

WORK IN PROGRESS – NOT TO BE CITED OR QUOTED

Paper presented at the conference on 'Rethinking Economic Anthropology: A Human-Centred Approach', SOAS and LSE, 11-12 January 2008

Dinah Rajak, University of Sussex

'Uplift and Empower': Discourses of Responsibility in a Transnational Mining Corporation

Abstract

This paper examines the discourse and practice of corporate social responsibility in a transnational mining company. Based on a multi-sited ethnography of the world's third biggest mining company, from their headquarters in London to the platinum mining belt of South Africa, I explore how new forms of moral authority are accumulated, authenticated and exercised through ethical regimes such as 'corporate responsibility', and the discursive practices to which they give rise. In particular, this paper focuses on a central pillar of CSR discourse: that of 'empowerment through enterprise' and its claim to bring the margins and peripheries into the inclusive and emancipatory embrace of 'the market' economy. Such a vision - and the goal of 'self-sustainability' that it extends - projects the company as a vehicle of empowerment, as it strives to 'uplift' 'beneficiaries' with the injunction to 'help yourself' to a piece of 'the market' and grab the opportunities that it offers. In contrast to this vision of mutual independence and impersonal market relations, this paper examines how the practice of CSR generates powerful moral bonds between the corporate donor and recipient that inspire deference and dependence, rather than autonomy and empowerment. The moral bonds created by such forms of corporate largesse not only reinforce old social hierarchies but represent a powerful mechanism for recruiting loyalty and manufacturing consensus. In this way, I argue, CSR serves to empower the corporation rather than the supposed subjects of their empowerment initiatives.

Sitting in Sandringham Gardens Retirement Village in Johannesburg, Ike Rosmarin, now 92, told me of his time in the town of Rustenburg, the urban hub of South Africa's Platinum Mining Belt. For 40 years, Ike had been manager of the Victoria Trading Store on the Rustenburg Platinum Mine and Chairman of the town's Red Cross:

Did Rebecca tell you about the water and the school?... Well, when Rebecca, my domestic worker, moved to Bleskop in the 70's there was no water there – not until the Rand Water Company came from Jo'burg and put water there quite recently. So I used to drive out there three times a week to deliver a big water tank to Rebecca and Abe. When her grandson, Elias, was still just little – and he was at school – that school right near Rebecca's house – it was his birthday and we arranged a birthday party for him in his classroom at the school, so we bought cake and biscuits and a tank of water for all his class mates to the school and had a party in his class. When we came out of the classroom there was a big crowd of school children with receptacles for water – because, the principle said, the school had no water, like the township. So the next day I went to see Charlie Stott who was the manager of the Rustenburg Platinum Mine and I told him that the school had no water and something must be done. Immediately we got into his Mercedes Benz and drove to the school and he spoke with the principle. You've seen the mine shaft, just opposite Rebecca's house – the Turfontein mine shaft. Well two weeks later Charlie Stott had a pipe built from the mine direct to the school to pipe water.

(Ike Rosmarin, Retired Store Manager (1956-1983); and Chairman of the Red Cross, Rustenburg (1956-2000). Interviewed in Johannesburg 14/5/05).

Ike's story of Charlie Stott bringing water to the Bleskop school evokes a poignant image of classic corporate largesse in a mining town. Here the iconic figure of the Mine Manager looms over the town as the paternalistic and all-powerful 'big man'. This picture of a mining town in a bygone age has been banished by the advent of the modern discourse of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and its focus on progressive buzzwords such as sustainability, empowerment and participation aligned with the political agenda of South Africa's post-Apartheid government.

In so doing, mining companies have moved away from the rhetoric of philanthropy towards that of capacity building and social investment programmes allowing them, as Stirrat and Henkel comment with respect to NGOs, 'to avoid the charge that they are patrons' (Stirrat & Henkel, 1997, p. 73). Significant resources have been devoted to developing comprehensive CSR policy both within companies and in the national and international arenas concerned with the role of corporations as vehicles for sustainable development¹. Most companies mining in South Africa now have a package of policies covering various areas which fall under the broad spectrum of CSR or Socio-Economic Development (SED). These commonly include community engagement, education initiatives, social enterprise and small business development which offer 'entrepreneurial solutions to insoluble (social) problems'². Implicit within this vision of development, is an ideal citizen who can respond to the moral exhortation to 'help oneself' by embracing the opportunities provided by expanding business, and, in so doing, will be uplifted out of poverty and brought into 'the market'.

¹ Examples of such international initiatives include the UN Global Compact, the International Council on Mining and Minerals (ICMM), and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), to name but a few. At the national level, the central regulatory vehicle for CSR in the mining industry is the Mining Charter and Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) Scorecard.

² Report by The Skoll Foundation, Allianz, DuPont and SustainAbility (2007). London: SustainAbility Ltd. Downloaded from, <http://www.sustainability.com/compass/register.asp?type=download&articleid=250>.

CSR, therefore, claims a radical break with the legacy of corporate philanthropy - charity replaced by the technocratic rationalism of 'responsible competitiveness' and 'sustainable development', while stakeholder engagement and participation take the place of the mine manager's paternalism (Rajak 2008). While mine ethnographers have revealed the way in which the paternalism of managers was a crucial vehicle of control over workers³, the magnanimous gestures of managers, such as Charlie Stott, toward the so-called 'wider community' were conventionally seen as peripheral to the activities of the mining business. In contrast, contemporary CSR claims the capacity to change the way in which business itself is done. It asserts the happy coincidence of economic imperative and moral injunction – the convergence of economic value and ethical values. It does so by drawing on a powerful paradigm of 'social investment' and 'empowerment' through the market - in the words of the ex-chairman of one of the world's biggest mining companies:

This isn't a grand philanthropic gesture, I don't see it as my responsibility to spend shareholder money on grand philanthropic gestures, it's actually how we build security for long-term business investment. (Sir Douglas Wolfe⁴ 19/5/04).

This paper is based on 13 months of multi-sited ethnographic research, tracking the 'translocal aspects'⁵ of a transnational mining corporation in pursuit of the slippery and shifting notion of *corporate social responsibility* (CSR). A pursuit which took me from the corporate boardrooms of the company's HQ in London, to their HQ in Johannesburg, and ultimately to the town of Rustenburg. In this paper I explore how the imperatives to 'uplift' and 'empower' affect the realities of CSR implementation in and around the Rustenburg mining operations. How do front-line CSR officers and operational managers engage with this new technocratic form of responsibility and its demands for sustainability, accountability and profitability? And, what does it mean for those who come under the company's responsibility agenda?

'Empowerment through Enterprise'

The rich mineral deposits of the Bushveld Complex's Western Limb are subject to the operations of five separate mining corporations. The division of spoils underneath the ground has been translated into an awkward urban geography and social landscape above ground, making the Rustenburg Local Municipality (RLM) a patchwork of industrial zones and urban sprawl which fall under the domain of one or other of the companies that mine the rich seams of the reef below. However, the mark of competing mining houses is not only seen in the towering mine shafts, chimney stacks and refineries. It is displayed on billboards, signposts and newspaper adverts proclaiming a company's social investment in many of the town's clinics, community organisations and schools - testaments to corporate-community partnership.

Just as the concept of partnership has been invoked as a central strategy in the pursuit of global corporate citizenship, linking together TNCs with governments, NGOs and local communities, so the language of partnership and its products have become ubiquitous within this so-called 'local context' of Rustenburg. Here, partnership is coupled with the imperative to embed 'sustainability' into this mining town, to guard against the ever-present threat of decline into 'ghost-town' when the mines close or cease to churn out profit. Central to this is the mission of

³ See for example Gordon 1977; Bulmer 1975; Burawoy 1972 and 1974; and Wilson 1972.

⁴ For the purposes of anonymity the real names of all informants, projects, NGOs and organisations have been substituted with fictitious names.

⁵ The world of CSR is a new area for anthropological enquiry. Indeed, Gupta and Ferguson ask: 'Why...has there been so little anthropological work on the translocal aspects of transnational corporations...?...Why is it that ... The household economy has long been considered eminently anthropological, but the study of ...international finance much less so?' (Gupta & Ferguson, 1997, p. 15).

local economic development and ‘empowerment through enterprise’. Rhetoric in both official company policy, and among the company’s front-line CSR agents in Rustenburg, stresses the rejection of a culture of dependency on hand-outs and gifts, and the creation of a new ethos of ‘self-empowerment’:

They can ask us for assistance if they need it but we try not to encourage it because we want them to be sustainable. We have a policy that we won’t give money to something unless the school or organisation contributes 1/3 as well. Because otherwise they become dependent on us and start thinking they can’t do anything themselves (Elaine, CSR Officer, Rustenburg, 13/4/05).

Thus from supply chain policy which favours procurement from companies owned by ‘Historically Disadvantaged South Africans’ (HDSA), to entrepreneurship training, SME development and even HIV programmes, the company projects its commitment to teaming up with the community in order to create a diversified local economy which will survive eventual mine closure:

We are trying to bring the idea to the people that even if you are HIV positive, you can still start a business (Gilbert Mogapi, HIV officer at a Rustenburg mine 14/4/05).

Mogapi’s remark hints that implicit within this model of empowerment through enterprise is the creation of a new class of empowered, entrepreneurial and self-sufficient citizens who are not only the ideal beneficiaries of CSR but embody the core values of the new South Africa – citizenship, enterprise and transformation - thus claiming the convergence of business values with those of the community, and indeed the nation. Under this new rhetoric, ‘donor’ and ‘recipient’ have been re-categorised as “partners”, “investors” and “social entrepreneurs”. This is manifest in the rhetoric in which companies cast their commitment to social responsibility and empowerment. For example the Anglo American Chairman’s Fund states that: ‘we’re... backing some of the more entrepreneurial NGOs...most importantly...we’re looking for winners’ (Robbins, 2001, p. 34).

NGOs and community organisations have also converged on this ideal, adopting the language of business and enterprise as they re-cast themselves not as development agents, but as ‘social entrepreneurs’:

Yes I run this NGO, but I am also a business woman. I am a *social entrepreneur* – we are people who are passionately pursuing community development and are passionate about transforming South Africa. And social entrepreneurship, is really the future of South Africa (Anna-Clare Bezuidenhout, Director of *The Business*, an NGO delivering entrepreneurship training around the mines, 24/5/05).

However the scarcity of funding for civil society and community development organisations, intensified by the virtual demise of state-funding and the short-term nature of most corporate support, makes social entrepreneurship an economic imperative for NGOs, as much as an ideological or spiritual mission⁶.

While sustainable enterprise and ‘empowerment through business’ provide the backbone of the company’s CSR policy, the reality is that almost all community organisations in Rustenburg are

⁶ The weakness of the NGO sector in the post-apartheid period (see Ramphela’s discussion of the demobilisation of civil society in the post-apartheid state (2005); and Habib & Taylor, 1999) has contributed further to the dominance of the privatised, corporate model of company and service provider.

dependent on money from the mines. An internal report company report (2002), which assessed and ranked home-based care organisations in the RLM for future partnership potential explicitly, noted the almost complete lack of alternative sources of funding for the NGOs ('zero from government'). The report concluded that they do not partner amongst themselves because of the competition between them for the scarce resources. This was reinforced by Clara Xorile a social worker at the Rustenburg mines, who previously had spent many years as a 'community social worker':

I spent 10 years working at a mine, then I left the mine and went into the community to work for an NGO as a community social worker dealing with victims of violence. But I found in the last years that the government does not want to support NGOs. So I moved from one NGO to another, but as a professional you can't work for 6 months without a salary. So I came back into the mines, because that's where the money is (Clara Xorile, Rustenburg, 19/4/05).

Already a picture starts to emerge in which NGOs and community organisations, desperate for survival, must compete to become the partner of choice for one of the mining companies operating in the area. This has the broader effect of drawing CBOs working further a field in rural North West Province towards the mines in the hope of funding, thus creating a 'hotspot' of NGO activity within the 50km zone of 'responsibility' of the various mines and a dearth beyond its border.

Anna-Clare Bezuidenhout's account of *The Business*, a small-business training scheme she runs at one of the mining operations in Rustenburg, disrupts her empowering vision of 'social entrepreneurship', as she narrates the asymmetry of power and the expectation of reciprocity inherent in the relationship between donor and recipient:

When the mine opened about four years ago there was a lot of demonstrations – a lot of people toyi-toying around looking for work and with expectations of the mine – so we were part of (the company's) attempt to please the community because they couldn't give jobs to everyone – so others could have training.

She went on to explain how the mine gave them a plot of barely usable land on which to set up the project and a minimal budget.

They make use of us when they have to brag about their CSR when they have important people they bring them to see us...whenever the mine wants to bring people there...whether it's from Jo'burg or America we must give up whatever we've planned, so they can have their photos taken in front of everything and put it in the magazine... They don't listen to our financial realities. We're constantly getting feedback from their top management that our statistics aren't good enough, but their expectations are unrealistic...they expect people to be in business the minute they leave our training...they don't realise economic empowerment is a process, that transformation is a process...They put in 500,000 rand and want to see a major miracle...*But they're giving it to us for free so what can we do.*

The funding provided by the company is bound by conditionality and brings with it the coercive powers of patronage. The company demands, in return, the implementation of projects that accord with its particular vision of development. This asymmetry of power is not only neglected but veiled by the elevation of the partnership paradigm. In this case, the NGO is trapped between the impossible demands of the company, and the inability to voice their discomfort due to a fear that their funding will be taken away and that, after all, they are indebted to the company for this 'free gift'.

Such relationships between corporations and civil society are at best precarious, at worst they serve to increase the power of corporations to pursue their own interests at the expense of the communities they claim to serve while blurring the lines of accountability between the company and the NGOs with which they work. For, no matter how fervently the parties assert a collaborative venture for a collective goal, the asymmetry between giver and receiver cannot be completely eliminated. After all, “he who pays the piper not only calls the tune but attempts to make sure that it is performed” (Stirrat & Henkel, 1997, pp. 75-6). Thus Grace, a CSR officer in Rustenburg explained:

The *service providers* don't realise that they need to justify the continuance of the project... I was talking to a guy today who was very narked that I was asking things like attendance records and he said he actually found it very hard to have the quality of the project questioned. But I have a right to expect results if I'm *giving* him the money (Grace 26/5/05).

Grace recasts the so-called ‘community partner’ as ‘service provider’, who must deliver a particular service to the company in order to ensure future funding. In so doing she shifts the discourse from one of equal collaboration to a commercial transaction between customer and vendor who must guarantee a ‘value-for-money’ service which will yield the returns the client demands. Yet slippage between the language of service provider, on the one hand, and Grace’s embodiment of herself as donor on the other (‘I’m giving him the money’), blurs the lines between the disinterested market model of client and service provider, and the expectation of reciprocity inherent in gift relations, transforming the company – and in this case Grace herself – from client to patron.

By extending the hand of patronage to civil society organisations – giving and taking away social investment where it sees fit - the practice of CSI further weakens NGOs as it strips them of autonomy under the banner of empowerment. Anna-Clare Bezuidenhout forcefully evokes this sense of impotence:

We had a very negative experience with the previous CSI manager, he gave us nothing. Then the next one liked us and started to take ownership – but then it started again with the struggles within his unit and because of political in-fighting he moved to another department...One of the big problems people have with the mines is that if you get to know one person and then they leave...you never know whether the next person is going to... just cut you off. They throw a bit of money at you but they'll never make a contract over 6 months.

Anna-Clare’s narrative of precarious ‘partnership’ dependent on the whims and personal discretion of CSR managers unsettles the confidence of senior executives in London in technocratic tools for needs assessment and stakeholder engagement. Her account was however echoed by those within the company, the front-line CSR agents, themselves the subject of seemingly incomprehensible policy changes and decisions from above.

There was, it seemed, both freedom and frustration in these webs of patronage. Front-line CSR practitioners often found themselves acting as local patrons and benefactors - a role which at times inspired a sense of personal honour and achievement, at others, discomfort. Despite the concerns expressed by Grace that projects might be cut from above on the whim of a new boss, these webs of patronage also allowed front-line CSR agents to pursue their own individual moral missions. Thus Grace explained that she, personally, had secured company funding for *LearnLife* – an extra-curricular summer programme for ‘future leaders’ – because her daughter had attended the project:

When Genna did it, I was just so inspired by what she learnt and all the kids, black and white working together; and the organisers were brilliant and I thought this is really a

project which [the company] should support. So I took it to Ingrid in head office and said “you just must come and see what they’re doing here” and she came and loved it too and we took it on. I’m so proud of that (Grace 20/4/05).

In this way responsibility is personalised and shifted from the corporation as a whole to an individual. The sense of personal honour derived from this role as patron is evident in the description of a recent project by a CSR coordinator at another mine near Rustenburg:

You see this is how we empower the community – we needed some land clearing – so I got young people from around here who were unemployed to form a company and I contracted them to do the job and then they have something to take home and they were so happy and now in the village they’ll shout “hey Mr Enele”. This is the thing that Daniel has done. This is what motivates me – to see myself doing these things and see them happening – I can feel proud of that.

At the top of this web of patronage, even the much mythologised figure of the mine manager – both resolute technocrat and generous philanthropist – prevails. Today the mine manager retains his discretionary fund for good causes – a very minor part of the CSR budget financially – yet nevertheless an important symbolic role embodying the magnanimous authority of the company. In a striking echo of Ike’s story of Charlie Stott bringing water to the Bleskop school, Jerry Mosenyi described the Mine Manager’s Fund today:

So here are a couple of petitions to the mine manager – one for a bore hole at a school and another for the North West Amateur Boxing Organisation. See this letter comes back to me with a note on it from Jed Thornton saying “give them 10,000R sponsorship for their boxing tournament. Sometimes I’ll say “No, Jed we should fund the bore hole”, and sometimes he’ll say “No, No Jerry, I like this one’ ... and then we do that one (Jerry Mosenyi, CSR officer, Rustenburg 14/4/05).

The sense of personal achievement expressed by local level CSR employees was commonly balanced by a contrasting sense of failure and impotence resulting from this individualisation of corporate responsibility, as they struggled to maintain relationships with community organisations in a context of constantly shifting company policy and unpredictable resource flows. While on the one hand they had become individual patrons driven by personal commitment, they remained, on the other hand, trapped under the weight of the company’s rigid hierarchy and opaque bureaucracy. Thus, Kobus, the manager of a mineworker’s hostel in Rustenburg commented:

You have your budget and here I’ve been planning to build *my men* a soccer pitch. My hostel has won the soccer tournaments every year for the past 5 years. So I cut and saved. But then someone puts 100,000 Rand on your budget from somewhere else and they tell you must make cuts of 10%. I can’t build it now. If you don’t keep your eye on it, *they*’ll put money on any budget *they* can to make the cuts (Kobus, Hostel Manager, Platinum Belt, NW Province).

Kobus evokes a sense of alienation from, or even hostility towards, a bureaucratic corporate machine which he refers to ambiguously as *they*. He constructs the world of the hostel as separate from this cost-cutting machine which he must watch and negotiate in order to run a good hostel and provide benefits to the mineworkers over which he expresses a personal, and indeed paternalistic, responsibility.

Many front-line CSR officers spoke of their budgets suddenly cut or projects prematurely curtailed, reinforcing this sense of isolation from the inner-workings of the company:

My biggest worry is that with the current climate in the company we’re not going to be able to give as many bursaries so I’m not going to be able to select as many kids for the *Platinum Future* programme which is so sad, because it does so much good. But then we

really don't know what's going to happen. I come in some mornings and I don't know if our jobs will still be here. Maybe *they* will have made a change (Grace, 23/5/05).

As a result Grace and her colleagues spoke of having to creatively negotiate ways to fulfil commitments to their beneficiaries and sustain relationships they had personally built up, thus reinforcing their role as patrons to an array of community 'clients', and intensifying the shift from corporate to personal responsibility.

Yet, for the recipients of the SED team's creative empowerment schemes, the ubiquitous rhetoric of 'empowerment' appears at best an impossible goal, at worst an extension of corporate control. Christa Vos, coordinator at *The Business* made clear the difficulties of working as an NGO partner within this seemingly unpredictable and opaque corporate climate. At the same time, she hints at how this uncertainty, confusion and alienation is deployed strategically by the company:

The company's CSR guy has the position but not the authority, he's not empowered enough and not skilled enough and so can't implement - Just like a pipe that you voice things to and he pipes it up into the ether of the company above him and it disappears... We as outsiders are always having to witness political power plays and games. Some of them will kill an initiative dead... There's no way you can take them to court. You can't make the company comply to their contractual obligations. So you are 200,000R overdrawn at the bank because they haven't delivered the money yet and now they say "we have to cut costs, we can't afford it after all". In the end that kills social entrepreneurs (Christa Vos, 21/4/05).

'Empowerment through Education'

The discourse of empowerment claims a long-lasting bond between the company and the targets of its CSR work. This claim was manifest in an advert which appeared in the Mail and Guardian Newspaper, appealing to the beneficiaries of the company's empowerment and education initiatives, entitled *We Have Come a Long Way*:

We made your acquaintance some years ago when you were still a young person with ambitions to arm yourself with higher education in readiness for the challenges of the future. Our relationship grew during your years of university education when we assisted you with a scholarship/ bursary...

We are pleased that our paths crossed when they did. We are happy to have known you. We are proud of your achievements and the contribution you are making in our democratic South Africa. We, too, are passionate supporters of our beautiful country...

Please let us renew our acquaintance and see it blossom into a wonderful friendship
(Mail and Guardian, 30th July 2005).

The advert casts responsibility in a deeply personal and paternalistic register. The relationship between donor and recipient is described in terms of the individual ('we' and 'you') rather than the institutional, evoking connotations of parent and child – 'we are *proud* of your achievements'. The image of personal friendship between company and beneficiary, and the language of affection in which it is described, is then broadened, to encompass all of South Africa. Such emotionally charged language and the appeal to a moral bond - rather than commercial relations - between recipient and company jars with the ubiquitous rhetoric of social investment and human capital found in official company policy and reports. The emotional register is, of course, far more compelling. The title of the advert - 'We Have Come a Long Way' – suggests, that this bond between sponsor and scholar, is not only personal and moral, but a metaphor for the relationship between the company and the country.

The twin targets of education and youth provide a powerful narrative not only for the company's CSR agenda, but for the relationship between the company as a whole and the new South Africa. As is epitomised in the advert above, by converging on education and youth, the company

claims a position as architect of South Africa's transformation. Education provides a central canvas onto which mining companies can project their moral claims as investors in the future of South Africa. Through this narrative the company claims an affinity with the targets of its empowerment initiatives, binding them together in a collective energetic movement, which replaces difference with unity in a shared goal. Yet, despite the obvious appeal of this vision, the practice of empowerment through education in Rustenburg appears a far cry from this emancipatory ideal of mutual interdependence and development. Thus, while the language of empowerment denies inequality between company and beneficiary, the discursive practices to which this agenda gives rise, sustains or even reconstructs the differences between the company and the subjects of its CSR.

In Rustenburg, this corporate commitment to educational development translates into a variety of activities to improve education and human capital in the communities around the mines. One such initiative is *Platinum Future*, a year-long residential academy between school and university funded jointly by 7 mining houses. It provides intensive science and maths teaching with the aim of producing engineers, metallurgists and rock mechanics to staff the mines. Each company selects students referred to as HDSA candidates from their mining areas. At the end of the year recruitment units at each of the companies compete in a kind of human auction to offer university scholarships to the best students. Those students are then tied to the company for 3-5 years after graduation.

One of those who's responsibility it is to select the targets of the company's educational empowerment is Grace. Grace's 'passion' for her work emerged most strongly in the deep affection she expressed for the recipients she hand-picks for *Platinum Future* and other Anglo Platinum projects, who she refers to as 'my kids':

I love my EduKids... Teachers are the bane of my life, but the children, and the chance to give them a future.... that, I love.

At the annual cheese and wine party for sponsors and donors of *Platinum Future*, Grace left the mingling minor dignitaries, educators and donors to find her 'EduKids' in the dormitories and classrooms of the programme. As we walked around the buildings, Grace showed me the well-equipped classrooms, the walls of which were papered with technical diagrams of mines and mining, alongside posters of 'our corporate values'. While the students funded by the different companies mix in class, their dormitories are separated according to sponsor. Once we located the right dorm, those who had been hand-picked by Grace to receive scholarships from the company for she worked, rushed up to her, hugging her and giving her letters and pictures that they have drawn for her – 'she is our hero' one of them said to me as they showed Grace how tidily they kept their rooms and the work they had been doing. Grace asked if they were working hard for the company. She told me,

I know them all so well, I picked them, so I've been with them through the whole process, they're my girls and they're brilliant. You wouldn't believe the poverty... that some of them come from. I just want to see them succeed. All of them, but especially the girls. South Africa needs more girls like this, succeeding and moving up (22/4/05).

The relationship between company and scholar is thus enacted in terms of an intimate personal attachment rather than an institutional arrangement. The long-lasting nature of the bond between them is constantly invoked, as Grace says 'I know them so well... I've been with them through the whole process'.

The little notes and drawings that the scholars give Grace while apparently trifles, are significant. For as Bourdieu reminds us, it is the apparently insignificant and 'little presents' which 'keep

friendship going' and in so doing act as 'strategies to neutralise the action of time and ensure the continuity of interpersonal relations' (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 7), in this case over many years of educational support. Indeed Bourdieu tells us the power of such 'little presents' is that, while they appear to be 'gratuitous gifts', disinterested from the politics of sustaining a relationship - 'they must be frequent... they must function within the logic of "surprises" or "kind thoughts" rather than according to the mechanisms of ritual.' (*ibid.*). Thus, Grace receives these letters when she goes to visit 'her girls' at the academy - she shows surprise and receives them as signs of a personal relationship which appears separate from the relationship between the company and their scholars. Support for projects and the granting of bursaries is steeped in personal relations of affection and gratitude which develop between the frontline CSR officers and the beneficiaries of their projects.

Yet the affection, warmth and protectiveness expressed by Grace and returned by her 18 year old proteges acts as a powerful and potentially coercive bond:

Last year, [Acheron⁷] (another mining company) poached *my* girls - I brought three of the best and brightest girls to the programme and the [Acheron] people went in early and offered them a scholarship for uni - and [Acheron] don't even sponsor *Platinum Future*, they just steal the bright students we produce (Grace 22/4/05).

The possessive commitment, verging on ownership, to the talent she has discovered and nurtured acts as a cohesive force imparting loyalty for the company to a new generation of 'empowered' recipients as they come under the authority of its paternalistic responsibility.

Grace's comment exemplifies the twin of forces of affection and ownership which seem to define the kind of patron-client relations which the company's SED work generates. Her anger at the way in which Acheron 'poached [her] girls' also perhaps points to the rejection of reciprocity which such an act involves. Those who Grace picks for *Platinum Future* spend a year at the academy preparing for the rigours of university and a life as a mining professional. For many of them, this is not their first encounter with the company. Many will have attended *The Bridge* – the company's after-school maths and science programme in Rustenburg. Others might have been picked by Grace or one of her colleagues to receive a bursary to attend *LearnLife* – a summer leadership camp for 12-16 year olds, or they might even have attended one of the mine's own primary schools. Thus their relationship to the company, and in some cases individual CSR officers, can already have dated back a number of years. Grace makes clear her expectation that, at the end of the academy, the company will select the brightest among their scholars to whom they will offer a university bursary, extending the bond for another 4 years. Finally, reciprocity supposedly comes in the form of 3 or more years service to the company after graduation. The delay is crucial. As Bourdieu points out: 'delay (in reciprocating the gift) is also a way of exacting from him the deferential conduct that is required as long as relations are not broken off' (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 7). In the case of Acheron poaching the 'Grace's girls', relations have been broken off. The long-lasting relationship between corporate sponsor and beneficiary has been severed, thus denying the expected reciprocity.

In the case of bursaries, the lines between gift and market relations are blurred. On the one hand, bursaries and scholarships represent a central vehicle of the company's empowerment mission. They offer the promise of both affirmative action and the meritocratic selection of beneficiaries amongst the target group and thus embody the central values of self-empowerment – to help those who are willing (and able) to help themselves. Bursaries are awarded through a fair and meritocratic selection process, according to a straightforward bureaucratic procedure accompanied by a contract which binds the recipient to repay the educational support with a

⁷ The name of the company has been changed.

number of years service to the company. Yet, on the other hand, the apparent meritocratic rationalism of the bursary schemes appears to veil the hidden dynamics of power and dependency which define corporate patronage. A kind of patronage that extends far beyond the individual relationship between the scholar and their corporate sponsor. As virtually the only supplier of bursaries to school children in Rustenburg hoping to go to university, and within a context of intense poverty, the 5 mining companies operating in the Rustenburg area become, in effect, the primary (and almost sole) local supplier of a ticket to higher education and a bright future in metallurgy, engineering or rock mechanics. Thus, following Bourdieu, I argue that the company's investment in education, while offering the promise of empowerment to individuals, provides a mechanism whereby 'economically-based relations of dependency and domination may be dissimulated and bolstered by the mask of moral ties, or charisma, or of meritocratic symbolism' (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 9).

However, the educational benefits offered by the company are not open to everyone: not everyone is seen to be eligible for empowerment. There is an ongoing tension within the company focused on whether educational investment should be directed towards school-support through public-private partnerships or towards direct 'learner-support' which selects the most 'promising' students who can benefit directly from the company's support through bursary schemes and outside school programmes. The overt aim of the latter approach is to create a scientific and technical elite and the hope that the benefits will, ultimately, trickle down to the rest of society. Thus Elaine, one of Grace's colleagues in the SED unit, commented:

It's become confusing, on the one hand we have the mines saying we must focus on maths and science to produce good company employees, and on the other there's the Mining Charter saying we must focus on community upliftment – so which is it? (Elaine, 18/4/05).

Just as in the case of 'empowerment through enterprise', the process of 'empowerment through education' involves the identification, isolation and elevation of an elite group of beneficiaries, making the company the architect of a new class of empowered subjects:

Some say we should be supplying education to the masses. I believe in giving it to a few good kids....I want to pick out a few with excellence and give them a future. We used to have these "[company] adopted schools". The idea is, if you target the educators you uplift the masses, you're not just helping a few, you reach more... But, look... you can *uplift* anyone but for it to be to a meaningful level they must have potential...So I believe in going straight to the kids, not the school - cut out the middleman... we're not in the business of taking bad students and making them better (Gina, Education Officer, Rustenburg, 20/4/05).

The school, for Gina, is simply a middleman. Through her work she endeavours to build an intimate and enduring bond between the student and the company, projecting the company as the architect of their empowerment: as Grace put it: 'I can take a good kid from a beleaguered school and give him what his teacher is not' (Grace 26/5/05).

At the *LearnLife* summer camp Gina introduced me to Thabo, a 14 year old participant of the programme. Afterwards she remarked: 'he's so good – why isn't he doing maths and science? – then I could bring him in on one of our projects. He should do maths and science, he would be so good at [the company]' (18/4/05). Like many of her colleagues, Gina's commitment and sense of responsibility to 'community upliftment' merged, and at times conflicted, with an equal or possibly stronger sense of responsibility and loyalty to the company, for, as she put it, 'I have lived *in* [this company] for 30 years'.

Through the practice of CSR, the enduring paternalism and webs of patronage within the company are projected outside in their relations with the so-called ‘community’ around the mines. While Gina and her colleagues state that they are not in the business of ‘grooming’ people for the company, ‘suitability for [the company]’ is one of the qualities that informs their selection of beneficiaries. In order to comply with the mining charter, the company must ‘aspire to a baseline of 40 percent HDSA participation in management within 5-years’ (Department of Minerals and Energy, 2004, 4.2). The mission to empower thus fuses with the imperative to create a pool of future black employees at management level. For Grace, Gina and Elaine, this involves not only selecting appropriate beneficiaries for empowerment through education, but incorporating them into the ‘[company’s] value system’ and inspiring in them a sense of loyalty, and, I argue, reciprocal obligation to the company. The company’s investment of ‘educational capital’ thus serves as a mechanism for business to legitimately maintain and reproduce, rather than transform, itself.

Competition between rival mining companies for ownership of this elite group of recipients is fierce, as each company strives to project themselves as the best producers of empowerment and to incorporate the products of their empowerment projects into the company. Grace explained that, in spite of the hot competition, the company had been able to get ‘first dibs’ on the best students in the Bojanala Platinum District (BPD):

We know which are the best schools and then we run testing in the schools and this year we introduced psychometric testing so we can see if they’ll be good in [the company]... When we started doing *Platinum Future*, I said, “No way am I giving money to kids I haven’t seen.. I want to see the school records and be in the interviews so that I can pick the brightest and the best”. Because I’m personally involved I get first choice and the other mining houses pick up the ones we don’t want (Grace 24/5/05).

Through their role as community donors, the company’s education unit gain access to areas of information and governance which otherwise would be denied them and which can directly serve to further their commercial interests. In this case it is the school records and exam results of all students from all schools in the BPD - which roughly represents the company’s target zone for its CSR interests.

‘The Will to Empower’⁸

At times, an explicit sense of spiritual duty was manifest in the words and actions of individuals charged with conducting the ‘ethical’ work of the company at the ‘coalface’. CSR managers around the mines in Rustenburg, often presented not only a deeply personalised vision of CSR, but one in which it was tightly bound up with a sense of a moral mission: as Gina put it, *‘I am the conscience of the company’*. The sense of a spiritual duty was powerfully evoked in the words of, Betty Fisher, another CSR manager at the Rustenburg mines:

My passion is nutrition, I’m reading up a lot about nutrition and I’ve become very passionate about feeding and this new hydroponic system...I have visions of being a Mother Theresa in khaki pants and white shirt...I have visions of going and doing my thing, taking hydroponics up and down Africa and *uplifting* people from poverty (17/9/04).

According to such narratives, exemplified by Fisher’s, CSR comes to represent a process of cleansing or transformation within the company and the CSR manager appears in the figure of a missionary bringing the sacred realm of morality into the profane realm of business. The ubiquitous use of ‘upliftment’ by many CSR personnel I spoke to in Rustenburg - a word which seems to resonate with colonial missionary ideals – claims on behalf of the company the power

⁸ Title taken from Cruickshank 1999.

to ‘uplift’ people from poverty and wretchedness. The notion of ‘upliftment’ conjures images of progress up the vertical social hierarchy, accompanied, perhaps, by an almost spiritual ascent.

The zeal of CSR rhetoric thus endows it with the sense of a moral mission, projecting images of “liberation”, “human fulfilment”, and “human flourishing” (Gasper, 1996, p. 643), The language of CSR can therefore be viewed as part of the modernising discourse of development, as it espouses a universal vision of social improvement and elevates the corporation as both architect and agent of this vision:

We’ve come up with a post-closure vision for Rustenburg, for when the mine closes – we must now take that vision to the municipality, because it must become a societal vision (Andy Walken, Sustainability Advisor, Rustenburg, 4/5/05).

What is this vision of upliftment to which the company aspires? As discussed above, at the heart of this vision are the twin goals of empowerment and entrepreneurship. The goal of empowerment, becomes in itself, a spiritual duty infused with a faith in the power of conversion and transformation. Such a vision is fervently projected in an article advertising *The Business*, entitled ‘The Ultimate Entrepreneur’:

Surely we are the generation to bring liberty to our children from the disaster that befell our ancestors... I believe that in the next generation in South Africa, we will see the *rise of a new breed of entrepreneur, a society not dominated by counterproductive bureaucrats and paper pushers! A society where parents will teach their kids “Dream yourself a radical new business idea, develop it into a financially successful enterprise and retire before you are 40”*.

For it is time, the article implores, ‘to ... [develop] an *entrepreneurial mindset* and [learn] to become your own boss’ (Zwennis, 2003, p. 16).

Thus participation in the market comes to stand for the promise of individual autonomy denied black South African’s under apartheid. In order to attain the emancipatory and transformative power of the market, a conversion is required. Anna-Clare Bezuidenhout described the process which those selected for *The Business* must undergo:

There’s so many levels of transformation we’re working on. It’s a mammoth task – transforming someone into a different animal. We do six months entrepreneurial training and we call it “the army”, not training, because it’s really toughening up. We call it “self-mastering people” – so that people who go through it can say “I am the master of my own destiny”. Most of the black people won’t believe that. The whole apartheid system and dependency it has created and unless you *change that mindset* – they’ll still fail and mess it up because they won’t have the internal locus of control (24/5/05).

The targets of such conversion begin much younger. The aim of the company’s educational programmes is, as Grace puts it, ‘to select the brightest and the best at a young age and invest in excellence and to *change their mindsets*’ so that children can ‘visualise a different future path, become confident and empowered’. Brochures and company reports speak of ‘providing life-changing experiences and opportunities which would otherwise have been beyond their reach’. At *Platinum Future*, there is a focus on exposing participant students not only to technology, science and maths, but also to ‘business principles and norms’. Similarly, the director of *LearnLife*, an ex-minister turned ‘social entrepreneur’ described the programme’s ‘bottom line’ thus:

Upliftment and development, the feeling of togetherness and striving towards our dreams are of the utmost importance.... Empowering people to empower themselves (20/4/05).

The marriage of market values to a profoundly moral, and at times religious register is striking. The overt evangelism of Fisher, Bezuidenhout and Kessler seems discordant with the cold market rationalism of the company's chairman in London, who stated absolutely that:

The market is like gravity. There's no right or wrong about it (6/12/05).

Yet when considered in the context of the specific framing of CSR as 'empowerment' it is possible to reconcile this discordant marriage. As Henkel and Stirrat have shown, the concept of empowerment, alongside that of participation - the vehicle through which it is achieved - while held up as the epitome of secular modernity, in fact finds its genealogy in religious roots (Henkel & Stirrat, 2001). These roots, they argue, are to be found in the Protestant Reformation, which placed a moral imperative on individual 'participation' in communal practice: 'salvation was to be attained through individuals actively participating in the duties of the community' (*ibid.*, p. 174). In so doing, they reveal the way in which the apparently secular orthodoxies of the development world 'bear the marks of religiosity' (*ibid.*). However the particular vision of development pursued through the practice of CSR, not only demands conversion to the project of modernity, but preaches conversion to the project of market capitalism. Participation in the market brings empowerment. This is not simply about economic pragmatism. It is about instilling market virtues and values. Just as the pursuit of global corporate citizenship enshrines the virtues and values of the global market in the dominant discourse of international development, so the practice of CSR strives to convert its 'beneficiaries' to these market moralities.

Implicit within this construction of the ideal subject of empowerment – one who can 'help oneself' – is the rejection of those who cannot or do not follow this model: those who, as one CSR officer put it, 'squander the opportunities provided by the mine and sit waiting for handouts' (Gilbert Mogapi, HIV officer, Rustenburg mines 14/4/05). The true subjects of empowerment are juxtaposed with the myriad 'false' claims on the company for endless supplies of cash of which CSR officers often complained: 'we're not made of money, we're not a bottomless pit, but everyone thinks we are'. They saw it as their responsibility to sort the 'true' and 'legitimate' subjects of empowerment from those who were trying to 'take advantage of' or 'exploit' the company. Thus the passionate commitment to 'empowering people' which they voiced, was often accompanied by a rejection of any claims of entitlement from those they sought to empower:

People around the mines feel an *entitlement* over and above the level of productivity they are willing to put in. Even *my school children* – who we've been *giving* a 40,000 rand bursary, which is more than their parents will be able to *earn* in a life time and you know those are the kids who phone me the first night they're on the programme and tell me they don't like the food (Grace 19/5/05).

The recipients of the company's 40,000 rand bursaries are placed in a position of indebtedness in which they are expected to receive the bursary with gratitude and not complain. The sense of reciprocity, or lack thereof, is implied as the CSR coordinator criticises people for expecting more than they can give back in terms of productivity. Crucially, 'giving' is juxtaposed with 'entitlement', so asserting the dominance of the company as a paternalistic institution. Grace implicitly contrasted this sense of entitlement with the work ethic of managers at the company:

Peter my husband would literally work 18 hours a day and every Saturday and Sunday if there was maintenance and the people under him are now working like that. These guys work really, really hard to earn the money that CSI then *gives away*. You can appreciate where these guys are coming from – they're at the face and mining life is tough and they see SED giving the money away that he's earning, to some worthless guy who doesn't do

anything while he's slogging away to pay his bond and car and pay for his kids to go to college (Grace 26/5/05).

The corporate gift thus appears as the antithesis to entitlement, which is 'alienable', defined in terms of the impersonal rather than the personal – 'once passed over to the other person the original owner no longer has any claims on it' (Eyben, 2003, p.10). In contrast, ownership and control of social responsibility or community investment projects around the mines tends to remain with the donor, the company. As Eyben puts it, 'while *giving*, the company is also *keeping*... if the donor maintains most of the decision-making powers they remain the owner although the recipient is in possession of the money' (*ibid.*, emphasis added).

If education becomes a gift, the promise of empowerment and sustainability becomes, instead the currency of patronage and control. The number of those who receive the bursaries and benefits provided by the company, are few. But the hope or promise of inclusion serves to elevate the company as a central agent of empowerment, securing for the company a dominant voice in the educational development of Rustenburg.

Indeed, CSR officers expressed a sense of frustration verging, at times, on resentment that in return for their good deeds, they were met, not with gratitude, but with expectations of hand-outs and vilification of mining as an exploitative industry:

They should be praising the mines not attacking them. We're doing a good job. We're killing less people. It just upsets me when people attack [the company] and say we're just callous - they have no idea the things we do for the workforce and the community (Elaine, 20/4/05).

Such a discourse is, however equally powerful at displacing and abdicating obligation. The injunction to 'help oneself' and 'exploit the opportunities given' acts to reinforce the claim that company may have claimed responsibility, but in doing so they deny obligation.

Bafana Hendricks, a senior advisor in the National Union of Mineworkers, captured the way in which this form of corporate practice is neither new, nor serves to empower:

I told you about the company I worked for in the 60's - a long time ago, they were committed to the training of black people – so, well before the legislation we have now with the mining charter, there were always companies, or people, who are *good samaritans* but that doesn't necessarily change the system (Bafana Hendricks, 5/5/05).

The desire to help, or as Grace put it, 'give back', seems at first to conflict with the anger she and her colleagues express at the imposition of social debt implied in a sense of expectation or entitlement. For Grace the expectation of 'handouts', that she and her colleagues reject, is indicative of an ethos of entitlement in the new South Africa and its new legislative requirement such as the Mining Charter and BEE Scorecard:

I don't know, this might be a white perception, but I don't see the mine as such a horrible employer – they are damn well paid and noone's holding a gun to your head and making people work here. Since the change in government *they* feel an entitlement.... The Mining Charter pisses me off – it's a hobby horse. We've had SED for 13 years, long before the Mining Charter. I'm proud to be part of this industry – we've always done things, not because of the law but because we want to *give back* and yet we're the ones that get all the stick. (Grace, 20/4/05).

Grace's disaffection with the Mining Charter seems to stem in part from the way in which the Charter aims to turn their individual philanthropic quests into legal imperative, thus removing from them the role, and at times honour, of personal patron which the practice of CSR has hitherto conferred on them. As CSR around the mine generates webs of patronage and clientalism, CSR personnel see themselves as empowerers of a hand-picked bunch of beneficiaries and resent the expectation of handouts from others. The corporate discourse of self-empowerment thus implicitly rejects any claims of entitlement and corresponding obligation. Responsibility is shifted from the corporation onto the recipients of their CSR agenda, who thus become subject to conflicting discursive practices – on the one hand to demonstrate their capacity for self-empowerment, on the other hand, to show gratitude and deference for the patron's provision. Anyone who does not respond to the moral injunction to help themselves, has only themselves to blame:

Everyone in Rustenburg is always looking to the mines for the town's failures and for the solutions – but perhaps they need to start looking to themselves, because when the mines close, we'll all be gone (Refinery Manager, Rustenburg, 12/5/05).

Yet, the denial of entitlement and the creation of patron-client relations makes this promise of independence and empowerment an impossibility. While people are apparently converted to the emancipatory promise of business, uplifted, through education and training programmes, and transformed into ideal market players, they are simultaneously subjected to the coercive powers of patronage which serves to reassert the hierarchy of the company's power over the community. CSR becomes, in the end, an instrument of social control and subjectification, rather than a conduit of empowerment – empowering the company, rather than the supposed subjects of its empowerment initiatives.

The advent of the Mining Charter and BEE scorecard could prove a challenge to the form of coercive corporate largesse that I have described above. The new regulatory framework encapsulated in the Charter and Scorecard demands that mining companies increasingly respond to a state-driven national agenda for Black Economic Empowerment (BEE) and sustainable development⁹. These include criteria such as 'community development, improved employee housing, affirmative procurement' (Hamann, 2004, p. 5) as well as targets for HDSA (historically disadvantaged South Africans) quotas in management positions, the identification of a talents pool and women in mining (Department of Minerals and Energy, 2004). Thus, the South African government's legislative transformation agenda aims, in some ways, to translate responsibility into obligation. The effects of this new regulatory environment are yet to be seen – whether it will mean a state-driven form of corporate accountability in place of a corporate-driven paternalism we will have to wait and see. While, many people are sceptical of the capacity of government to actually enforce their demands, others suggest it is just a matter of time: as one CSR coordinator put it:

The mining charter means that ... the company can't try to be Father Christmas anymore (Gilbert Mogapi, 15/4/05).

However, while the imperatives of BEE represent the role of the state in the provision of corporate social investment, the emphasis on *economic empowerment* (as opposed to a redistributive form of social justice) simultaneously highlights the extent to which the post-Apartheid state has embraced business as a vehicle for social improvement. At the same time, business, seems

⁹ As stipulated by the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, companies are now required to convert their 'old order' mining rights into 'new order rights', in order to do so, and in competing with other companies for new exploration and mining rights, they must meet a number of social and labour targets laid down in the Charter (Hamann, 2004, p. 8-9; Hamann & Kapelus, 2004, p. 89).

increasingly, to embrace everything¹⁵. Corporate social investment has stepped into the breach left by the weakening of civil society organisations in the post-apartheid period (Habib & Taylor, 1999). Implicit within this vision of development, is an ideal citizen who can respond to the moral exhortation to 'help oneself' by embracing the opportunities provided by expanding business, and, in so doing, will be uplifted out of poverty and brought into 'the market'. This ideological vision of 'empowerment' which asserts the primacy of the market as the panacea to poverty, thus fits perfectly with the discourse of corporate social responsibility, authenticating the position of TNCs in the new South Africa as central agents of social improvement. The state thus becomes the advocate of a market- or business-led vision of development, rather than the guardian of society against the potential perils of the market.

Market Moralities

Through the master narratives of 'empowerment through enterprise' and conversion to an entrepreneurial spirit, CSR serves, not only as an authenticating discourse for market capitalism, but an extension of this hegemonic market ideology, according to which, as Olds and Thrifts put it, 'accumulation becomes the very stuff of life, through persuading the population to become its own prime asset – a kind of people mine' (Olds & Thrift, 2005, p. 272).

The relationship between the company's CSR operatives and the beneficiaries they seek to empower through their CSR work seems to embody the much broader contradictions of the relationship between big business and the new South Africa. The company asserts its role as key players in development of the nation through a narrative of empowerment, transformation and responsibility. At the same time, the discourse of CSR serves to reject claims of entitlement, obligation and the legacy of their role in the country's tortuous past. By providing a moral narrative of commitment to national development, CSR banishes questions surrounding the inequitable distribution of wealth and resources in South Africa's mineral economy and the relationship between capital and production is naturalised. The logic of business itself – and entry to the market - come to stand for the values of freedom and empowerment which lie at the heart of South Africa's new nationalist discourse.

Conventional models of modern capitalist economics have long claimed the independence of the market from other forms of social life and from the concerns of morality. Yet, the Economist tells us that: 'Greed is out. Corporate virtue, or the appearance of it, is in' (The Economist, 2004). How can the CSR movement and its claims to 'compassionate capitalism' (*ibid.*) be reconciled with conventional representations of the amorality of the modern market economy, of hi-tech global extraction, and 'the cold reasoning of the businessman, banker or capitalist' (Mauss, 1967, p.73)? The much extolled ideal of 'corporate virtue' seems to summon up visions of Victorian philanthropic industrialists who were often openly motivated by religious principles. The image of 'corporate virtue' is juxtaposed with that of 'corporate greed'¹⁰: CSR held up to represent the triumph of selfless good over the selfish pursuit of profit.

The persistent intrusion of this moral discourse into the supposedly modern world of market relations seems at first to signify, as David Graeber suggests, an underlying repugnance, even within capitalist societies, towards the harsh logic of the market (Graeber, 2001), demanding redemption through philanthropic endeavours. According to this argument, corporate giving unleashes a purifying force which makes capitalist accumulation moral¹¹. Is the gift or philanthropy then, simply the smooth surface to corporate power? Is it simply old school philanthropy in new clothes – offering moral purification to the process of accumulation?

¹⁰ An image which is reminiscent of the unbridled corporate greed of the 1980's depicted in Tom Wolfe's 'Bonfire of the Vanities' (1990) or the infamous Gordon Gekko in the film *Wall Street* (Stone, 1987).

¹¹ See for example Odendahl 1990; McCarthy 2003; and Zunz 2004.

However such arguments place the act of giving and the practice of CSR, outside the core practice of business – a moral bolt-on or postscript to the fundamentals of the market. Yet the modern discourse of CSR seeks to do quite the opposite. Rather than providing a purifying function to capitalism, CSR has become a central mechanism for corporate power to extend and authenticate its authority beyond the economic sphere. The morality it extends is that of the market itself: for it is through the market that the great goals of empowerment, sustainability and upliftment will be achieved.

REFERENCES

- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste*.
Translated by R. Nice. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *An outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, UK:
Cambridge University Press.
- Bulmer, M. (1975). Sociological models of mining communities. *The Sociological Review*, 23, 61-92
- Burawoy, M. (1972). Another look at the mineworker. *African Social Research*, 14, 239-287
- Burawoy, M. (1974). *Constraint and manipulation in industrial conflict*. Lusaka:
University of Zambia.
- Cruikshank, B. (1999). *The Will to Empower: Democratic Citizens and Other Subjects*. Ithaca
NY: Cornell University Press.
- Department of Minerals and Energy. 2004. *Scorecard for the broad based socio-economic empowerment charter for the South African mining industry*.
Retrieved March 2, 2006, from
Electronic document, <http://www.dme.gov.za/minerals/pdf/scorecard.pdf>
- Economist (2004, January 24). Business: Two-faced capitalism; corporate social responsibility. *The Economist*, 370, Iss. 8359, 59.
- Eyben, R., with León, R. (2003). Who owns the gift? Donor-recipient relations and the national elections in Bolivia. Paper presented at the EIDOS Workshop on “Order and Disjuncture: the Organisation of Aid and Development”, SOAS, September 26.
- Gaspar, D. (1996). Culture and development ethics: Needs, women’s rights and Western theories. *Development and Change*, 27(4), 627-661.
- Gordon, R.T. (1977). *Mines, masters and migrants: Life in a Namibian compound*. Johannesburg: Ravan Press.
- Graeber, D. (2001). *Toward an anthropological theory of value: The false coin of our dreams*. New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Gupta, A. & Ferguson, J. (1997). Discipline and practice: "The field" as site, method, and location in anthropology. In: A. Gupta & J. Ferguson (Eds.), *Anthropological locations. Boundaries and grounds of a field science* (pp. 1-47). Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press.
- Habib, A. & Taylor, R. (1999). Anti-Apartheid NGOs in transition. *Voluntas*, 10(1), 73-82.
- Hamann, R. (2004). Corporate social responsibility, partnerships, and institutional change: The case of mining companies in South Africa. *Natural Resources Forum*, 28, 1-13.
- Hamann, R., & Kapelus, P. (2004). Corporate social responsibility in mining in Southern Africa: Fair accountability or just greenwash?. *Development* 47(3), 85-92
- Henkel, H., & Stirrat, R.L. (2001). Participation as spiritual duty; empowerment as

- secular subjection. In: B. Cooke and U. Kothari (Eds.), *Participation – the new tyranny?* (pp. 168-185). London and New York: Zed Books.
- Hocking, A. (1973). *Oppenheimer and son*. Johannesburg: McGraw-Hill.
- Mail and Guardian* (2005, July 30). Anglo American advertisement: We have come a long way.
- Mauss, M. (1967). *The gift* [1925], transl. By I. Cunnison. London: Cohen & West Ltd; & New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- McCarthy, KD. (2003). *American creed: Philanthropy and the rise of civil society 1700-1865*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Odendahl, T. (1990). *Charity begins at home: Generosity and self-Interest among the philanthropic*. New York: Basic Books.
- Olds, K. & Thrift, N. (2005). Cultures on the brink: Reengineering the soul of capitalism - on a global scale. In: A. Ong and S. Collier (Eds.), *Global Assemblages – Technology, Politics and Ethics as Anthropological Problems* (pp. 173-194). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Oppenheimer, N. (1979). Investment in South Africa Today and Tomorrow. Address to the Financial Mail Conference, *Investment in 1980*. Johannesburg, November 9.
- Rajak, D. (2008). 'I am the conscience of the company': Responsibility and the gift in a transnational mining corporation. In: K. Browne and L. Milgram (Eds.), *Economics and Morality: Anthropological Approaches*. Society for Economic Anthropology Monography. Maryland, USA: AltaMira Press.
- Ramphele, M. (2005, September 15). Citizenship is stewardship. *Business Day*.
- Robbins, D. (2001). *Anglo American's corporate social investment in South Africa*. Johannesburg, SA: Anglo American Corporation of South Africa Ltd.
- Stirrat, R.L., & Henkel, H. (1997). The development gift: The problem of reciprocity in the NGO world. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 554, 66-80.
- Stone, O. (1987). *Wall street*. 125 min. Hollywood, CA: 20th Century Fox.
- Wilson, F. (1972). *Labour in the South African gold mines, 1911-1969*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Wolfe, T. (1990). *The bonfire of the vanities*. London: Picador.
- Zunz, O. (2004). Philanthropy as creed: The encounter between past and present. *Reviews in American History*, 32, 506-511.
- Zwennis, V. (2003, October). The ultimate entrepreneur?. *Lebone*.