chair of the Oxfam CAA National Executive (Board) also held the view that the organisation had adopted two new forms of advocacy, “engagement with the private
sector” and the introduction of a human rights agenda (Henderson, 1999: 28/6). Henderson stated that the association between human rights and development was a relatively new area for Oxfam CAA, becoming the recent focus of campaigns. Henderson attributed this shift in emphasis to some external pressures, including changing ideas about the role human rights had in development and the growth of local NGOs in developing countries raising human rights issues. However, she also indicated that the shift came from within the organisation, particularly from staff working in the field, who were recognising the important political dimension of their work. She also saw this having an impact on the way Oxfam CAA delivered services in the field, suggesting that it was more important to build capacity for local service delivery, putting the organisation in a “secondary, tertiary NGO service” role (Henderson, 1999: 28/6).

In contrast, the Asia Regional Manager, Adams, had a less positive view of the incorporation of a human rights policy into programme (field) work. He stated that human rights was not a focus “embedded deeply” in Oxfam CAA’s programming, but more part of the “public positioning” of the organisation.

The suggested difference in point of view on a rights based approach is reflective of differing perspectives between practice and policy. Endemic to most service organisations with a structural split between policy makers and practitioners or fieldworkers, the political objectives will sometimes be in conflict. Interestingly, the issue of a tension between rights and responsibilities (obligations) is also employed in pragmatic views of miners or mine executives in the debate about how to manage conflicting demands between local people, the mine and local NGOs with broader principles informing their agendas. Adams alluded to a complex distinction between pragmatic, immediate outcomes for people facing poverty and political struggles that utilise rights based arguments in advancing the relationship between development and democratisation or liberation. There is an implication that by pursuing a rights based campaign, issues such as state responsibility for structural economic disadvantage can be lost to a cause such as corporate responsibility. Adam’s view, however, was in contrast to the position of key players in the Mining Campaign. His position appeared to be seen as part of the tension between ‘field’ staff by the policy makers in the campaign whose ideas followed those put forward by National Executive members (Henderson and Evans).
Clearly, the Mining Campaign reflected some significant changes in philosophy and resource distribution within Oxfam CAA. The campaign not only indicated a change in direction for the organisation away from advocacy toward the state to advocacy toward MNCs, it also reflected a broader shift in the way development/aid organisations viewed their purpose. This is described below:

There are two changes that have taken place in CAA (Oxfam CAA), one is a change from advocacy mainly directed towards governments to one mainly directed towards corporations. The other change is a change in the way in which we think about what we do and that's where the Basic Rights Campaign comes in. Here, we change from seeing what we do as charity and out of the goodness of our hearts because we are rich and we feel sorry for you people (what I call a charity mentality), to a mentality which says we assist people in the third world not because we are so good hearted but because its their right as human beings to have clean water (Atkinson, 1999:19/3).

Atkinson further explained that the shift away from charitable motives was because Oxfam CAA had an ‘obligation’ to acknowledge these issues as human rights issues not simply as disadvantage. Thus, the Basic Rights Campaign signalled a change in the way Oxfam CAA perceived its relationship between itself and the recipients of its developmental assistance and aid. Atkinson wanted to emphasise that it was a fundamental shift in the language and understanding of the organisation’s view of its recipients. They were to be viewed not as “the recipients of charity” but as “people who have rights that are being denied and legitimately demanding those rights”. Oxfam CAA saw itself as responding to those demands and ensuring that the material assistance and the advocacy process provided to people in developing communities was a means of facilitating the “process of gaining basic rights” (Atkinson, 1999: 19/3). The broader use of the notion of human rights as it applies to material as well as personal and political rights can be seen most clearly in relation to the elevated profile of indigenous land rights issues. It can also be seen as a means of strengthening social, civil and economic citizenship.

Consistent with Henderson’s view above, advocacy was increasingly encouraged as a direction for Oxfam CAA by its staff working in the field. This was directly related to a growth in the number of grass roots NGOs emerging with a clear focus on advocacy, as well as existing NGO partners taking up a human rights advocacy approach. It was also consistent with a worldwide trend in
developing countries as described by Fisher (1998) and, in the case of Indonesia, reflective of an improved democratisation, affording more freedom for local NGOs to form.

The evolving nature of the Mining Campaign has to be seen in the broader context of what was happening in the increasingly interconnected global NGO and business sectors. This included the emergence of engagement between NGOs and MNCs in the relationships between the developed and developing nations in the latter part of the 1990s. This broader context influenced the development of policy on the Mining Campaign and must be acknowledged as a motivating factor. Ideas of corporate citizenship were becoming widespread among MNCs at the time.

In 1997, Oxfam CAA established a clearly designated project, in Indonesia, to engage Australian mining companies. This action was based on the following policy statement;

..Community Aid Abroad believes that we have a responsibility to raise awareness in Australia about the impact of this type of commercial activity on the rights of the world's poor, to assist those who are faced with loss of their land and livelihood, and to dialogue with the companies involved (Oxfam CAA, 1999).

The Mining Campaign was an important vehicle for the new focus of advocacy work launched through the Basic Rights Campaign. The key shift in policy that saw the development of the Basic Rights Campaign and the Mining Campaign, was the adoption of a human rights development framework. The notion of human rights as an objective for peoples’ struggles in integrally linked to citizenship development. Human rights advocacy risks abstraction if the entire citizenship context is not an objective of the advocacy. In other words, it is not enough to win one right if the lack of others means it cannot be exercised. Resource sharing and decision-making power, are key citizenship rights but without economic rights, it is unlikely they will be greatly exercised or indeed beneficial.

**Corporate Engagement and Citizenship**

The overall conduct of the Mining Campaign was not based on a planned, strategic model, an observation supported by a CAA commissioned, external advocacy evaluation (Kelly et al, 2001: 13). CAA was embarking on a new type of advocacy, not only for their organisation, but within the wider NGO sector. Demonstrating its evolving nature, the Mining Campaign, can be seen in
three phases of development, beginning prior to the launch of the campaign and evolving as it progressed over a number of years. They can be described as the:

2. **Negotiation phase**: 1997-99, characterised by ‘constructive engagement’ or ‘dialogue’ with mining executives, broadening to become the more inclusive ‘Mining Campaign’.
3. **Strategic phase**: 2000 onwards, characterised by a ‘maturity’ in judgement which emerged around corporate engagement and wider advocacy goals, both in within CAA and the global NGO network. The main display of ‘maturity’ was indicated by two key aspects: first, the campaign’s emphasis on industry-wide targeted strategies and; second, a policy not to attend meetings or seminars run exclusively by mining MNCs, where the mining MNCs set and controlled the agenda.

The table below (Table 1) although not inclusive of every instance of corporate engagement in the Mining Campaign (such as meetings and consultations), includes a summary of all of the significant engagement events. Ten out of the fourteen documented engagements were immediately positive for the advocacy process, meaning that they either led to another engagement opportunity or improved the overall relationship between Oxfam CAA and the mining MNCs. What the table does not indicate is the longer-term impact of each engagement. As is found in the wider research, there were very limited concrete outcomes for the key stakeholders. For example, the 1998/99 engagement with Rio Tinto over the Kelian mine led to an agreement for eviction compensation but three years later it had not been payed due to disputes between the company and local people about how the compensation should be distributed. Therefore the seeming progress made in the “North” to “North” dialogue between the Oxfam CAA executive officers and the Rio Tinto executives could not be transferred when the previously excluded key stakeholders directly entered the engagement process. A key question about the advocacy role of the NGO is what did they do to strengthen the citizenship position of the key stakeholders in their dialogue with Rio Tinto executives in the Melbourne head office? Further, who set the agenda for the facilitated negotiation between mine management and the local stakeholders? Given Oxfam CAA’s later disillusionment with Rio Tinto it would seem that the "North" to "North" dialogue had not been a productive advocacy strategy and that the local people at the Kelian mine were left of the periphery of that dialogue.
Similarly the engagement with Aurora Gold in 1998/99, as indicated in the Table 1, appeared to have very positive outcomes from the dialogue, however, despite a written agreement emerging from the dialogue none of the key issues were resolved for the range of local people affected by the mine. The complexities of conflict in the communities around the mine precipitated violence and even death. Also, as reported from the Aurora Gold perspective, the fact that Oxfam CAA had no first hand knowledge of the situation diminished their effectiveness as advocates for the local people. Again, the local people were not directly involved in setting agendas or participating in dialogue with the company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Company/Mine Engaged with.</th>
<th>Engagement.</th>
<th>Type of Engagement</th>
<th>Outcome for CAA Advocacy Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Placer Dome Asia Pacific-Porgera Mine, PNG</td>
<td>Published photograph of effluent flowing into the river.</td>
<td>Confrontational</td>
<td>Positive - started dialogue later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>BHP - Ok Tedi, PNG</td>
<td>Dead fish demonstration at BHP AGM in Melbourne.</td>
<td>Confrontational</td>
<td>Negative - good publicity but hostility from BHP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Aurora Gold - Indo Muro Mine, Indonesia</td>
<td>Negative publicity tour, including a ‘land claim’ on an Aurora executive’s personal property.</td>
<td>Confrontational</td>
<td>Positive - although slow - started dialogue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 July</td>
<td>Rio Tinto</td>
<td>Meeting with Rio Tinto Head (RT) office (Melbourne) with JATAM Rep. Re update Kelian mine &amp; corporate values.</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Negative - decided that RT wasn’t committed to corp. responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/00</td>
<td>Placer Dome Asia Pacific (PDAP) &amp; Western Mining Co (WMC).</td>
<td>Dialogue, meetings to discuss development of benchmarks for mining practice in host countries.</td>
<td>Constructive</td>
<td>Positive - in building stakeholder relationship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999/01</td>
<td>Placer Dome Asia Pacific (PDAP) &amp; Western Mining Co (WMC).</td>
<td>Research - PDAP - Misima mine community impact study. WMC - Tampakan community consultation in exploration study.</td>
<td>Constructive &amp; Strategic</td>
<td>Gained co-operation from both mines in study – CAA, NGOs and miners were better informed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three phases of the mining campaign are also reflected in Table 1. The predominance of confrontational engagement in the early period, even prior to the formal launch of the campaign, reflects the first, ‘confrontational phase’. This involved several forms of protest designed to draw attention to the activities of certain mining companies and their impact on local people, including bringing local people to Australia. The second phase is based on mostly constructive advances, predominantly ‘dialogue’ focussed and in the third, the negotiation phase, Oxfam CAA established its own protocols for engagement, setting out its strategic goals and guiding principles. Emphasising the local level, it set out appropriate conditions for meeting with corporations, emphasising documentation, transparency and reporting back to staff, particularly those working in the field. It also drew a line about not accepting financial assistance from mining MNCs in the process of the campaign, an important step in addressing the question of how far to go in the engagement process. However, there were no conditions that local key stakeholders would be included in the dialogue with corporate executives. There may be many practical resource reasons for this but its impact reflects the key problem of the capacity for effective advocacy when the key stakeholders are excluded from agenda setting and actual dialogue. This absence sets up structural exclusion and lessens the potential for inclusive citizenship for the key stakeholders.

After the first phase, Oxfam CAA found that it was beneficial to continue dialogue with the companies at an executive level to protect the integrity of the access they established between the local people and mine management. The ongoing dialogue, meetings in boardrooms, was challenging and, as described by one ex-Oxfam CAA informant, ‘seductive’, but did present learning opportunities, and is indicative of the negotiation phase of the campaign. It is at this point that the weakness of this form of engagement resulted in the exclusion of the key stakeholders. It
is also evident that distinction between positioning of the 'Northern' NGO as an "equal" level citizen is what opened doors to the executive boardrooms of the targeted MNCs.

In the most recent, strategic phase, Oxfam CAA, having recognised the ‘seduction’ of talk, developed a more critical policy. They decided not to participate in “talk-fests” just because they had been invited, restricting their corporate engagement to strategic meetings only. This reflects a maturity that emerged in the campaign, avoiding an assumed complicity that MNCs can adopt in their community liaison audits. By this stage, clearly influenced by prevailing corporate citizenship aspirations, the large mining MNCs with which Oxfam CAA had engaged, had begun to organise seminars, briefings and meetings with a wide number of Australian NGOs to build an expanded ‘stakeholder’ community. Oxfam CAA also found they were being contacted constantly by mining companies to be ‘sounded out’ for their views on issues, technically amounting to free expert consultation, thus revealing a risk of opening the engagement door too far.

A clearly strategic initiative adopted in the campaign in the later phase, was the establishment of a Mining Ombudsman in Oxfam CAA. The role of the ombudsman was as a contact person for complaints from local communities about mining practices ‘abusing’ their rights. Announced in February 2000, it had a legitimate investigative function but was also employed to place strategic pressure on the Australian mining industry to establish its own independent, formal mechanism for people affected by mining practices (Atkinson, 2000: 13). Participation in the Democrats-led development for a legislated Code of Conduct is also levelled at the industry as a whole and shows a fresh attempt to re-involve the state as the nexus for changing corporate behaviour. The nature of this type of advocacy was to force overall mining industry or individual MNCs to change their policies relating to mining in developing countries. Given the power of MNCs achievements in this form of advocacy would have great potential for inclusive citizenship processes. Major shifts in policy regarding local infrastructure investment, local employment and sustainability would be key contributing factors to strengthen local citizenship.

In 2001 the Mining Ombudsman has become the single advocacy strategy of the Mining Campaign. Integral to the Ombudsman is the establishment of a set of “benchmarks for the mining industry and specifications for establishing an industry complaints mechanism” with the objective of providing:
…communities affected by mining with a fair, independent and non-threatening intermediary that would investigate their grievances and hold companies to account where appropriate (Oxfam CAA, 2002: 1)

The 2001-2002 Annual Report of the Mining Ombudsman states that most of the mining MNCs they engaged with “have demonstrated an unwillingness to respect the rights of women, men and children affected by their activities” (Oxfam CAA, 2002: 1). The Oxfam CAA benchmarks for the mining industry are a collective set of rights that amount to inclusive citizenship practice for the companies. They are: right to be heard; right to a sustainable livelihood; right to basis social services; right to life and security and right to identity (Oxfam CAA Ombudsman Report 2002: Appendix 1). The benchmarks are setting out a requirement for MNCs to recognise and facilitate citizenship in the context of their activities, a reasonable pressure given the corporate sector’s claims that they too wish to be seen as and treated as good corporate citizens.

**Conclusion**

The key argument in this paper is that inclusive citizenship would be a useful objective in NGO/corporate engagement advocacy strategies and processes. By presenting some research from the case study of Oxfam CAA’s Mining Campaign, it has been suggested that some of the advocacy processes, dialogue with MNCs in particular, left the key stakeholders on the periphery of citizenship in the negotiation processes for their economic, social and environmental rights.

Given the increasingly important role of NGOs in the global context and the common acceptance amongst many MNCs of "the triple bottom line" (Elkington, 1998: 397) of corporate citizenship (that is the inclusion of social and environmental considerations with the financial imperative for conducting business), there is great potential for the integration of NGO work and the fundamentals of democratisation via an expanded citizenship idea. Clearly, for NGOs, when a policy of strong key stakeholder inclusion does not form the basis for agenda setting in corporate engagement then "North" to "North" dialogue can duplicate the wider impositions of a world divided by economic power and influence. As discussed above, Oxfam CAA came to this realisation in the latter phase of their campaign, due to the failure of the advocacy dialogue to produce concrete and capacity building type outcomes for the key stakeholders. Their response to this failure and their recognition of the lack of true commitment to the "triple bottom line" by the mining MNCs they were targeting, led to a broader industry targeted advocacy. This shift, although still an advocacy process via the Mining Ombudsman and the focus of benchmark
practices for mining MNCs, avoids the exclusive nature of "North" to "North" dialogue but still lends itself to the inclusion of citizenship strengthening demands as illustrated in the revised objectives of the Mining Ombudsman.

It is fair to ask why NGOs should use inclusive 'citizenship' as a working concept in their activities. It is suggested that given the increasing global status of Northern NGOs in particular, and their increased social policy role both at the international institution level and within the domestic economies of developing or Southern states, they are increasingly well position to hasten the idea of citizenship as a broad, globally uniform status. The other important and perhaps less abstract aspect of this proposition is that it builds on the idea of global social policy where instead of activities of large NGOs taking away pressure or services of individual welfare states or as Duffield (1996) suggests create "residualisation" of welfare states in the South, it imposes state based citizenship rights that must be supported through increased democracy and social rights within the countries in which they work and for the people whom they act as advocates. In the specific context of corporate engagement as an advocacy strategy this may mean the harnessing of the heralded good will of MNCs that claim to be good corporate citizens and directing it somewhat towards the "Southern" states which they tend to strive for non-conflictual partnerships with. This would inevitably increase the political nature of this advocacy process however, given the willingness of MNCs to sit around the table at the last Earth Summit in Johannesburg (2002), for example, with both Northern and Southern States and agree to take some responsibility for world poverty, there appears timely opportunity for NGOs to develop such an approach.
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