

- **Team-Work:** Working together as a unit for common goal, building teams through mutual trust, respect and cooperation.

Hence, a competent civil servant plays a key role in creating an enabling environment for the development and management of human resources of the Government for efficient, accountable and responsive governance.

6. The mandatory nature of Corporate Social Responsibility goes against the notion of philanthropy. Discuss. (10)

Approach:

- Briefly discuss the importance of corporate social responsibility.
- Explain the hierarchy of responsibilities of a corporate.
- Bring out how the mandatory inclusion of corporate social responsibility affects its discretionary responsibilities.
- Briefly discuss the critique of the aforementioned viewpoint in the concluding part.

Answer:

In general, CSR and philanthropy are often barely distinguishable from each other. The notion of philanthropy is usually integrated into a bigger picture of corporate social responsibility plan.

Any business for its organisation or any individual for its income depends upon society for various inputs like manpower, resources, money et al. Thus, they owe a responsibility to the society at large.

Philanthropy or CSR is a way for them to give back something to society in return by way of money, social actions, environment protection and such. Both evoke their sense of responsibility towards the community and environment (both ecological and social) in which it operates. Both are positive concepts designed to deliver corporate resources to the community the corporation serves.

However, mandatory nature of Corporate Social Responsibility goes against the notion of Philanthropy:

- Philanthropy is a private matter and must be encouraged. It should be up to the corporate to decide whether, how much and whom to give to.
- The direct intervention of government in such decisions makes it another legal obligation for the corporation and not as such social responsibility.
- The act of philanthropy has deep concern for certain cause or issue in the society. Mandating it shows distrust and misunderstanding of markets and capitalism and may also promote half-hearted action by corporates.
- Willingness to spend part of their fortunes by corporate themselves out of their own conviction towards any cause would also ensure some tangible outcomes in that respect in the longer run. With mandating CSR, it almost reduces to a sort of tax which they need to pay using money and their resources towards certain activities.
- Many a times, the activities of CSR are undertaken as a brand-building exercise, thus, going against the notion of philanthropy in the sense that the end goal is not public interest but some sort of self-interest.

However, in a resource-strained country like India such measures are necessary to push certain wealth out of the pockets of corporates towards social causes. CSR indeed has helped India in involving better technology and efficient human resource in improving social infrastructure, accelerating community development and promoting environmental protection norms. It increases the exposure of learned people of the society to such activities. It may also induce long-term behavioural and attitudinal changes in individuals and corporates regarding their responsibility towards society. Further, the outreach of CSR is likely to be far broader than much individual philanthropy.

Further, the trusteeship model also suggests that corporate social responsibility practices are justified because companies have a moral duty to give back to the community what they receive in