Chapter X

Providing Foundations: philanthropy, global policy and administration

Tobias Jung and Jenny Harrow

Abstract: Philanthropy is gaining renewed policy prominence. Focusing on the institutional expressions of philanthropy – philanthropic foundations – this chapter critically explores foundations' various contributions to, and roles in, global policy. Emphasising the need to move beyond traditional perspectives, dominant focal points and well-established questions around philanthropy, the chapter argues for more synthesised, critically reflective, engagement with philanthropy in global policy research. To this end, the importance of examining historic antecedents of contemporary developments in philanthropy and the need for a stronger evidence-base are outlined. The chapter concludes by discussing the spectrum of research opportunities philanthropy provides for the global policy and transnational administration field.

Keywords: philanthropy, foundations, philanthropists, worldmaking, hyperagency

'Malignant' (Parmar, 2002, p. 1), a constructor of hegemony (Roelofs, 2003), a co-producer of world order (Krige and Rausch, 2012), a colonial project (Lipman, 2015). These are just some of the overarching criticisms levelled at philanthropy and its role in policy and administration. With philanthropy emerging as a central component of contemporary networked governance (Jung and Harrow, 2015) and as an essential ingredient in the 'private welfare state' model (Boesso et al, 2014, p. 159), our chapter examines the different roles and expressions of global philanthropy. We specifically focus on the organisational expressions of philanthropy, philanthropic foundations. Not only have these been undergoing unprecedented global growth but, prominently equated to the organisational equivalent of 'giraffes', ill-equipped, aristocratic institutions (Nielsen, 1972), and to '600-pound gorillas', whose mere presence at the policy table suffices to exert influence (O'Mara, 1997), it is foundations that have attracted most of the academic, political and popular attention to date.

Our chapter begins with critical reflections on prominent perspectives on philanthropy and foundations. We highlight the need to move beyond traditional definitions, and emphasise the importance of taking the historic links and antecedents of contemporary philanthropy discourse into account to advance, rather than repeat or reinvent, thinking about the field. To examine philanthropy's presence, parts and practices in the policy agora – the sphere of interconnected, fluid, dynamic and complex links across politics, markets, culture and society that are emerging globally (Stone, 2008) – we then address foundations' approaches to shaping policy and administration. Here, we point to three strategic and temporal clusters of philanthropic involvement in the global policy field. After discussing current data and

expressions of global philanthropy, we consider the growing marketisation, financialisation, and emphasis on 'effectiveness' in philanthropy. To-date, visions and rhetoric appear to have trumped broader reflective engagement with, and robust evidence on, those developments. Arguing for the need to move from polarised towards more nuanced perspectives on philanthropy, we conclude with outlining the spectrum of research opportunities that the philanthropy field offers to global policy.

Philanthropy and global philanthropy: what's in a name?

To begin, it is important to clarify the meaning of philanthropy and to point to its strong and longstanding relationship to policy and administration. Notwithstanding recent debates about philanthropy's influence in national and international policy spheres and whether this is a cause for concern (e.g. Ball and Junemann, 2012; Stone, 2010), it is essential to recognise that philanthropy is inherently political and value-laden. While charity focuses on addressing the symptoms of a problem, philanthropy tries to address root causes and advocates for policy and social change (Hammack and Anheier, 2013). Philanthropy is thus a place for exercising and negotiating power (Cunningham, 2016). Its use as a strategic tool in the political rat race was recognised early by the Roman author and administrator Pliny the Younger (von Reden, 2015) and resonates with contemporary discussions about the activities of foundations associated with political leaders: from Clinton (Roberts, 2016) to Trump (Abramson, 2017). Indeed, the use and abuse of philanthropy to foster personal interests and agendas, to secure family fortunes and well-being, to shape and maintain social and public structures, and to convey and enforce desirable behaviours are well documented (e.g. Berman, 1983; Cunningham, 2016; von Reden, 2015). As such, it is unsurprising that philanthropy remains a contested concept (Daly, 2012).

Modern anglophone academic and policy discourse tends to cast philanthropy normatively, as 'the love of humanity', as 'doing good', or as 'caring about' (Sulek, 2010). Such 'warm glow' perspectives are of limited use. Firstly, they fail to acknowledge the broad spectrum of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations that can drive philanthropy – from altruism to personal gains and social control (Gordon et al, 2016; Pharoah, 2016). Secondly, they restrict critical engagement with the field (Rogers, 2015) by creating a romanticised vision of, and sentimental discourse on, philanthropy (Phillips and Jung, 2016).

To overcome the limitations of traditional understandings of philanthropy, and to allow for the inclusion of diverse drivers, expressions and the changing characteristics of philanthropy, it is useful to cast philanthropy in broader, more neutral, terms as 'the use of private resources – treasure, time and talent – for public purposes' (Phillips and Jung, 2016, p. 7). In its expression as 'global' or 'transboundary' philanthropy (Schmid and Bar Nissim, 2016), this can refer to a number of different developments. It can either mean the worldwide burgeoning of philanthropic institutions and individuals, or philanthropy's growing involvement in addressing global issues (Plewes, 2008). Alternatively, it can point to the globalisation *of* philanthropy (Leat, 2007), the means and processes by which philanthropic practices and infrastructures are spread, shared and interact globally, using worldwide interconnectedness to promote, express and develop particular norms and forms of

international giving (e.g. WINGS, 2017).

Foundations, fears and furore

Philanthropy, especially in the form of foundations, has always been surrounded by furore, distrust and suspicion. Perceived as 'titans of the nonprofit world' (Gaul and Borowski, 1993, p. 161), foundations are paradoxical creatures: (a) their wealth originates in self-interest, yet is to be used altruistically to help those less fortunate; (b) they have got great social, economic and political power, yet this power is concentrated in the hands of few, generally unelected, foundation leaders; (c) they address public issues, yet tend not to consult the public thereon; and (d) they try to add value to society, yet often fail to explore or comprehend any change created (Fleishman, 2007, pp. 48-49). In the absence of a strong theory of the foundation, with foundations' own associations and umbrella bodies acknowledging that 'the term foundation has no precise meaning' (e.g. Association of Charitable Foundations, 2017), academic and non-academic discourse on foundations tends to lack nuances (Jung et al, 2016).

For example, the enormous wealth held in the handful of mega-foundations – Gates (ca. $41bn), Wellcome (ca.$27bn), Ford (ca. $12bn) – distorts popular perceptions about foundations' resources. It fails to appreciate the very 'long tail of philanthropy': a very small number of foundations with extremely large assets are followed by huge numbers of ever-smaller foundations (Pharoah et al, 2017). The private nature of foundations and their general discretion over philanthropic spending choices have further contributed to longstanding concerns about these organisations. One of the early foundation examples, Plato's Academy, was closed by the Roman Emperor Justinian on the basis that it spread unorthodox, heretical and pagan ideas (Whitaker, 1974). Within medieval England, the accumulation of wealth in ecclesiastical foundations, which eventually exceeded that of the Crown, irked the royals and contributed to their appropriation of foundation wealth (Kiger, 2000). Contemporary anxieties about foundations are reflected in numerous congressional investigations into foundations in the U.S., and in ongoing global attempts at controlling and curtailing foundations' powers and purposes (e.g. Bishop and Green, 2012; Gaul and Borowski, 1993). In addition, high-profile cases of individual foundations being used and abused for non-charitable purposes – from tax-avoidance, to legal misconduct and criminal acts – have often tainted the broader foundation field by association (Smith et al, 2016; Whitaker, 1974). Given the tensions that arise from these characteristics, practices and perceptions, it is unsurprising that critiques of philanthropy and of foundations have come from all parts of society, from across the whole political spectrum: on the one hand, they have been criticised for reinforcing inequalities and for promulgating neoliberalism and globalisation (McGoey, 2015; Roelofs, 2003), and, on the other, for advocating and backing socialism and spreading communism (Abrahamson et al, 2013).

The longstanding links between philanthropy, global policy and administration

The historic role and relationship between philanthropy policy and administration warrants clarification. A popular portrayal is the idea of a 'philanthropy-policy ping-pong', whereby philanthropy is either cast as a provider of 'first' or of 'last resort', as a prelude or postscript

to public policy initiatives. This needs to be challenged. The relationship between the two – whether discreet or explicit, collaborative or confrontational – has always been much more closely intertwined than commonly perceived. In how far philanthropy and policy need each other to achieve 'positive outcomes that neither could achieve alone' (Macdonald and Szanto, 2007), or whether their links are predominantly facades (Almog-Bar and Zychlinski, 2012) or symbolic actions aimed at maintaining the status quo (Thümler, 2011), are matters in need of further research and exploration.

Within the policy landscape, foundations tend to be subliminal players, a widely unrecognised socio-political undercurrent. While philanthropy's hyperagency – its diverse capacities and dispositions that allow for the production of specific social outcomes and the creation of the conditions and contexts within which agency is exercised (Schervish, 2013) – is vividly displayed by the worldwide activities of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (e.g. McGoey, 2015), or claimed by, and ascribed to, the global ambitions of the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative (2017), in general, philanthropy tends to operate in more subtle ways: it shapes and influences by virtue of its selective, controlling and normative moulding of knowledge, discourse and practice (e.g. Ball and Junemann, 2012; Stone, 2010). This can be illustrated at primary, secondary and higher education levels, across different continents, in relation to disciplines in the natural and social sciences, and through the examination of global networks and institutions (Jung and Harrow, 2016). In short, philanthropy has shaped the arenas of global policy and transnational administration for over a century through influencing developments at local, national and international levels.

Well before the notion of 'development assistance' was defined within the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC), foundations were active in international work (Grimm et al, 2009). The extent of these foundation activities is illustrated in a statement by John D. Rockefeller issued on Christmas Day 1919. Announcing additional funds of $50,000,000 to his foundation (that is approximately $730,000,000 in current value adjusted for inflation), Rockefeller highlighted that these extra resources would enable the Rockefeller Foundation to more adequately 'meet the large demands of a world-wide programme which already reaches twenty-five countries' (cited in Walsh, 1920, p. 608). In a comment on this development, his contemporaries concluded that 'There is not a country on the western hemisphere which is not subject to some of the Foundation's activities, and there is scarcely a country in the world into which its direct influence has not been diffused' (Walsh, 1920, p. 608).

Historic examples, such as the Rockefeller one, frequently dwarf the resources provided by, and challenge the novelty of, more recent global foundation ambitions. For example, the NoVo Foundations' announcement of its Radical Hope Fund 'a four-year, $20 million commitment to support bold and transformative social justice work globally' (NoVo Foundation, 2017) seems a mere trifle in comparison. Similarly, while former United Nations (UN) Secretary-General Kofi Annan's call for a 'uniquely African Green Revolution' and foundations' involvement in the resulting Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) might be seen as an exciting new global policy initiative (AGRA, 2017), it can also be seen

as a resurfacing of the Rockefeller Foundation's 1941 Green Revolution initiative, aimed at improving crop yields and nutrition (Spero, 2010).

On the global policy philanthropy scene, two other foundations have traditionally had similar prestige to Rockefeller: the Carnegie and Ford philanthropies. Emerging at the beginning of the 20th Century as harbingers of a new era, the age of big foundations (Cunningham, 2016), these foundations' aims were equally ambitious and grand. The Charter of the Rockefeller Foundation (1913) declared its aim 'to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world', the Ford Foundation (1936), the largest foundation in the world during the mid-20th Century, focused on 'scientific, educational and charitable purposes, all for the public welfare', while one of Andrew Carnegie's many foundations, the Carnegie Peace Fund, known as the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (CEIP), was established with the task of abolishing 'international war between so-cald [sic.] civilized nations' (Carnegie, 1910, p. 3).

From a contemporary perspective, it is easy to criticise these institutions and initiatives. Indeed, scholars have repeatedly recited a common canon of concerns relating to foundations' historic and contemporary involvement in the policy arena. This includes questions about the origins and size of foundation funds, foundations' unelected and undemocratic nature, their elite composition and influence, and the cultural imperialism and dominance that have been associated with foundations' activities (Arnove and Pinede, 2007; Berman, 1983; Krige and Rausch, 2012; Parmar, 2012; Roelofs, 2003). What is rarely acknowledged is 'the possibility that funding decisions may be less than sinister', that foundation officers' efforts 'may be admirably thorough and evenhanded' (Woods, 1999, p. 151), that, for all their faults, such organisations were usually driven by idealism, the potential for progress, and the actual hope to create and maintain political stability and 'world peace' (Rietzler, 2008; Witkowski and Bauerkämper, 2016). Considered alongside the spectrum of roles that foundations working internationally can fulfil – acting as legitimisers, amplifiers, importer and exporters if ideas, institution builders, coalition builders, and as representatives (Heydemann and Kinsey, 2010) – there is thus a danger of moving from critiques and criticisms of a select number of individual foundations or specific foundation initiatives to inappropriate generalisations across the entire foundation field. Furthermore, it is important to contextualise and compare the current landscape of philanthropy's role(s) and influence to its prior expressions. For example, the Rockefeller Foundation's early 20th century initiatives can be argued to have had much greater impact on international health than the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation's current global health efforts: the former occurred at a time when the field was more open and in a global context defined by strong European and growing US imperialism; the latter occurs at a time of neoliberal globalisation and fading US hegemony (Birn, 2014).

Foundations' approach to shaping global policy and administration: three overarching strategies, three temporal clusters

The Peace Palace in the Hague, home to the International Court of Justice, to the Permanent Court of Arbitration and to the Hague Academy of International Law, was financed by

Andrew Carnegie in 1903. The institution he created for this purpose, the Carnegie Foundation, to this day continues to be the owner and in charge of the upkeep and maintenance of the building, its grounds and the Peace Palace Library (Carnegie Corporation of New York, 2007). Such funding, that shapes and supports global policy and administration in various ways, is a recurring theme in philanthropy.

Following World Wars I and II, for example, American foundations played a central role in casting and informing American cultural diplomacy (Witkowski and Bauerkämper, 2016); Carnegie, Rockefeller and Ford philanthropies were essential in shaping, strengthening and institutionalising the areas of International Relations and of foreign area studies. The focus was on simultaneously shaping these as fields of research and to inform policy and practice (Guilhot, 2011). In the US, their involvement included the funding and fashioning of the Council on Foreign Relations, the Foreign Policy Association, the Institute of Pacific Relations, as well as the Yale Institute of International Studies and the Princeton Public Opinion Studies Programme (Parmar, 2012). Foundations, in tandem with government, academia and practitioners, thereby shaped the internal and external perception, portrayal and expression of America's place on the global stage (Müller, 2012). These efforts went well beyond the American context. This is prominently illustrated in these foundations' activities in Germany.

In the interwar period, American foundations funded the development of independent academic institutions, including the Foreign Policy Institute and the German Academy for Politics (the Institut für Auswärtige Politik and the Deutsche Hochschule für Politik respectively). These were aimed at developing transnational academic collaborations on international relations (Rietzler, 2008). During the Cold War, American foundations again focused on strengthening German academia through encouraging pluralism and open discourse (Witkowski and Bauerkämper, 2016). While not often acknowledged, it is also important to bear in mind that such 'world making' activities have historically neither been restricted to American foundations nor limited to specific social or political perspective. This is evident in the philanthropic activities in Africa that originated from both West and East Germany (Witkowski and Bauerkämper, 2016) or, more recently, the Qatar Foundation's Reach Out To Asia (ROTA) initiative (Al-Thani, 2016). Furthermore, as the ongoing support for the global spread of community philanthropy models, institutions and movements as vehicles for local, sustainable, development, poverty alleviation and citizen participation by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and the Charles Stewart Mott, the Ford, the King Baudouin, and the Open Society Foundations highlights, neither is this approach a thing of the past (see Global Fund for Community Foundations, 2017).

Philanthropy is thus intricately woven through the very fabric of global policy and administration. While some of it has become more explicit in recent years, the key focus on funding for infrastructures, knowledge and understanding, and on shaping discourse and practices is omnipresent; it is evident in the Carnegie Corporation's historic educational activities in Africa (Murphy, 1976), the Rockefeller Foundation's longstanding involvement in the domains of agriculture, nutrition and food security (Smith, 2009), the Bill and Melinda

Gates Foundation's work around health (Matthews and Ho, 2008), as well as these foundations' combined activities in international development and global education more broadly (e.g. Martens and Seitz, 2015; Stone, 2010). While foundations are frequently included amongst the 'new' actors on the global policy landscape, they have thus tended to be forerunners in several global issues and developments that are undergoing a renaissance, rediscovery or recasting.

Foundations' involvement in policy can be roughly divided into three temporal clusters: an era of gifting knowledge; a second period linking academia, policy and practice; and a third phase that has emphasised taking charge of driving change (Jung and Harrow, 2016). The first, covering the period up to World War II, was rooted in Carnegie's motion of moving away from 'indiscriminate giving' towards achieving actual and lasting good (Carnegie, 1901). To this end, philanthropy was geared towards the support and application of systematic, scientific principles, towards fostering science, learning and education. The second phase started around 1945. Its catalyst was the recognition that, despite progress in science and technology, inequality and social challenges persisted. Consequently, foundations moved their funding and activities towards emphasising policy analysis, advocacy and linking academia, policy and practice (Dowie, 2002). However, the difficulties of working with government, and growing chasms across the foundation world itself, quickly made foundations wonder if they might be better off by taking matters in their own hands: either through taking actions themselves, or through funding social movements and initiatives to achieve things on their behalf. While the logics and approaches of the preceding two phases continue, the latter established itself as the prevailing logic in the 1960s and still dominants the field (Dowie, 2002; Jung and Harrow, 2016). Hand-in-hand with these approaches goes a subtle but important shift in the perception of power.

Power has been conceptualised in a multiplicity of ways. To understand philanthropy's changing role on the global stage, the distinction between 'power to', 'power with' and 'power over' is helpful. The first refers to the ability to exercise power; the latter two emphasise the relational nature of power. Power 'with' emphasises a collective and collaborative approach; power 'over' points to a power imbalance, where one actor is in a dominant position (Göhler, 2009). These perspectives roughly coincide with the three aforementioned temporal clusters of foundation approaches. *Power to* mirrors the early realisation and ambition to achieve change; *power with* reflects the collaborative and collective approach illustrated in the second stage. *Power over* is becoming ever more clearly expressed in the size and numbers of foundations working at a global level.

Expressions of global philanthropy

Data on global philanthropy is patchy and incomplete; there is a potential to over-represent some donors and under-represent others. As foundations can channel their global giving through the funding of domestic intermediary nonprofits which in turn operate internationally, it is difficult to identify and follow foundation resources (Schmid and Bar Nissim, 2016). Furthermore, due to differences in reporting standards, requirements and cycles, data on foundations, where even available, is often dated. International information

thus tends to be unsystematic and not directly comparable. However, indicative insights from the international development field over the last decade point to around half of all European foundations being involved in international activities, with international development representing around 9% of all UK grant making foundations' spending, while around 27% of American foundations' grants go to international activities (Marten and Witte, 2008; Martens and Seitz, 2015; Pharoah and Bryant, 2012). Within this context, the Gates Foundation stands out. It is roughly double the size of the second largest American foundation, the Howard Hughes Medical Institute, and almost five times as large as the third, the Ford Foundation. Its spending power, dominating logics and influence are well documented and widely discussed (e.g. Matthews and Ho, 2008; McGoey, 2015). More broadly, however, the size of philanthropy's role might be smaller than popularly assumed. Recent findings indicate that of all private contributions by G20 to developing countries, philanthropy only seems to be around $64 billion of the total of $513 billion, that is, just below 12% (Hudson Institute, 2016). This queries the extent to which foundations are uniformly 'outbidding' or outrunning more established intergovernmental institutions (e.g. Donaldson and Rutter, 2017). Furthermore, philanthropic developments across the Asian and African contexts might be, albeit very slowly, starting to challenge the influence of international philanthropy. Rather than satisfying external foundations' norms and needs, there is a growing recognition and emphasis on horizontality, 'a systematic and grounded approach to organisational reform that takes the indigenous as the point of departure' (Fowler, 2016, p. 166).

Given the various critiques levelled at philanthropy outlined so far – from questions about democracy, accountability and transparency in foundation activities, to concerns about philanthropy's driving and skewing of particular social agendas whilst ignoring others – why does philanthropy get a seat at the policy table? Here, the actual extent of philanthropic resources only appears to be one factor. The very characteristics of philanthropy that are widely criticised also make it very appealing to, and useful in, the global policy landscape: a general resource independence, control over strategic direction and redirection, claims to recognise and respond to specific social needs and niches, essentially private – albeit nationally regulated – decision -making, and the ability to both operate over flexible and long timescales and with a diversity of actors. In addition, foundations offer the opportunity and ability to access and operate in contexts where more traditional global policy players cannot, or cannot be seen to, be involved. Not only does this offer the chance to provide governments with indirect support, but it is also an opportunity that has repeatedly been used by international intelligence agencies and terrorist organisations alike to channel funds, and to set foot, into different areas of the world (Smith et al., 2016; Whitaker, 1974).

The relationship among policy, administration and philanthropy covers a spectrum of expressions. It can be complementary, supplementary, or adversarial (Young, 2000). Of these, the first two expressions have received most research attention, highlighting a number of issues. For example, some findings point to interactions where, despite a ceremonial collaborative veneer, policy and philanthropy partners try to exert control and further goals and ambitions that are not in the interest of the other party. This raises the topic of whether such collaborations are a desirable or effective way of promoting different sectors' interests

and aims (Almog-Bar and Zychlinski, 2012). Furthermore, given that philanthropy's ultimate success would be its own abolition – in other words, it being no longer required – researchers have wondered if the coming together of philanthropy and policy predominantly focuses on legitimisation. Whether or not these partnerships achieve positive change is irrelevant: the mere working together generates and mobilises 'ascriptions of moral legitimacy for the organisations involved by virtue of their claim to improve the performance of the system' (Thümler, 2011, p. 1111). The third, adversarial, aspect is highlighted in the notion of 'the angry gift' (Silber, 2012). Identified in the context of diaspora and cross-national giving, this refers to philanthropy as the expression of 'bitter criticism and intensely negative feelings' against policymakers; through angry gifts, philanthropy critiques and criticises governmental incompetence, indifference and inefficiency (Silber, 2012, p. 325). The latter resonates with philanthropy's own historic critiques of the charity field and, in turn, with recent calls for philanthropy itself to be reinvented as discussed in the next section.

Pilanthropoids, philanthropenese and philanthrocapitalism

Perceived as having wasted 'billions of drops in millions of buckets' (Goldberg, 2009), the last few years have seen increasing calls for philanthropy to reinvent itself, to move from 'doing good' to 'doing best' (Friedman, 2013, p. 7). This is driven by the background of contemporary philanthropoids, those who determine which enterprises of benevolence or scholarship will be nourished with foundation money (Macdonald, 1956). Coming from successful entrepreneurial backgrounds, they are keen to apply their business experience to the venture of giving money away. As such, a replication of New Public Management (NPM) in the form of 'new' philanthropy management is noticeable. NPM denied the special nature of the public sector and, instead, is built on the values, concepts and experiences drawn from the private sector; its institutional centrepiece was the replication of the private firm with legitimacy arising from substantive performance and cost efficiency (Olsen, 2004). Essentially, advocates of philanthrocapitalism are trying to replicate this approach in philanthropy (Bishop and Green, 2008; Friedman, 2013; Salamon, 2014). While their emphasis on quantification is novel, the focus on business models and impact is anything but.

Contemporary discussions on 'effective' philanthropy can be traced back to the notion of 'scientific philanthropy', a critique of the unsatisfactory workings of public and private relief organisations during the 1873-78 depression (Bremner, 1956). Taken up by Carnegie and Rockefeller, this developed into the vision that a more professional approach, based on impact assessment and informed by business and corporate principles, was needed. Recently embraced and developed by 'Carnegie's Children' or 'philanthrocapitalists', who approach philanthropy in the way they have succeeded in business (Bishop and Green, 2008), this idea has spawned a whole dictionary of philanthropenese, 'the lingua franca of the foundation world' (Macdonald, 1956, p. 99). Examples include 'entrepreneurial philanthropy' (Gordon et al., 2016), 'creative philanthropy' (Anheier and Leat, 2006), 'venture philanthropy' (John, 2006), 'catalytic philanthropy' (Kramer, 2009) and 'philanthrocapitalism'(Salamon, 2014), as well as accompanying concepts such as 'effective altruism' (Singer, 2015).

Notwithstanding some subtle nuances between these terms, they boil down to the idea of

taking 'a high engagement and long-term approach to generating societal impact' using three core practices: tailored financing, organisational support and impact measurement and management (Balbo et al, 2016, pp. 18-19). In their current expressions, they entrench two developments: the marketisation of philanthropy, that is, the transfer and use of the principles and methods of the market (Nickel and Eikenberry, 2009), and the financialisation of philanthropy, that is, the growing importance and use of financial concepts, markets, actors and institutions in philanthropy (Thümler, 2016). Despite populist rhetoric about how these 'new frontiers' of philanthropy can reshape and improve philanthropy's global expressions (Salamon, 2014), there have been various criticisms: philanthrocapitalism appears to be a breakthrough in labelling rather than in practice (Frumkin, 2003), its actual achievements are disputable (Edwards, 2008), its surrounding spectacle equates to a 'fantasy machine' that allows for 'a disavowed enjoyment of global inequality' (Wilson, 2014, p. 1144), and there are concerns about its political roles and influence (McGoey, 2015).

Such critical engagement with the area, and how it is promoting and promulgating neoliberal ideas and ideals across the global policy spectrum under the veil of philanthropy have, however, tended to be peripheral (Thümler, 2016). Broader questions about how the accompanying change in discourse and perspective is altering philanthropy and restraining its potential as risk taker remain. The extent to which the tools and techniques of philanthrocapitalism provide meaningful and relevant insights, and the degree to which they replicate rather than challenge neoliberalism and its accompanying socio-cultural, economic and political impacts, need wider and more reflective research and discussion.

These, though, need to be discussed in the context of philanthropy's social and political roles more broadly, as well as in relation to their impact on the evolution of global policy and on the forms and styles of transnational administration. For example, philanthrocapitalism's infatuation with business models and quantification can be seen as leading towards risk aversion and an emphasis on fast results; the importance of structural and political aspects in developments – such as weak public systems – tends to be consistently underestimated (Seitz and Martens, 2017). Alongside debates about foundations' own egos and competition in the global policy arena, as well as questions that equally apply to other private actors, such as matters of authority, voice, and choice (e.g. Graham, 2017), the foundation field provides another important aspect for consideration: foundations' transience. Unlike national governments and prominent inter-governmental institutions, a still small, albeit growing, number of foundations is pursuing a limited-life or spend out approach: after a certain date, the foundation simply ceases to exist. At that point, all of a foundation's resources will have had to be given away or used up. Of special interest to the global policy field is that one of these is the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Established as a foundation for the 21st century, the entirety of its endowment will have to be spent within twenty years of the death of Bill and Melinda (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2017). As such, current concerns about its role and influence in global policy might be dwarfed by questions as to what happens at that point. While in the case of the Gates Foundation the sheer amount of the resources that need to be used up in a relatively short timeframe will prove interesting, the limited-life approach presents wider challenges at all levels of policy, including issues of

accountability, responsibility and liability by, and to, such foundations beyond their cessation.

Philanthropy and policy: beyond pleasantries and paranoia

Philanthropy in policy is a polarising issue, a pendulum swinging between pleasantries and paranoia: another grateful acknowledgement of foundations' contribution versus another grave attack on their undue influence. Transnational developments and perspectives, however, point to the diverse expressions and expectations of philanthropy. It can be seen as 'stop-gap', 'stakeholder', 'standard-bearer', 'starry-eyed problem solver' and 'stooge' in the policy process (Harrow and Jung, 2011). While there is no doubt that a simplistic 'enchantment with philanthropy', a preference of idealism over realism can pervade policy discourse (Harrow and Jung, 2011, p. 1055), governments are not necessarily 'rolling over' for philanthropy (see Phillips and Smith, 2016). Indeed, the changing global regulatory landscape for philanthropy, partly aimed at clamping down on terrorism and tax evasion, increasingly curtails global activities of a large part of the philanthropy field, leading to remarks about the essential role of government in maintaining the vibrancy of philanthropy (Farouky, 2015, p. 47).

With wider debates about philanthropy's philosophical underpinnings and role – whether philanthropy is or can be effective or efficient, whether philanthropy is mundane and pedestrian, and whether philanthropy is patronising, dehumanising, self-indulgent and ideologically-driven (Davies, 2015) – there is an ongoing need for better understanding and theorising of the area. The call for social scientists to 'take philanthropy seriously' (Rogers, 2015) so that the area can move 'beyond simplistic celebratory, or indeed fatalistic, rhetoric' (Harrow and Jung, 2011, p. 1049) is a longstanding one; it has been made repeatedly, its urgency remains.

Studies have tended to focus on 'the big three', Carnegie, Rockefeller, Ford, and, more recently, on the philanthropic activities of Gates, Soros and Zuckerberg. Given these philanthropies' prominence in, and dominance of, an otherwise more hidden field, these choices are unsurprising. However, expressions and activities of philanthropy and their relationship to, and role in, the policy process should be looked at in more depth, especially from non-North American perspectives and within non-North American contexts. This would enable policy, practice and academia to move away from the tendency to compare apples with pears when examining and discussing philanthropic foundations, their forms, contexts and activities (Jung et al, 2016). Differences in the legal forms and frameworks, governance and accountability requirements, as well as the expressions and approaches to philanthropy mean that the overemphasis on, and use and transfer of, US-based and informed conceptualisations is inappropriate; it severely limits the growth and development of the field of philanthropy study. Thus, while some foundations' policy influencing opportunities might be extensive, hidden and detrimental to society, it is important to separate these from the wider field of foundation activities: foundations will vary as to whether they want to make, develop, change, absorb or simply support policies of either their donor or recipient countries.

Secondly, while critical engagement with foundations' roles in policy at all levels and at all steps of the process is important, this needs to be reflective and nuanced; it needs to move beyond the well-trodden paths of common critiques of foundations and philanthropy more generally. To this end, it is important to bear in mind that foundation fatigue covers two sides and works both ways. On the one hand, it relates to valid questions about foundations' activities in the policy arena and the need for exploring in how far some foundation roles could be more appropriately addressed by other means; whether there are more appropriate approaches to achieving equality, balancing needs and distributing resources than philanthropy. However, foundation fatigue can also relate to foundations' bemoaning and their becoming fed-up with having the burden and expectation of 'fixing society's ills' placed on their shoulders, 'effectively relieving governments of their share of the responsibility to citizens' (Farouky, 2015, pp. 47-48). Different arguments pertain to intergovernmental organisations' burden-sharing, where foundations' ability to earmark funds is not open to member governments, so that the weight of some 'burdens' may in fact be heightened or redistributed.

A plethora of research opportunities thus exist. At the most basic level more, better and more timely data is needed: if the levels, forms and flows of giving are unclear, it is neither possible to identify the gaps and tensions that need addressing nor to spot overemphasis on causes and contexts that warrants rebalancing. This relates to specific areas, such as philanthropy and development (Sanna and Mc Donnell, 2017), but also to philanthropy in global policy and transnational administration more broadly. Alongside the need for integrative theory of foundations as an organisational form (Jung et al., 2016), the role and relationships of individuals within foundations needs examination: how do these differences relate to foundations' policy activities; what differences exist between younger foundations set up by entrepreneurs and more established family foundations; how do gender and age characteristics of foundations shape their activities; what is the role of trustees and professional staff in policy activities, and between those at foundation headquarters or in the field?

There are also the different philanthropic structures beyond foundations that influence policy and need attention: corporate philanthropy by multi-national corporations and business-philanthropy-policy collaborations; philanthropic platforms such as the SDG Philanthropy Platform aimed at 'getting the philanthropic scene right' through learning from other countries' experiences and helping foundations and philanthropists to develop effective and appropriate collaborations with governments and actors in the set of pilot countries, comprising Kenya, Ghana, Zambia, Indonesia and Colombia (OECD Development Centre, 2016; SDG Philanthropy Platform, 2017); the role of international foundation networks, such as the Arab Foundations Forum or WINGS – the World Initiatives for Grantmaker Support – as well as bottom-up philanthropic initiatives shaping policy at national and international levels, illustrated by different foundation forms' activity and inactivity in fostering democratic reform in the Middle East (e.g. Herrold, 2012).

Finally, more attention needs to be paid to policymakers and administrators themselves. How do they approach, harness and engage with philanthropy? Does philanthropy offer them the potential for 'having the cake and eat it' policymaking by acting as a shield? Are governments in their channelling and working with philanthropy themselves being exploitative of, and parasitic on, philanthropy? And, depending on whether philanthropy is 'private' or 'public' money, should this or should this not be the case?

References

Abrahamson, E. J., Hurst, S., & Shubinski, B. (2013). *Democracy & Philanthropy. The Rockefeller Foundation and the American Experiment*. New York: Rockefeller Foundation.

Abramson, J. (2017). The Trump Foundation: what's known is shocking. We need to know more. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/sep/21/trump-foundation-charity-settle-legal-disputes-reporting

AGRA. (2017). Who we are. Retrieved from http://agra.org/who-we-are/

Al-Thani, A. F. (2016). Philanthropy as boundary spanning. Reaching in and out for a Qatar-based charity. In T. Jung, S. D. Phillips, & J. Harrow (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Phianthropy* (pp. 289-292). London: Routledge.

Almog-Bar, M., & Zychlinski, E. (2012). A Façade of Collaboration. *Public Management Review, 14*(6), 795-814. doi:10.1080/14719037.2011.642625

Anheier, H., & Leat, D. (2006). *Creative Philanthropy*. London: Routledge.

Arnove, R., & Pinede, N. (2007). Revisiting the "Big Three" Foundations. *Critical Sociology, 33*(3), 389-425. doi:10.1163/156916307X188960

Association of Charitable Foundations. (2017). What is a foundation? Retrieved from http://www.acf.org.uk/about/what-is-a-foundation/

Balbo, L., Boiardi, P., Hehenberger, L., Mortell, D., Oostlander, P., & Vittone, E. (2016). *A Pracitcal Guide to Venture Philanthropy and Social Impact Investment*: EVPA.

Ball, S. J., & Junemann, C. (2012). *Networks, New Governance and Education*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Berman, E. H. (1983). *The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy: The Ideology of Philanthropy*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. (2017). Financials. Retrieved from https://www.gatesfoundation.org/Who-We-Are/General-Information/Financials/Foundation-Trust

Birn, A.-E. (2014). Philanthrocapitalism, past and present: the Rockefeller Foundation, the Gates Foundation, and the setting (s) of the international/global health agenda. *Hypothesis, 12*(1), NP.

Bishop, M., & Green, M. (2008). *Philanthrocapitalism: How the rich can save the world*. London: A&C Black.

Bishop, M., & Green, M. (2012). *Private Foundations - International Development Committee. Written Evidence submitted by Matthew Bishop and Michael Green*. London: House of Commons.

Boesso, G., Cerbioni, F., & Kumar, K. (2014). What Drives Good Philanthropy? The Relationship Between Governance and Strategy in Foundations. In G. Luca, A. Hinna, & F. Monteduro (Eds.), *Mechanisms, Roles and Consequences of Governance: Emerging Issues* (pp. 159-180).

Bremner, R. H. (1956). "Scientific Philanthropy," 1873-93. *Social Service Review, 30*(2), 168-173.

Carnegie, A. (1901). *The Gospel of Wealth and Other Timely Essays*. New York: Century Co.

Carnegie, A. (1910, 14th December). Mr. Carnegie’s Letter to the Trustees. Retrieved from http://carnegieendowment.org/about/pdfs/CarnegieLetter.pdf

Carnegie Corporation of New York. (2007). *The Carnegie Trusts and Institutions*. New York.

Chan Zuckerberg Initiative. (2017). Advancing human potential and promoting equal opportunity. Retrieved from https://chanzuckerberg.com/

Cunningham, H. (2016). The multi-layered history of Western philanthropy. In T. Jung, S. D. Phillips, & J. Harrow (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy* (pp. 42-55). London: Routledge.

Daly, S. (2012). Philanthropy as an Essentially Contested Concept. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 23*(3), 535-557.

Davies, R. (2015). *Public Good by Private Means*. London: Alliance Publishing Trust.

Donaldson, L. J., & Rutter, P. D. (2017). The Global Poliomyelitis Eradication Initiative: The Role of Diplomacy in Reaching “The Last 1%”. In S. Matlin & I. Kickbusch (Eds.), *Case Studies in Global Health Diplomacy (Volume 2)* (pp. 119-139). New Jersey: World Scientific.

Dowie, M. (2002). *American Foundations. An Investigative History*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Edwards, M. (2008). *Just another emperor? The Myths and Realities of Philanthrocapitalism*: Demos and The Young Foundation.

Farouky, N. (2015). *Trends in philanthropy in the Arab region: beyond a charity-based model*. Retrieved from http://civicus.org/images/SOCS2015_ESSAY7_TrendsInPhilanthropy.pdf

Fleishman, J. L. (2007). *The Foundation*. New York: Public Affairs.

Ford Foundation. (1936). *Articles of Incorporation*. Michigan.

Fowler, A. (2016). Changing direction: adapting foreign philanthropy to endogenous understandings and practices. In S. Mottiar & M. Ngcoya (Eds.), *Philanthropy in South Africa. Horizontality, Ubuntu and Social Justice* (pp. 155-168). Cape Town: HSRC Press.

Friedman, E. (2013). *Reinventing Philanthropy*. Washington: Potomac Books.

Frumkin, P. (2003). Inside Venture Philanthropy. *Society, May/June*, 7-15.

Gaul, G. M., & Borowski, N. A. (1993, 24 April). Foundations Build A Giant Nest Egg, 24th April. *The Philadelphia Inquirer,* p. 1.

Global Fund for Community Foundations. (2017). Our supporters. Retrieved from http://www.globalfundcommunityfoundations.org/supporters/

Göhler, G. (2009). 'Power to' and 'Power over'. In S. R. Clegg & M. Haugaard (Eds.), The SAGE Handbook of Power (pp. 27-39). London: SAGE Publications Ltd. Retrieved from http://sk.sagepub.com/reference/hdbk_power. doi:10.4135/9780857021014

Goldberg, S. H. (2009). *Billions of Drops in Millions of Buckets*. Hoboken: Wiley.

Gordon, J., Harvey, C., Shaw, E., & Maclean, M. (2016). Entrepreneurial philanthropy. In T. Jung, S. D. Phillips, & J. Harrow (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy* (pp. 334-347). London: Routledge.

Graham, E. R. (2017). Follow the Money: how trends in financing are changing governance at international organizations. *Global Policy, 8*, 15-25.

Grimm, S., Humphrey, J., Lundsgaarde, E., & John de Sousa, S.-L. (2009). *European Development Cooperation to 2020: challenges by new actors in international development*. Retrieved from Berlin:

Guilhot, N. (Ed.) (2011). *The Invention of International Relations Theory. Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation, and the 1954 Conference on Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Hammack, D. C., & Anheier, H. K. (2013). *A Versatile American Institution. The Changing Ideals and Realities of Philanthropic Foundations*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.

Harrow, J., & Jung, T. (2011). Philanthropy is dead; long live philanthropy? *Public Management Review, 13*(8), 1047-1056.

Herrold, C. E. (2012). *Philanthropic Foundations in Egypt: Fueling Change or Safeguarding Status quo?* Paper presented at the Takaful. Second Annual Conference on Arab Philanthropy and Civic Engagement, Cairo, Egypt. http://dar.aucegypt.edu/bitstream/handle/10526/4295/Philanthropic Foundations in Egypt Fueling Change or Safeguarding Status quo 35-54.pdf?sequence=1

Heydemann, S., & Kinsey, R. (2010). The State and International Philanthropy: the contribution of American FOundations, 1919-1991. In H. Anheier & D. C. Hammack (Eds.), *American Foundations* (pp. 205-236). Washington: Brookings Institution Press.

Hudson Institute. (2016). *The Index of Global Philanthropy and Remittances*. Washington.

John, R. (2006). *Venture Philanthropy: the evolution of high engagement philanthropy in Europe*. Retrieved from Oxford: http://www.sbs.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/Skoll_Centre/Docs/Venture philanthropy in Europe.pdf

Jung, T., & Harrow, J. (2015). New development: philanthropy in networked governance—treading with care *Public Money & Management, 35*(1), 47-52.

Jung, T., & Harrow, J. (2016). Philanthropy: knowledge, practice and blind hope. In K. Orr, S. Nutley, R. Bain, B. Hacking, & S. Russell (Eds.), *Knowledge and Practice in Business and Organisations*. London: Routledge.

Jung, T., Harrow, J., & Leat, D. (2016). *Unpicking the intellectual fruit bowl of philanthropic foundations: towards a typology?* Paper presented at the Philanthropy today? Philanthropy tomorrow?, Centre for the Study of Philanthropy & Public Good, University of St Andrews.

Kiger, J. C. (Ed.) (2000). *Philanthropic Foundations in the Twentieth Century*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Kramer, M. R. (2009). Catalytic Philanthropy. *Standford Social Innovation Review, Fall*, 30-35.

Krige, J., & Rausch, H. (Eds.). (2012). *American Foundations and the Coproduction of World Order in the Twentieth Century*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Leat, D. (2007). The Infrastructure of Global Philanthropy: Wings and Wings-CF. In H. K. Anheier, A. Simmons, & D. Winder (Eds.), *Innovation in Strategic Philanthropy* (pp. 199-211). Boston: Springer.

Lipman, P. (2015). Capitalizing on crisis: venture philanthropy's colonial project to remake urban education. *Critical Studies in Education, 56*(2), 241-258. doi:10.1080/17508487.2015.959031

Macdonald, D. (1956). *The Ford Foundation. The Men and the Millions - an unauthorized biography*. New York: Reynal & Company.

Macdonald, G., & Szanto, A. (2007). Private Philanthropy and Government: friends or foes? In S. U. Raymond & M. B. Martin (Eds.), *Mapping the New World of American Philanthropy - causes and consequences of the transfer of wealth* (pp. 235-239). Hoboken: John Wiley.

Marten, R., & Witte, J. M. (2008). *Transforming Development? The role of philanthropic foundations in international development cooperation*. Berlin: Global Public Policy Institute.

Martens, J., & Seitz, K. (2015). *Philanthropic Power and Development. Who shapes the agenda?* Berlin: Global Policy Forum.

Matthews, K. R. W., & Ho, V. (2008). The grand impact of the Gates Foundation. *EMBO Reports, 9*(5), 409-412.

McGoey, L. (2015). *No such thing as a free gift. The Gates Foundation and the price of philanthropy*. London: Verso.

Müller, T. B. (2012). Die Macht der Menschenfreunde – Die Rockefeller Foundation, die Sozialwissenschaften und die amerikanische Außenpolitik im Kalten Krieg. In J. Krige & H. Rausch (Eds.), *American Foundations and the Coproduction of World Order in the Twentieth Century*. Göttingen: Vandenoeck & Ruprect.

Murphy, E. J. (1976). *Creative Philanthropy. Carnegie Corporation and Africa 1953-1973*. New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Nickel, P. M., & Eikenberry, A. M. (2009). A Critique of the Discourse of Marketized Philanthropy. *American Behavioral Scientist, 52*(7), 974-989. doi:doi:10.1177/0002764208327670

Nielsen, W. A. (1972). *The Big Foundations*. London: Columbia University Press.

NoVo Foundation. (2017). NoVo Foundation Launches Social Justice Fund. Retrieved from https://novofoundation.org/novointhemedia/novo-foundation-launches-social-justice-fund/

O'Mara, R. (1997). Buzzword for Pew: 'pro-active' Philanthropy: Private foundations may be more influential than ever before, and one of the most generous has involved itself intensely in public affairs. *Baltimore Sun*. Retrieved from

http://articles.baltimoresun.com/1997-03-17/news/1997076006_1_pew-center-pew-charitable-trusts-private-foundations

OECD Development Centre. (2016). *Catalytic philanthropy in Africa Harnessing foundations' potential to achieve the SDGs - Summary Record*. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/site/netfwd/Summary_Record_netFWD_20162809.pdf

Olsen, J. P. (2004). Citizens, public administration and the search for theoretical foundations. *Political Science and Politics, 37*(1), 69-79.

Parmar, I. (2002). American foundations and the development of international knowledge networks. *Global Networks, 2*(1), 13-30. doi:10.1111/1471-0374.00024

Parmar, I. (2012). *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundation in the Rise of American Power*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Pharoah, C. (2016). What motivates people to give their own private resources for the public good? In T. Jung, S. D. Phillips, & J. Harrow (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy* (pp. 71-87). London: Routledge.

Pharoah, C., & Bryant, L. (2012). *Global grant-making. A review of UK foundations' funding for international development*. London: Nuffield Foundation.

Pharoah, C., Walker, C., & Goddard, K. (2017). *Giving Trends 2017. Top 300 Foundation Grantmakers*. London: Association of Charitable Foundations.

Phillips, S. D., & Jung, T. (2016). A New 'New' Philanthropy: from impetus to impact. In T. Jung, S. D. Phillips, & J. Harrow (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy* (pp. 5-34). London: Routledge.

Phillips, S. D., & Smith, S. R. (2016). Public policy for philanthropy: catching the wave or creating a backwater? In T. Jung, S. D. Phillips, & J. Harrow (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy* (pp. 213-228). London: Routledge.

Plewes, B. (2008). *Global Philanthropy and International Cooperation: A guide to Trends and Issues*: Canadian Council for International Co-operation.

Rietzler, K. (2008). Philanthropy, Peace Research, And Revisionist Politics: Rockefeller And Carnegie Support For The Study Of International Relations In Weimar Germany. *GHI Bulletin, Supplement 5*, 61-79.

Roberts, D. (2016). Latest WikiLeak dump ties Clinton Foundation to personal enrichment claims. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/oct/27/wikileaks-bill-clinton-foundation-emails

Rockefeller Foundation. (1913). *Charter*.

Roelofs, J. (2003). *Foundations and Public Policy. The Mask of Pluralism*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Rogers, R. (2015). Why the Social Sciences Should Take Philanthropy Seriously. *Society, 52*(6), 533-540. doi:10.1007/s12115-015-9944-9

Salamon, L. M. (Ed.) (2014). *New Frontiers of Philanthropy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sanna, V., & Mc Donnell, I. (2017). *Data for Development: DAC Member Priorities and Challenges. OECD Development Co-Operation Working Paper 35*. OECD.

Schervish, P. G. (2013). *Hyperagency and High-Tech Donors: A New Theory of the New Philanthropists*. Boston: Social Welfare Research Institute.

Schmid, H., & Bar Nissim, H. S. (2016). The globalization of philanthropy: trends and channels of giving. In T. Jung, S. D. Phillips, & J. Harrow (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy* (pp. 162-177). London: Routledge.

SDG Philanthropy Platform. (2017). What is this site for? Retrieved from https://www.sdgphilanthropy.org/

Seitz, K., & Martens, J. (2017). Philanthrolateralism: Private Funding and Corporate Influence in the United Nations. *Global Policy, 8*, 46-50. doi:10.1111/1758-5899.12448

Silber, I. F. (2012). The angry gift: a neglected facet of philanthropy. *Critical Sociology, 60*(3), 320-337.

Singer, P. (2015). *The Most Good you can Do*. Yale: Yale University Press.

Smith, D. H., Eng, S., & Albertson, K. (2016). The Darker Side of Philanthropy. How self-interest and incomptenece can overcome a love of mankind and serve the public interest. In T. Jung, S. D. Phillips, & J. Harrow (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy* (pp. 273-286). London: Routledge.

Smith, E. (2009). Imaginaries of Development: The Rockefeller Foundation and Rice Research. *Science as Culture, 18*(4), 461-482. doi:10.1080/09505430903186070

Spero, J. E. (2010). *The Global Role of U.S. Foundations*. Retrieved from http://foundationcenter.issuelab.org/resource/the_global_role_of_u_s_foundations

Stone, D. (2008). Global Public Policy, Transnational Policy Communities, and Their Networks. *Policy Studies Journal, 36*(1), 19-38. doi:10.1111/j.1541-0072.2007.00251.x

Stone, D. (2010). Private philanthropy or policy transfer? The transnational norms of the Open Society Institute. *Policy & Politics, 38*(2), 269-287.

Sulek, M. (2010). On the Modern Meaning of Philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 39*(2), 193-212. doi:10.1177/0899764009333052

Thümler, E. (2011). Foundations, Schools and the State: school improvement partnerships in Germany and the US as legitimacy-generating arrangements. *Public Management Review, 13*(8), 1095-1116.

Thümler, E. (2016). Financialization of philanthropy: the case of social investment. In T. Jung, S. D. Phillips, & J. Harrow (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Philanthropy* (pp. 362-374). London: Routledge.

von Reden, S. (Ed.) (2015). *Stiftungen zwischen Politik und Wirtschaft*. Oldenburg: DeGruyter.

Walsh, J. J. (1920). I.: The Rockefeller Foundation. *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review, 9*(36), 608-613.

Whitaker, B. (1974). *The Foundations. An Anatomy of Philanthropy and Society*. London: Eyre Methuen.

Wilson, J. (2014). Fantasy machine: philanthrocapitalism as an ideological formation. *Third World Quarterly, 35*(7), 1144-1161. doi:10.1080/01436597.2014.926102

WINGS (Ed.) (2017). *A New Global Picture of Organizations Serving Philanthropy*. Sao Paulo.

Witkowski, G. R., & Bauerkämper, A. (Eds.). (2016). *German Philanthropy in Transatlantic Perspective*. Cham: Springer.

Woods, L. T. (1999). Rockefeller Philanthropy and the Institute of Pacific Relations: A Reappraisal of Long-Term Mutual Dependency. *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations, 10*(2), 151-166.

Young, D. R. (2000). Alternative Models of Government-Nonprofit Sector Relations: Theoretical and International Perspectives. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly, 29*(1), 149-172. doi:10.1177/0899764000291009