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As someone who went to an all-boys, mostly white, and quite elite private school until 16, gender issues were not at the forefront of my consciousness. Despite seeing myself as liberal, I was still a product of my school, family and religious environment. That environment was overwhelmingly patriarchal and I failed to find the right role models when it came to gender issues.

While much has changed in the intervening period, it was still with trepidation when, over 25 years later, I began working on this issue with our guest editors Ise Bosch and Ndana Moyo.

One thing was clear from our initial conversations: more funding for ‘women and girls’ is welcome but hardly sufficient. What philanthropy really needs is a feminist consciousness – a vision which places women’s rights front and centre, challenges political norms and economic orders, shifts power to the most marginalised and interrogates the social construction of gender. This revolutionary spirit runs through the contributions which inform this issue. These contributions also raise important questions for our own field given that men of wealth and power dominate the most senior board and management positions in the global philanthropy sector.

According to a recent survey, 84 per cent of Alliance readers believe there to be a gender pay gap in their sector. ‘Though getting better, philanthropy has been a male culture, and changes slowly,’ one respondent noted. The avoidance of and resistance to change is reflected in funding too. Only 0.6 per cent of funding currently supports women’s rights, according to latest figures from Candid. While 5 per cent ($4.3 billion) goes to women and girls, this too seems wholly inadequate to the task of creating gender equality.

Perhaps mindful of the challenges, Ise and Ndana have brought together contributions from around the world which highlight and celebrate gender equality.

Philanthropy needs a feminist consciousness
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Editor, Alliance
charles@alliancemagazine.org
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30 Feminist philanthropy
The climate emergency is the defining issue for our planet. The intersection of human rights and climate change has been evident for some time, but we have been too slow to act. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change has worked tirelessly to warn us all. Individuals from Pope Francis to Greta Thunberg decry the lack of political and corporate will. Organisations like Extinction Rebellion are also ramping up the pressure to act.

One human rights issue is emphatically clear. The murder rate for environmental activists is now higher than for other activists. According to Front Line Defenders, more than three-quarters of the 321 activists killed in 2018 were environmental, land and Indigenous people’s rights activists.

The foundation that I work with is small, if devoted. We endeavour to provide thoughtful grantmaking for environmental sustainability and peace-building (they too are linked) and urge everyone to make the climate emergency a high priority in your work, whatever your area of focus. Everything is connected.

There is still more to achieve in improving understanding of how all the human rights frameworks mesh with one another and how we can achieve profound, lasting, and in the case of climate, much more immediate progress. I encourage Alliance to keep this discussion alive in coming issues, even as it tackles other important areas for philanthropy.

Angela Seay
Chair, Trustees, Polden Puckham Charitable Foundation

The excellent special feature on Human Rights Philanthropy (Alliance, September 2019) began a nuanced discussion on the role of philanthropy in the frameworks for economic, social and cultural rights, in addition to political and civil rights. To that I would add the Human Rights and Climate Change framework. My question is, did the issue go far enough in emphasising the relationship between environment and human rights?

There are those, even in the environmental funding community, who do not yet accept the connection and I hope that this changes. In addition, there is a failure to link up issues like the right to education for girls with mitigating climate change, even though this has been identified as a key practical step to reduce emissions in the long term.
I read the latest Alliance issue on human rights philanthropy with great interest. In their lead article, the guest editors make the point that a key role for philanthropy is to 'keep the human rights movement alive' – among other things – 'bringing out the connections between challenges people face in their everyday lives and the tools the human rights framework provides, particularly for economic and social rights.

My own view is that the focus should lie elsewhere — not on how human rights abstractions can be made relevant to people’s lives. Rather, the starting point should be people and where they are likely to turn to for support when they need it.

Going to a nearby NGO with a long acronym that includes the words ‘human rights’ is less and less attractive. That might be partly a communications problem, but I think it’s more structural than that: it’s a problem of NGO priorities, strategies and tactics. The key question for me is how can human rights NGOs become more embedded in their communities and less creatures of an international system under pressure that might not be the one singular solution to all problems anyway?

Ed Rekosh
Co-founder, Rights CoLab

Israel-Palestine: the issue is apartheid not peace

I enjoyed the spotlight on Israel-Palestine in the recent ‘peace philanthropy’ issue (Alliance, June 2019). However, the references to a peace process are misconceived. The primary issue in the Israel-Palestine context is the struggle for equal rights, to end racial discrimination against ethnically Palestinian persons and in favour of ethnically Jewish persons. I never heard the phrase ‘the Southern African peace process’ during the apartheid regime in South Africa.

Robert Wintemute
Professor of Human Rights Law, Kings College London

Above: Israeli separation wall.
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**The Americas**

**GCEEP commission to tackle energy poverty**

Rockefeller Foundation announced in September the launch of The Global Commission to End Energy Poverty (GCEEP) to address the lack of access to electricity for approaching a billion people worldwide, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. The foundation calculates that 'about 840 million people live without energy access'.

**Website encourages giving to Native Americans**

Native Americans in Philanthropy and Candid have launched a website to encourage greater philanthropic funding and support to Native communities in the US. Investing in Native Communities gathers information on philanthropic funding for Native Americans, allows users to recognise its importance, learn from other organisations' experiences, and expand understanding of US history through a Native lens. According to a report accompanying the launch, between 2002 and 2016 large US foundations gave on average 0.4 per cent of the US population.

**Pioneering director of Mott Foundation dies**

One of the longest-serving leaders of a major US foundation, William S (Bill) White, has died aged 82. Under White’s leadership, the Mott Foundation grew from a primarily local funder to an internationally recognised foundation with over $3 billion in assets. Among the honours bestowed on White were the Council on Foundation’s Grantmaker Award in 2002 and The European Foundation Centre’s first Philanthropy Compass Prize in 2009.

**Melinda Gates pledges $1Bn to focus on US gender equality**

Melinda Gates has pledged to commit $1 billion to expanding women’s power and influence in the US over the next ten years. The pledge will fund female-focused programmes via Gates’ firm Pivotal Ventures. It will have three priorities: dismantling the barriers to women’s professional advancement, fast-tracking women in high impact sectors including technology, media, and public office, and mobilising shareholders, consumers and employees to increase external pressure on companies and organisations in need of reform.

**Europe**

**European foundations in major pledge to develop environmental research body**

Four of the principal European foundations tackling climate change have announced substantial funding for the Global Commons Alliance (GCA). Porticus, Good Energies, Oak and MAVA Foundations have pledged in excess of $15 million to GCA for the next three years. Through its key component, the Earth Commission, GCA will provide science-based targets for the whole of the earth systems (not just the climate) from which governments and companies can derive quantifiable measures to arrest or reverse decay of those systems. As its name suggests, its focus will be on the global commons, the areas and ecosystems of the planet on which we all depend, such as the Amazon rainforest and the Greenland ice sheet.

**JRCT recognised for responsible investment**

The UK’s Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust (JRCT) has been named one of the 47 global leaders by the UN-supported Principles for Responsible Investment (PRI), which recognises excellence in responsible investment and organisations that excel in the selection, appointment and monitoring of external managers. JRCT is the only European foundation to have made the list.

**Survey underlines German foundations gender shortfall**

According to a survey carried out by the Association of German Foundations (BDS), less than one in five respondent foundations finance or implement projects that support gender justice and only 15 per cent of that proportion include gender justice or gender equality as the main focus of their work. Only 21 per cent think about gender differences in their grantmaking. Internally, in none of the 183 foundations who responded were women in a majority in the decision-making bodies. In 71 per cent of cases, they were in a minority, in the remaining 29 per cent there were no women at all. On a brighter note, 46 per cent of respondents want to receive support to enable them to apply more gender-just approaches to their internal structures and their grantmaking and operational work. The survey was carried out by BDS and non-profit consultancy, PHNEO, earlier this year (see page 58). A fuller description of the survey was published in the autumn edition of BDS’s in-house magazine, Stiftungswelt.

**GCEEP**

https://tinyurl.com/energy-commission

**Mott Foundation**
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https://tinyurl.com/Gates-pledge
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Africa and Middle East

**Global Updates in low-income areas**

Gavi's INFUSE initiative, which has made the investment through its partnership with global vaccine alliances, Gavi, to prevent the spread of disease in low-income urban areas. The Human Rights Funds Network said the award undermined the Gates Foundation's 'credibility' as a champion of human rights and its efforts to reduce inequality. In India itself, Sabih Hamid has resigned from her job at the Gates Foundation in protest. She argues that the award violates one of the foundation's fundamental beliefs, that every life has equal value and, in an op-ed published in the New York Times, cites the 2005 attacks against Muslims in the state of Gujarat – where Modi was chief minister – which left over 1,000 dead. Her decision followed a protest letter signed by over 100 Gates Scholars and alumni at the University of Cambridge. The letter points to the withdrawal of autonomy from Jammu and Kashmir, arrests of democratically elected representatives and suppression of communications in the state, as well as the implementation of a National Register for Citizens that would potentially strip 1.9 million citizens (mostly Muslims) of their citizenship.

**Education support for 10,000 refugee students**

The Abdul Aziz Al Ghurair Refugee Education Fund has made grants to eight organisations from Jordan, Lebanon and United Arab Emirates to support thousands of young refugees in the region. This second round of grants by the foundation will provide AED25 million (approximately $7 million) to refugee students in Jordan and Lebanon, and children affected by disasters and conflicts, residing in the UAE. The fund aims to support 10,000 students (more than in 2018) through secondary level and vocational education. The first round of funding disbursed AED74 million (approximately $20.7 million) for the education of over 17,000 youth in Jordan, Lebanon, and UAE. 

https://tinyurl.com/refugee-education-fund

**Palestine projects recognise role of informal groups**

The first projects funded by Palestinian communities fund, Rawa, are now underway. Most of the 23 projects are from informal and unregistered community groups in their four sector areas: Gaza, West Bank, '48, and Jerusalem. The choice of projects follows Rawa’s belief that ‘people can come together to... implement creative community development ideas without the usual restrictions of humanitarian aid and development, such as formal registration and thematic, restricted funding.’

https://tinyurl.com/Rawa-projects

**$5m boost for access to vaccines in low-income areas**

Alwaleed Philanthropies has made a $5 million investment in its partnership with global vaccine alliance, Gavi, to prevent the spread of disease in low-income urban areas. The Saudi-based foundation has made the investment through Gavi’s INFUSE initiative, which identifies groups known as ‘pacesetters’, who are developing new innovations to improve vaccine access and delivery. The initiative connects pacesetters to cities in need of vaccine innovation and provides them with funding and support. The new grant, which builds on an original $1 million investment made in 2015, will support work in Timor Leste, Kiribati, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Moldova and Guyana.

https://tinyurl.com/Alwaleed-vaccines

**AVPA names Aswani as new CEO**

Frank Aswani has been appointed the new CEO of the African Venture Philanthropy Alliance (AVPA). Aswani brings experience of both the social and private sector to the role, including vice-president and director of strategic relations at the African Leadership Academy (ALAA), and sales director at Eli Lilly and Co where he managed over 25 countries in sub-Saharan Africa. According to AVPA, his ‘breadth of knowledge and experience has prepared him well to spearhead AVPA’s growth across the continent; greatly enhancing our ability to advance the social investment ecosystem in Africa in the years ahead.’

https://tinyurl.com/Aswani-avpa-ceo

Asia and the Pacific

**Protest over Gates award to Indian PM**

The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has set off a wave of protest over its decision to give Indian prime minister, Narendra Modi, one of its Global Goal Awards for his Swachh Bharat Abhiyan, or Clean India Mission sanitation programme. The Human Rights Funds Network said the award undermined the Gates Foundation’s ‘credibility’ as a champion of human rights and its efforts to reduce inequality. In India itself, Sabih Hamid has resigned from her job at the Gates Foundation in protest. She argues that the award violates one of the foundation’s fundamental beliefs, that every life has equal value and, in an op-ed published in the New York Times, cites the 2005 attacks against Muslims in the state of Gujarat – where Modi was chief minister – which left over 1,000 dead. Her decision followed a protest letter signed by over 100 Gates Scholars and alumni at the University of Cambridge. The letter points to the withdrawal of autonomy from Jammu and Kashmir, arrests of democratically elected representatives and suppression of communications in the state, as well as the implementation of a National Register for Citizens that would potentially strip 1.9 million citizens (mostly Muslims) of their citizenship.

https://tinyurl.com/Modi-award-protest

**Foundations to set up independent body on Australia’s freshwater**

Two Australian foundations, the Ian Potter Foundation and The Myer Foundation, are to jointly fund an organisation to provide an independent source of advice on the country’s water and catchment policy. The stimulus for the new organisation is a report funded by the two foundations, exploring the issues affecting Australia’s freshwater systems, to understand what role philanthropy can play in the management and protection of the resource. The research suggests that a trusted, independent, community-led and evidence-based organisation is needed to catalyse change and help frame future water and catchment policy to serve the interests of all Australians for generations to come. Leonard Vary, CEO of the Meyer Foundation told news outlet Pro Bono Australia. Both foundations have committed $5 million to the project over the next decade, on the basis they are able to raise a further $25 million from external parties.

https://tinyurl.com/MDA-Kenya

Chinese philanthropist in bid to combat malaria in Kenya

Chinese philanthropist Zhu Layi is in talks with Kenyan health officials about a mass drug administration (MDA) test run among 10,000 people in Mombasa, Kenya, in an effort to wipe out malaria. Zhu has spent an estimated $300 million on MDA research and experiments in Africa. A previous initiative by him and his company, New South, in collaboration with Chinese scientists, successfully eradicated malaria in the island nation of Comoros. These Chinese initiatives, often overshadowed by the more well-known Gates-backed anti-malarial campaign launched in 2007, draw on substantial experience of MDA in China, which has been successful to the extent that no new native cases of malaria were recorded last year. According to the World Health Organization, almost half the global population is at risk from malaria, which each year affects some 212 million people and kills 430,000 of them – with nearly 1,200 deaths each day, 92 per cent of which occur in Africa. Despite previous successes, MDA is not uncontroversial. It involves giving anti-malarial pills to every person in a given area and has raised ethical questions about giving medication to people who don’t have the treated disease. Critics also raise concerns about MDA’s giving rise to increased drug resistance.

https://tinyurl.com/MDA-Kenya
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Interview: Sandra Breka

Sandra Breka was appointed to the Board of Management of the Robert Bosch Stiftung, Germany’s second-largest foundation, in September 2017. Since then, she has led a process which has involved the foundation turning itself inside out – redrawing its International Understanding and Cooperation programme area. The process led to the termination of all its existing grants and programmes. Why such an upheaval and what will the foundation look like now?, asks Charles Keidan.

All change at Robert Bosch Foundation

What happened at the Robert Bosch Foundation that led to the changes?
We currently have five focus areas: health, science, society, education and international relations, with the latter taking up more than 50 per cent of our funding for operational and grantmaking activities. In 2017, there were changes within the foundation’s leadership – both the Board of Trustees and the Board of Management. Most importantly, the international context is changing, which was the biggest catalyst. A number of trends are now highly influential in shaping our world and we wanted to look at them in a systematic way and at how the different regions are evolving with a view to these trends. In addition to commissioning studies and consulting a broad range of international experts, we made sure that the process was highly participatory. In the end, it included about half the foundation’s staff. We asked them to work in groups across departments. This approach created a new dynamic. We essentially designed this strategic review and realignment to be a learning journey for the whole foundation.

What made the process different from previous reviews?
It was more systematic, very inclusive, agile, longer and more far-reaching in its results than any review in the past. We didn’t know at the beginning how the process would be implemented, nor did we anticipate any results. For a long time, we were not able to give much reliable orientation concerning the future. We invested more staff time and more money in this process than ever before.

If you’d asked me at the beginning of the process, I would have predicted we will close down 30 per cent of our projects, keep maybe 30 per cent as they are, and adapt 40 per cent, but after half a year, we felt that closing down everything and starting from scratch was what we needed to do. When we saw that changing how we work would be the next step, we talked to many other foundations that had been through similar processes. The strongest advice we received was not to relabel things and to be consistent in the implementation of results. Probably the most important decision of our Board of Trustees was to exit from all existing programmes. That altered the dynamic completely.

The momentum of the changes in the international relations areas also inspired us to do the same in our areas of health, science, education and society. The results are expected by the end of 2019. All of it is derived from Robert Bosch’s legacy in view of the challenges of our time and our experience to date.

How much money have you invested?
The process will end in the summer of 2020 and by then we will have invested about €2 million, all with a view to achieving a fundamental strategic alignment between our work areas and the most pressing topics globally.

And the issues the Robert Bosch Foundation will now focus on are conflict, climate, migration and inequality?
Yes, these are the four topics we will focus on in the area of International Understanding and Cooperation. We are currently developing specific approaches within each topic because they are very broad and we have to focus. The developments over the 55 years since the foundation’s establishment had resulted in an eclectic and very broad portfolio. We had valuable projects, but in the end we lacked a clear profile. Our main objective now is to remain focused. Another priority is to approach the four topics as a nexus and try to work on the intersections between them, climate and conflict, climate and migration, conflict and migration, conflict and inequality. It will be a challenge to explore these intersections.

After half a year, we felt that closing down everything and starting from scratch was what we needed to do.
How much money do you think you will allocate to climate issues in the coming years? Amid all the changes, we are also realigning the project budget allocation system. To date, we have allocated our full project budget to our focus areas. From 2020, part of the budget will not be allocated in advance but will be kept for more entrepreneurial grantmaking, which will allow our departments to react to new developments and come up with joint endeavours. So we’re starting with a seed development budget of about €2.5 million in climate for the first months. Based on the results we will allocate additional funding in the middle of 2020. In the future, budgets are likely to change from year to year.

So there will be a significant amount of new funding from the Bosch Foundation to address climate change? It is significant for us, though maybe not in overall terms. If you think that we currently spend about €29 million for international work and are now focusing on four areas, and not on ten, that is significantly more for each topic.

You also mentioned a change in your approach, in particular the ratio between operating programmes and grantmaking work. Up to now, we have on average been 60 per cent operational and 40 per cent grantmaking. We will increase the grantmaking component and will work in partnerships given the complexity and size of the issues. I think our strength has and will always be that we both operate programmes and make grants. But we have to acknowledge that we do some things better than others, and identify what those are and who can do them better. So, yes, the ratio will shift – more grantmaking and less operational programmes.

What is your thinking about investments, particularly in light of your new climate portfolio? We have a limited, relatively conservative, investment portfolio. We have started to open that portfolio to more impact investment and we will assess the results next year. Right now, we are in the middle of changing our project allocation budget. But the issue of investments is a relevant question for us as it is for others.

All of your longstanding programmes are ending. How have you managed the exit process with existing grantees? Quite frankly, it was a dramatic change. Some of the programmes have been around for 35 years with established partnerships which were doing well. On the other hand, ending all of the programmes made it easier both internally and externally. It would have been impossible to explain to some of our partners why our relationship with them was being ended and others weren’t.

Even so it must still have been extraordinarily difficult to terminate relationships with longstanding partners. Yes, it was very hard, not only externally, but internally, because people who work at foundations are strongly invested. They are as invested in the issues as they are in the personal relationships they have with these partners. We communicated to the whole staff every decision that we took in the process and when we didn’t know what the result of part of process would be, we were open about it. That honesty and authenticity was very important. We also informed our partners early on about the process. When we decided on full exit, we talked to them personally. We made many last-time investments to allow for smoother transition, either to a different kind of programme, or have an end which would be responsible and phased. While most of them were sad, many showed great respect for the process and acknowledged that the topics we chose were the right ones.

We have an International Alumni Centre which is supporting us in thinking about how we can continue to work not just with existing institutional partners but the many individuals who have been involved in our programmes. We are not giving up that community. Interestingly, many of the foundations whom we had initially consulted have come to us and asked us how we came to our decision and how we are managing the transition. A number of them are saying they want to do something similar.

Do you think this appetite for change suggests a wider concern among European foundations that they are lagging behind in terms of their relevance to the issues faced by society and therefore need to reinvent themselves? I think many would agree that the foundation sector in Europe has always been less dynamic than the American one, even though European philanthropy evolved considerably in the last 20 years. Partly, that’s because the legal framework is different, as is the societal context and the role of government. There is a much larger and more developed philanthropic culture in the United States where philanthropy takes on many tasks that, for instance in Germany, are the state’s responsibility. That said, there are big changes worldwide and I think the European foundation sector will have to respond. But do you expect some foundations to undergo similar changes to those you have made to be more fit for purpose?

The beauty of the foundation world is its variety. There aren’t that many large European foundations, the majority of foundations are small and they are often single-issue. But given the challenges we face globally and domestically, many are reviewing what their contribution to those issues should be. This will also be true for those working internationally. While numbers in giving are growing in Germany and Europe, they are not growing as fast as they are worldwide. Wherever we operate, we engage with the local foundation sectors, in Africa, in Asia, who will be important partners for us. They have different approaches to philanthropy and that is shaping the way philanthropy is seen there. It’s a relationship which is changing dramatically.

Do you think foundations are not as comfortable as they should be in challenging another about what they’re doing? Absolutely. But, during our peer review, we talked openly among colleagues and to staff at different foundations about how we were struggling with the process, and we received sincere answers and a lot of good advice. There are so many meetings in the sector – these need to be as self-reflective and
self-critical as possible. Since we are such individual beasts, it's very easy to claim 'we are very different from everybody else'. In essence, if we talk about the same issues, we have to challenge each other on what we do and how we work in the best sense of a peer review.

Another debate in philanthropy is whether it is diverse enough. This issue of Alliance has a focus on feminist philanthropy and includes a discussion about the representation of women at senior levels in German foundations. Do you envisage a future in the foundation sector where there’s a more equal representation of both women and other groups within the foundation world?

The majority of our staff is female, so on the staff level, the gender issue is the other way around. It is different on the top leadership level where you find only few women. I think feminist philanthropy is a difficult term because it doesn’t necessarily suggest diversity. If you look at the inequality of a certain segment of society you often enhance the inequality of another segment. For me, diversity implies being as representative as possible and that’s difficult. First of all, as a German foundation, we should be representative of German society. But the real difficulty is how to make sure that what you do in your issue areas and where you work is somehow represented in your staff or in forms of cooperation. We will not be able to reflect the world that we work in globally within our foundation. This leads to the need for more participatory approaches to grantmaking.

Looking back, what has been the most difficult part of the change process? One of the biggest questions we faced was how to establish a sense of urgency for change within an organisation which, because of its funding structure, doesn’t have it to begin with. You can only challenge yourself by talking to the most diverse set of actors internationally, through conversations with peers who are on the cutting-edge of the development of the sector. The sector can have a tendency to be self-sufficient, sometimes complacent, although it sees itself as spearheading progress which is almost in itself a contradiction. How and when do you need to change to be relevant, competitive and to have an impact? That’s what foundations have to ask themselves continuously.
Stars to steer by

New destinations require new navigational tools.
Four very different books from within the ‘social change’ profession highlight the complexities of achieving systemic transformation of the current economic and political orders.

A significant reassessment of our current economic and political orders is underway. The need to better address our most grave societal threats – poverty, inequality, environmental collapse, social trauma, and technological overreach – is increasingly apparent. In this article, I look at how four very different books from inside the ‘social change’ profession, that self-selecting community of people who dedicate their careers to the common good, are contributing to this reassessment and inspiring hope and action.

One of the four books is an indictment of the hypocrisy that sits within the social change-philanthropy project, writ large. The other three offer what I believe are uniquely valuable and powerful new perspectives and frameworks for transforming our economics and politics.

The indictment... Anand Giridharadas’s *Winners Take All: The elite charade of changing the world* has questioned the motives of mega-rich philanthropists. Giridharadas argues that they are self-serving purchasers of a polite, limited flavour of social change which does nothing to address the underlying problems which their philanthropy merely ameliorates.

Along the way, he skewers the armies of handsomely rewarded professionals who populate the conferences, foundations, social enterprises and non-profits that depend on these philanthropic capitalists. An accomplished journalist, Giridharadas’s well-strung phrases make sure that the pages fly along, dropping breadcrumbs that lead to a seemingly inevitable conclusion: there is no intellectually honest alternative to grappling with systemic and structural change but most philanthropy is not intellectually honest. The book is very much in the spirit of Mark Twain’s injunction that the writer’s job is to ‘afflict the comfortable and comfort the afflicted’.

...and three responses
The other books come from people who have spent collectively over 140 years in the day-to-day work of social change. They understand Giridharadas’s critique, but offer carefully considered insights into how to meet the challenge of systemic transformation.

Each book reveals a distinctive persona: the Philosopher, the Activist and the Teacher.

Author Jed Emerson’s persona is the Philosopher. Emerson spent his twenties running homeless shelters and outreach programmes before becoming a social investment manager and later a fund strategist. His concept of ‘blended value’ anticipated impact investing. His most recent book *The Purpose of Capital: Elements of impact, financial flows, and natural being is something of an existential re-set button*:

‘I thought this journey was bringing me to a better understanding of how to create sustained change in the world through our allocation of capital. Now, I find it has brought me circuitously down, deeper – not higher – to a place of profound personal reckoning, greater humility, and quiet reflection.’

Emerson’s call to the ‘reading life’ does not mean he is mellowing into his sixties. He is irascible as ever and his message to the impact investing and social enterprise community is blunt: stop being lazy; shut up with your frameworks, PowerPoints and smug answers; pose deeper questions about your purpose; and embrace the everyday struggle of being irrevocably connected to others.
Giridharadas argues that they are self-serving purchasers of a polite, limited flavour of social change which does nothing to address the underlying problems which their philanthropy merely ameliorates.

Diagnosis. Part of what is wrong with social change today is that we’re all, as Emerson puts it, ‘leading with our answers’. That prevents us from teasing out the new directions that the times call us to pursue. Giridharadas coins the term ‘MarketWorld’, to describe the naivete – or something more sinister – of the idea that those who have most benefited from the system that created the problems will be the ones to solve them.

Above all else, these books allow us to examine why we are in our present fix. They suggest a set of values of inclusiveness, honesty, respect, and love. I make no apologies for my hope and optimism. I am hard-wired to look for win-win solutions. This can lead me to underplay conflict situations which are zero sum. But I cannot help being thrilled by what I see as vast potential for practical realism.

Chambers shows how all participatory methodologies stand in a kind of epistemological humility – a scepticism about one’s own viewpoints, a willingness to be shown one’s blind spots: an imperative to invite and absorb how others see you.

These three authors all make it clear that they believe effectiveness in social change requires introspection and personal growth. They have slightly different vocabularies for this. Giridharadas recounts how activists wrestle with trade-offs and conflicting priorities. Emerson forges an unbreakable bond from capital to personal meaning. Chambers exudes an irrepressible joy in the lives of others that has always been at the heart of participatory methods, but in this book takes on a larger resonance.

All three books emphasise the need for a self-critical stance, of listening to others more than knowing the answer, of valuing the connection with those who have most at stake, and, ultimately, putting the last first. If certainty is the greatest of illusions, these three authors provide ways to embrace the struggle of working together with uncertainty.

Above: Anand Giridharadas asserts in Winners Take All that hypocrisy sits within the social change-philanthropy project.
A new Microsoft fund illustrates how companies can engage with communities where they have operations to help create real change.

Recently, Business Roundtable leaders acknowledged that corporations have a responsibility to benefit not just shareholders but all stakeholders and the environment. While the statement signals a new direction, what might this stance look like in practice? Among other things, it will mean moving away from the transactional nature of corporate social responsibility to programmes and processes that build transformational relationships with communities. One such example is Microsoft’s new Community Empowerment Fund, which combines elements of community-led development and participatory grantmaking to create transformational relationships through shifting and sharing power.

Most corporate social responsibility programmes are transactional by design: they ‘give back’ through volunteer days, employee fundraising drives, sponsorships, capital campaign donations, etc. Though these contributions may provide real benefit to communities, they are usually a response to the short-term needs of groups whose goodwill is important for the company’s business mandate. They are not intended to foster long-term partnerships or support communities in driving their own development.

Technology companies, which are building large-scale data centres to power cloud computing, have a growing physical presence in communities and face heightened expectations to make a positive local impact. Forward-thinking companies understand the connection between socio-economic development and a healthy market, and this creates an opportunity to go beyond transactional CSR toward a more transformational approach. Microsoft’s Community Empowerment Fund attempts this by cultivating relationships with local leaders and groups, expanding the investment beyond funding, and laying the groundwork for deeper, mutually beneficial collaboration.

The programme, which provides financial support to local organisations in areas where Microsoft operates data centres, is built around four key pillars of community-led development:

1. **Societal needs:** programme representatives comprise the majority of the board, whose members rotate regularly to bring new people into leadership roles.

   Community representatives have expertise and knowledge, identify community priorities for funding. Applications, which are solicited through an open call, are assessed on how well they engage community members, especially from marginalised groups, in decision-making and programme design; leverage local assets; align with local priorities; work with partners; and promote solutions that address interconnected problems.

   The advisory board then recommends projects to Microsoft headquarters for funding. In addition to financial support, the advisory board and other Microsoft staff help organisations network, raise public awareness, and enhance operational skills through workshops, meetings, and community events. These activities strengthen connections among non-profits, local businesses, government officials, community members, increasing the possibilities for grassroots collaboration.

2. **Socio-economic development and a healthy market:** the top priority is ensuring that the group reflects the demographic diversity of the community as well as other characteristics such as experience and geographic representation.

   Funded projects demonstrate the programme’s ability to engage transparently. All stakeholders bring an agenda. The key for Microsoft and community representatives is to work with the advisory board in the Netherlands in its second year. In the US, a new board has been established in Des Moines, Iowa, and another is planned for Arizona in 2020. The results so far are promising, but more work is needed to refine and expand the programme. This approach to corporate philanthropy is new for Microsoft, as it is for most large corporations, and requires some cultural shifts. Community priorities are also at stake, with some organisations addressing systemic causes.

3. **Institutional breakdown, inequality and fear:** is key for Microsoft and community stakeholders. The advisory board provides an ongoing, essential process, and it will take a range of different strategies in different communities to achieve this standard.

   Last but not least, sharing power is effective only when all parties engage transparently. All stakeholders bring an agenda. The key for Microsoft and community representatives is to work with the advisory board in the Netherlands in its second year. In the US, a new board has been established in Des Moines, Iowa, and another is planned for Arizona in 2020. The results so far are promising, but more work is needed to refine and expand the programme. This approach to corporate philanthropy is new for Microsoft, as it is for most large corporations, and requires some cultural shifts. Community priorities are also at stake, with some organisations addressing systemic causes.

   Corporate leaders aware of this reality is important if the programme is to gain the traction it needs to succeed in the long term. For many Microsoft and local stakeholders alike, grantmaking and community-led development as a practice are new. It will be necessary to continue investing in training, materials, and conversations to further the learning and to help local teams customise the programme for different contexts. Ensuring the advisory boards are diverse, representative, and inclusive of people whose voices have been marginalised is an ongoing, essential process, and it will take a range of different strategies in different communities to achieve this standard.

   Last but not least, sharing power is effective only when all parties engage transparently. All stakeholders bring an agenda. The key for Microsoft and community representatives is to work with the advisory board in the Netherlands in its second year. In the US, a new board has been established in Des Moines, Iowa, and another is planned for Arizona in 2020. The results so far are promising, but more work is needed to refine and expand the programme. This approach to corporate philanthropy is new for Microsoft, as it is for most large corporations, and requires some cultural shifts. Community priorities are also at stake, with some organisations addressing systemic causes.

   Corporate leaders aware of this reality is important if the programme is to gain the traction it needs to succeed in the long term. For many Microsoft and local stakeholders alike, grantmaking and community-led development as a practice are new. It will be necessary to continue investing in training, materials, and conversations to further the learning and to help local teams customise the programme for different contexts. Ensuring the advisory boards are diverse, representative, and inclusive of people whose voices have been marginalised is an ongoing, essential process, and it will take a range of different strategies in different communities to achieve this standard.
Ups and downs of celebrity foundations

Being or being associated with a celebrity philanthropist has both advantages and drawbacks when attracting attention to social causes.

‘Give me your fucking money!’

Urban legend has it that the Irish rocker Bob Geldof blurted this out at the 1985 Live Aid concert to raise funds for the Ethiopian famine. Whether or not that was actually what he said, one thing is true: celebrities have a voice, and if they want to use it for social good, they can. Live Aid was linked by satellite to more than a billion viewers in 110 countries and raised over $100 million in famine relief for Africa.

Celebrities as magnets

Although there is no shortage of cynics who categorically dismiss celebrities as only in it for the publicity, or having no impact on social causes whatsoever, I have been fascinated by celebrity activists and philanthropists ever since I witnessed their enormous convening power. Whenever I’ve struggled to get people to attend a philanthropy event, I have learned that getting a boldface name celebrity to show up often works wonders in getting other people to do so.

Film stars, musicians, athletes, authors, artists and members of royalty play a powerful role in shaping public opinion and behaviour, and having watched their movies, attended their concerts, read their books or followed their tweets are not prerequisites to being cast under their social and cultural spell. When they lend their name to a cause and do so with sincerity, people pay attention. As Angelina Jolie once said, ‘People take my calls.’

I’ve witnessed how their power often translates into success in fundraising as well. For instance, Sean Penn’s charity gala this year raised $3.5 million for Haiti; last year’s Leonardo DiCaprio Foundation gala in St Tropez raised $40 million in one night; the Elton John Aids Foundation has raised more than $400 million for HIV prevention, treatment and advocacy worldwide.

Some of the effects are more qualitative, such as the apparent reduction of stigma attached to causes that celebrities have embraced, like HIV/Aids, gay rights and, more recently, mental health. As Angelina Jolie once said, ‘People take my calls.’

Celebrity philanthropy’s challenges

Despite its proven effectiveness, the field of celebrity philanthropy faces great challenges. In conversations I’ve had with founders and senior staff of foundations of public figures, these are a few of the common refrains:

• How can we achieve scale and do this without being over-dependent on the celebrity?
• How can we encourage more celebrities and public figures to be philanthropic despite the fact their moves will always be under great public scrutiny?

What aggravates these issues is that both formal and informal collaboration and coordination among celebrity-led organisations are rare, in some cases virtually non-existent. So how can celebrity charities learn from each other’s successes and failures, and collaborate with each other to gain more leverage where it matters?

It became obvious to me that the first step was to get them to meet each other.

Whenever I’ve struggled to get people to attend a philanthropy event, I have learned that getting a boldface name celebrity to show up often works wonders in getting other people to do so.
The convening

I undertook to bring together senior leaders of foundations, celebrity activists, and policymakers. The occasion took place at the Rockefeller Foundation’s Bellagio Center in April 2019. Among those who attended were the heads of the Royal Foundation of the Duke and Duchess of Sussex and the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge,1 the Queen Rania Foundation, the C.A.A. (Creative Artists Agency) Foundation, the Elton John AIDS Foundation, the Charize Theron Project for Africa, the Tribeca Film Institute, the Galileo Project Foundation (of the Pope) and the Barefoot Foundation (of Colombian pop star Shakira). Here are some of the lessons gathered from our discussions.

Setting up a foundation – or not?

The first thing the celebrity needs to ask themselves is whether they want to set up a foundation at all. A foundation offers great control in defining its mission, making grants, developing programmes and choosing who sits on its board. However, it also requires great responsibility on the ground. Being in touch with the communities that philanthropists serve also helps them actually gain a sense of fulfilment from their charitable efforts.

Cultivation: Major gifts officers and other professional fundraisers know that it sometimes takes years of careful cultivation for a gift to come to fruition. Celebrities may have great convening power that gets people to show up, but this is not enough. Celebrity foundations must know the importance of relationship building with past, present and future donors.

They may not necessarily have the same levels of wealth, but Mr Oscar Winner wants Ms Billionaire to support his cause. Mr Oscar Winner must have some financial skin in the game as well. A common practice among celebrity foundations is to assign foundation responsibilities to well-intended friends, relatives and managers who are trusted members of the celebrity’s inner circle. Running an effective foundation requires technical skill and experience that may require more specialised staff and advisers. If a celebrity decides to set up a foundation, it is essential to bring on people with the right expertise – and empower them to deliver.

As more public figures share their experience of controversial or stigmatised issues, incredible shifts start to happen.

Stigma: Celebrities face the same risks of discrimination and stigmatisation as others do. Actors risk being denied parts, getting blacklisted from events, or disappointing fans, and the risk of shame and rejection can be too high for many. But as more public figures share their experience of controversial or stigmatised issues (like Prince Harry revealing his personal mental health battles), incredible shifts start to happen. The public begins to see that celebrities are more like us than we imagined, and we in turn feel less fearful about opening up about our own challenges. Similar shifts happen when celebrities interact with marginalised communities, as when a gloveless Princess Diana shook hands with people afflicted with HIV/AIDS.

Leaving a Legacy

The lessons gathered from our discussions.

Galas and fundraising events: While events can be very effective tools for fundraising, the CEO of a well-known celebrity foundation that has staged numerous multi-million dollar events warns: ‘When a celebrity’s event becomes so popular and glitzy, the risk is that they can lead you down a cul-de-sac. Because they are so shiny, they get tons of press, but then that becomes the only thing your organisation gets known for. And they are so much work.’ Keep in mind that bigger events are not necessarily the most effective ones in terms of fundraising and awareness raising.

Using the celebrity’s unique assets: There are many benefits to having a coordinated approach within a celebrity’s whole team. For example, when a celebrity lands a commercial endorsement deal, the manager can make sure there is a clause that stipulates a percentage of the deal goes to the celebrity’s foundation. This is often a win-win for the celebrity and the endorsed brand, especially these days when companies understand the value of having a social purpose.

Above: The Rockefeller convening was held before the Duke and Duchess of Sussex decided to establish their own new charitable foundation.

1 The Bellagio convening was held before the Duke and Duchess of Sussex decided to establish their own new charitable foundation.

Far left: President and CEO of the Christopher & Dana Reeve Foundation, Peter Wilderotter.

Left: Participants at the event gather by Lake Como.
Feminist philanthropy

Funding women and girls is not enough. Philanthropy needs a feminist consciousness.
Philanthropy is a feminist issue

If humanity is to progress philanthropic resources need to support women’s voices, choices, participation, education, livelihoods and more catching up to today: violence against women, the crisis of democratic institutions and growing inequality.

What is feminist philanthropy? Feminist philanthropy is more than funding women’s issues. According to Fondo Centroamericano de Mujeres, a women’s fund in Nicaragua: ‘Feminist philanthropy is not a charitable act or an act of power. It is an act of solidarity and mutual empowerment, in which the solutions to the problems that women face are seen as a matter of mutual responsibility.’

Nor is it just financial giving which is important. Global Fund for Women’s founder, Anne Firth Murray, writes, ‘It is the “how” that has the power to transform systems, structures, attitudes and behaviours of both the people who give and their recipients, not the “how much”:’

Feminist philanthropy is not a charitable act or an act of power. It is an act of solidarity and mutual empowerment.

If humanity is to progress philanthropic resources need to support women’s voices, choices, participation, education, livelihoods and more

In May 1983, the New York Times published an article entitled, ‘Feminist Philanthropy Comes Into Its Own’, highlighting the growing number of foundations and giving circles established to redress years of philanthropic neglect of women’s issues. This movement of feminist philanthropists had their passions and motivations rooted in deep-seated anger over retrogressive realities and experiences of systemic oppression and marginalisation of women, girls, trans and gender non-conforming people across generations, communities and continents.

As this special feature aims to give readers an overview of current feminist philanthropy, and inspire different types of funders to work closer together, it seems fitting to affirm at the outset the anger that drove women to create their own solutions to their unhappiness, generational trauma and denigration. These solutions matched in magnitude, intelligence and resources the factors supporting the dominant systems and structures that reinforced and sustained their pain: patriarchy, heterosexuality hegemony, capitalism, white supremacy, neo-liberal and imperialistic agendas.

By the turn of the century, more individual and community philanthropists and private foundations began to prioritise women, girls, trans and gender non-conforming people’s issues. Today, some governments are now adopting feminist approaches to their international development agendas, among them Sweden, Canada, France and Wales. This is a recognition that more resources need to support inter alia women’s voices, choices, participation, education and livelihoods for humanity to progress. With all the excitement generated by newcomers to the feminist funding spectrum, we should acknowledge earlier feminist philanthropists such as Anne Firth Murray, Tracy Gary and Kim Klein who were at the forefront of championing just, caring and participatory ways of giving to communities, just as they were in the vanguard of pointing out some fundamental socio-political and economic issues that mainstream philanthropy is only
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Understanding power

Feminist philanthropy is informed by a power analysis. Power within elevates the agency, voice, wisdom and choices which women and communities possess. Power to provide the ammunition to destroy systems of power that oppress and marginalise women and their communities. Power with inspires co-creation, movement building and power-sharing to fight for social and gender justice, equality and equity. All these types of power are involved with dismantling hierarchies of philanthropy that are based on power over exemplified by institutions that purport to know it all, control resources and see communities as needing ‘help’. Feminist philanthropy is more careful than any other kind of philanthropy not to replicate exploitative dynamics of power.

In an article on the principles of feminist philanthropy, Caitlin Stanton, Kellea Miller and Esther Lever argue that feminist philanthropy brings changes in two ways: where the resources are coming from and where they are going to. This is not a linear but a circular model that recognises the importance of giving both to the givers and the receivers, apportioning them equal power to contribute to the achievement of women’s rights, gender and social justice.

This is perhaps best exemplified by FRIDA’s participatory grantmaking model featured in this issue (see page 44).

Being intersectional

Women’s funds, which are mostly public foundations with a political vision, play a critical role in building a feminist, rights-based approach to philanthropy. They emerge out of the movements they serve which means they know and understand where resources are most needed and are often the first source of funding for groups overlooked by mainstream philanthropy. The fact that women’s funds live and breathe feminist philanthropy values and principles gives them legitimacy.

Women’s funds are also acutely aware of intersectionality. For Astraea, intersectionality is one of the principles of feminist funding (see panel above). Lines of gender oppression intersect with other forms of discrimination. For example, the fight for racial justice is deeply connected to a number of other issues – misogyny, heterosexism, homophobia, sexual and reproductive rights, sex workers’ rights and migrant justice – because people of colour are disproportionately affected by health, immigration, labour and criminal justice policies.

In challenging prevailing economic systems, feminist philanthropy acts against the exploitation of public goods and natural resources. Such exploitation destroys ecosystems and hastens climate change while disproportionately affecting the poor and powerless who are mostly women and children. In supporting this work feminist philanthropy promotes the active participation of women in decision-making and the governance of natural resources.

This aspect of feminist philanthropy is well illustrated by the work of the Global Alliance on Green and Gender Action, featured in this issue (see page 56). To resource movements intersectionally is to address the greatest systemic factors that sustain injustice.

The intersectional approach in practice is well illustrated by the case of Sudan, where diverse movements including businesspeople, religious and cultural groups, the creative sector and the LGBTQI movement came together to play a critical role in ousting President Omar Al Bashir. Feminist philanthropy contributed to fueling the movement, sustaining the momentum and is now helping to strategise on women’s participation in the country’s transition period.

Body politics

Women’s sexuality and reproductive health and choice are significant in the deconstruction of patriarchy so feminist philanthropy values bodily individuality, autonomy and integrity upon which layers of political discourse and dispensations are placed. It prioritises women, girls, trans and gender non-conforming people share their experiences of sexual harassment leading to changes in policy at government and institutional levels. The recent #TotalShutDown hashtag in South Africa has also created solidarity among African women against sexual, physical, emotional and economic violence against them.

Amplifying voices, care and well-being

Feminist philanthropy understands the power of voice. It is committed to creating spaces where voices of women shape discourse, policies and perceptions. In most countries it is a few women with courage to stand up to oppression who speak on behalf of others, as is the case with women’s human rights defenders working in very tough situations. Mama Cash is an instance of a women’s fund that supports women, girls and trans people to tell their stories and influence the communities where they live and work (see page 39). This support takes many forms, including advocacy in parliaments and the use of media to set agendas and change norms. Such work can be risky and the lives of women and gender non-conforming activists and those close to them can be in danger. In recent years feminist philanthropy has placed emphasis on the well-being of people at the forefront of feminist activism. Examples of this are provided by Urgent Action Fund-Africa which is leading the process of establishing The African Women’s Human Rights Defenders Platform – aka The Feminist Republic – and FRIDA’s care model described in these pages.

In all of this work, it’s important to appreciate that gender equality and equity work is process-oriented, slow and painful. Above all, because they come from the movement

Below: Young Sudanese student Alaa Salah came to symbolise the greatest movement against the country’s president.

Alliance wishes to thank Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice for the Feminist funding principles panel.

Feminist funding principles

1 Fund those most impacted by gendered oppression
2 Fund at the intersection of women’s rights and LGBTQI liberation movements
3 Apply an intersectional lens to break down funding silos
4 Provide flexible and sustained core funding to activists
5 Fund efforts to make social and cultural change, alongside and as part of legal and policy change
6 Support cross-issue and cross-regional movement building
7 Go beyond grantmaking: accompany activists with capacity building and leadership support
8 Invest in holistic security and healing justice
9 Support work at the crossroads of feminist activism, digital rights, and internet freedom
10 Partner with women’s and other activist-led funds to ensure that funding reaches the grassroots

(see panel above). Lines of gender oppression intersect with other forms of discrimination. For example, the fight for racial justice is deeply connected to a number of other issues – misogyny, heterosexism, homophobia, sexual and reproductive rights, sex workers’ rights and migrant justice – because people of colour are disproportionately affected by health, immigration, labour and criminal justice policies.

In challenging prevailing economic systems, feminist philanthropy acts against the exploitation of public goods and natural resources. Such exploitation destroys ecosystems and hastens climate change while disproportionately affecting the poor and powerless who are mostly women and children. In supporting this work feminist philanthropy promotes the active participation of women in decision-making and the governance of natural resources.

This aspect of feminist philanthropy is well illustrated by the work of the Global Alliance on Green and Gender Action, featured in this issue (see page 56). To resource movements intersectionally is to address the greatest systemic factors that sustain injustice.

The intersectional approach in practice is well illustrated by the case of Sudan, where diverse movements including businesspeople, religious and cultural groups, the creative sector and the LGBTQI movement came together to play a critical role in ousting President Omar Al Bashir. Feminist philanthropy contributed to fueling the movement, sustaining the momentum and is now helping to strategise on women’s participation in the country’s transition period.

Body politics

Women’s sexuality and reproductive health and choice are significant in the deconstruction of patriarchy so feminist philanthropy values bodily individuality, autonomy and integrity upon which layers of political discourse and dispensations are placed. It prioritises women, girls, trans and gender non-conforming people share their experiences of sexual harassment leading to changes in policy at government and institutional levels. The recent #TotalShutDown hashtag in South Africa has also created solidarity among African women against sexual, physical, emotional and economic violence against them.

Amplifying voices, care and well-being

Feminist philanthropy understands the power of voice. It is committed to creating spaces where voices of women shape discourse, policies and perceptions. In most countries it is a few women with courage to stand up to oppression who speak on behalf of others, as is the case with women’s human rights defenders working in very tough situations. Mama Cash is an instance of a women’s fund that supports women, girls and trans people to tell their stories and influence the communities where they live and work (see page 39). This support takes many forms, including advocacy in parliaments and the use of media to set agendas and change norms. Such work can be risky and the lives of women and gender non-conforming activists and those close to them can be in danger. In recent years feminist philanthropy has placed emphasis on the well-being of people at the forefront of feminist activism. Examples of this are provided by Urgent Action Fund-Africa which is leading the process of establishing The African Women’s Human Rights Defenders Platform – aka The Feminist Republic – and FRIDA’s care model described in these pages.

In all of this work, it’s important to appreciate that gender equality and equity work is process-oriented, slow and painful. Above all, because they come from the movement

When groups of women who are self-led have money directly put in their hands, they are more equipped to challenge the laws and practices that perpetuate their oppression and marginalisation.

Alliance wishes to thank Astraea Lesbian Foundation for Justice for the Feminist funding principles panel.
themselves, feminist philanthropists understand how arduous the dismantling of poisonous systems and structures is, how draining is the winning of hearts and minds to the cause of women’s rights, gender and social justice. Perhaps more than any other form of philanthropy, feminist philanthropy needs patience. Things take as long as they take. Feminist philanthropists don’t hurry constituencies and demand results after six or ten months. They are patient because, coming from the movement, they understand what being in the trenches feels like!

We write in a global context where the equality which underpins democratic societies is eroding. Religious fundamentalisms, which are profoundly gender-unequal, in some cases to the point of ‘gender apartheid’, are gaining momentum. The machinery of power and the associated systems that give rise to the oppression of women are facing confrontation at every turn. In this decade alone the visibility of feminist activism and mobilisation have risen dramatically. In Sudan, the role of women during the protests that have transformed the country and the government has been critical and women have been at the forefront of this movement. The restrictive environment in Sudan which essentially polices women’s movement and association resulted in them using innovative ways of resisting. The women transformed Facebook groups to expose members of the security forces abusing their power. Women marched on the streets and rallied one of the largest protests in the country. Not only in Sudan, women in Uganda, Nigeria, Algeria, India, Fiji, Honduras and elsewhere are lending their voices, energy and movement towards radical social change and a society where women’s bodies, presence and abilities are respected.

Yet attacks on the democratic institutions which offer protection for women are continuing. For example, on 14 November 2018, the Kenya Medical Practitioners and Dentist Board ordered Marie Stopes Kenya to cease abortion related services in all its facilities within the republic of Kenya. Feminist philanthropy is a mainstay in fighting back and it is needed more than ever.

Gender blindness reinforces the status quo

So why is more support not forthcoming? Non-feminist funders often claim that they do not want to discriminate by ‘singling out’ women and non-binary people but that simply reinforces the power bias. When we enjoy privileges, what seems to be neutral is really not. Northern-based philanthropy needs to get over its claims to be ‘gender blind’. The board, leadership and staff teams of Northern foundations will need to get more comfortable with the theme of ‘difference’, with power-sharing and with funding relationships based on trust. And people with proven gender expertise and experience need to be in leadership positions.

In Mexico City this August, a group of feminist activists met to set a strategy for the 25th anniversary of the landmark UN World Conference on Women, held in China in 1995, which produced the Beijing Platform for Action. They had this to say: ‘In marking the Beijing+25, we must celebrate and affirm gains we have made in... advancing women’s human rights; harness our rage at the crises confronting our communities and ecologies; build on the hope of women’s mobilisation and transformative actions; and take collective action to forge solidarity with other resistance and liberation movements, demanding accountability of states and the private sector.’

We hope that this special feature points up some of these new directions and, most importantly, gives you the inspiration to join us in the tasks which lie ahead.
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Shifting the power in a feminist funding ecosystem

**Kellea Miller** is manager for feminist resourcing, Association for Women’s Rights in Development (AWID).

Rhett supporting women and girls is all very well, but it needs to be matched by a corresponding increase in funding for feminist movements.

Feminist movements are blazoning a path towards justice and creating feminist realities in every part of the world. The resources supporting these movements should be as significant and transformative as their organising.

Latest figures from Candid show that while 5 per cent of foundation giving in 2016 ($4.3 billion) identified ‘women and girls’ as a target population, just $492 million went to ‘women’s rights’. This means that only 1 per cent of funding for ‘women and girls’ (and 0.6 per cent of overall grants) is reaching rights-based organising led for and by communities themselves.

This meagre proportion is consistent with other major funding sectors, where rhetoric for supporting women and girls is not matched by actual funding to feminist movements.

This needs to change. Funders must use their power to resource feminist organising and create a feminist funding ecosystem.

**Defining a feminist funding ecosystem**

An ecosystem starts with the simple principle that we are all interconnected. A feminist funding ecosystem reveals a web of connectivity between movements, funders, and larger funding flows and makes a fundamental distinction between direct funding - money that reaches movements - and that which could but does not. Most importantly, it points to the power that different actors hold to contribute to a more balanced, thriving ecosystem where feminist movements are equal partners in defining resourcing priorities. Here, funders directly support feminist movements and use their power to shift their practices and the larger ecosystem.

The role of feminist philanthropy

Philanthropic giving is a key revenue source for feminist work. Human rights funders granted over $2.8 billion in 2016 alone. According to a 2013 AWID report, foundations and women’s funds accounted for one-fifth of all income reported by women’s rights organisations (WROs), with feminist women’s funds playing an especially pivotal role reaching feminist groups across issues and regions. Individual donors also support feminist movements, providing nearly 10 per cent of WROs’ reported income in 2013.

However, there are contradictions that need to be resolved when it comes to philanthropic support for a feminist funding ecosystem.

First, the roots of philanthropy are tangled. Accumulated wealth exacerbates and benefits from inequalities, and favourable tax regimes allow money which might be public to be kept in private hands. In an ecosystem, this bigger picture cannot be ignored.

Second, funding is often done in silos, with money allocated to distinct issues that ignores the richness of modern movements’ cross-issuing organisation.

Finally, philanthropy is more than grants. According to a 2018 study of global philanthropy, private foundations’ assets exceed $1.5 trillion, of which just 10 per cent is paid out annually in the form of grants. These pools of unallocated resources are increasingly coming under scrutiny, especially around how to align endowments with grantmaking values.

**Charting a path forward**

While there is much to do, the following recommendations provide a snapshot of ways philanthropic funders can contribute to a balanced, transformative funding ecosystem:

- **Provide core, flexible and multi-year support directly to feminist movements**
- **Find ways to fund the full range of feminist knowledge and experiences**
- **Learn from women’s funds’ feminist approaches and recognise women’s funds as key to reaching local, national and regional feminist movements, particularly in the Global South**
- **Bring on board peer funders that could support feminist movements but are not aligned investment practices with grantmaking goals and values**
- **Be honest about philanthropic money. Explicitly support work to democratisate and decentralise wealth, combat economic inequality, and move public money back to the public**

The author wishes to thank Rochelle Jones and Nana Darkoa Sekyiamah at AWID and Inga Ingulfsen at Candid for their contribution to this article. For an expanded discussion, see AWID’s report Towards a Feminist Funding Ecosystem at https://tinyurl.com/AWID-report.

In Profile

The global force of feminist philanthropy

A snapshot of the ecosystem of coalitions, initiatives and movements doing the heavy lifting to promote gender equality and women’s rights

**Beyond the binary**

Jessica Horn, director of programmes at African Women’s Development Fund (AWDF) writes:

The first women’s funds were founded in the 1980s as a mechanism to resource the work of women-led activism for women’s rights and social transformation otherwise neglected by the worlds of philanthropy and government funding. At that tempestuous history, feminist movements globally largely understood their struggle as one of women against patriarchy – with women understood as cis-born, bodies sexed as ‘female’ and gendered as girls and then women. However as trans feminists grow in numbers and in visibility, women’s funds have had to consider two questions.

The first is relatively straightforward: do we consider trans women to be women and therefore trans women’s organising to be eligible for funding and support as part of our core constituency? On this point, every women’s fund that has considered the question has said yes. The second is one that touches on an unresolved debate in feminism thinking itself: what if trans activists are feminists but do not identify with the binary category ‘woman’? What if they exacerbate patriarchy, but may situate their identities along the spectrum of gender non-conformity and against the idea that there are only two discrete genders? Would organisations formed by feminists who support cis and trans women’s rights but equally question the basis of binary gender be eligible for support? These questions remain live ones for the women’s funds community, as funds consider how to stay true to their founding mandates of investing in the frontline of women-led work for women’s rights and feminist transformation, while being responsive to shifting understandings of gender itself and the ways that people are affected by and resist patriarchy, including through their gendered identities.

Prospera

Prospera is a network of women’s funds. Rather than being a funder in its own right, it sees itself as a means of enabling collaboration between members to mobilise resources and develop technical skills and knowledge. It embraces 38 women’s funds which collectively provide grants in over 170 countries of $66.3 million a year. Nine of the funds are based in Latin America, seven in Eastern Europe, six in North America and five in each of Western Europe, Africa and Asia. The scope of their grantmaking ranges from national to international. https://www.prospera-inwdf.org/
Campaigning for gender equality and women’s rights

Philanthropy Advancing Women’s Human Rights (PAWHR)

PAWHR is a network of large foundations which includes Ford, Gates, Hewlett, Open Society, NoVo, Oak and the Sigrid Rausing Trust. Set up in 2014, it aims to increase collaboration and knowledge about women’s human rights issues by sharing grantmaking strategies, to advocate for more women’s human rights philanthropy and to provide a platform for joint advocacy. Its Strategic Collaborations to Leverage Resources fund aims to support the growing joint fundraising efforts of smaller women’s rights organisations, especially in the Global South, whose work is often overlooked by funders in favour of larger INGOs. www.pawhr.org

Gender-wise funding toolkits

Count Me In! Consortium

Count Me In! Consortium (CMIC) is a joint initiative led by Amsterdam-based international women’s fund Mama Cash, which includes the sex worker-led Red Umbrella Fund, together with the Association for Women’s Rights in Development, CREA, Just Associates and the Urgent Action Sister Funds. The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs selected Count Me In! as a strategic partner under its Dialogue and Dissent policy framework awarding CMIC €32 million from 2016-2020. The Dutch gender platform WO=MEN is a strategic partner for lobbying and advocacy. CMIC’s aims are to prevent gender-based violence, uphold the economic rights of women, girls, and trans people, and advocate for more sustainable resourcing of feminist movements. Projects it has supported include the Our Bodies, Our Lives campaign, an initiative in Malawi to demand accountability and improve healthcare for HIV-positive people. https://tinyurl.com/count-consortium

Global Fund for Women

The Global Fund for Women works for women’s sexual and reproductive health and rights, freedom from violence, economic justice, and leadership. A public foundation, the Global Fund relies on fundraising for its resources. Through its grants, it supports organisations working on these issues led by women, girls and trans people, identifying relevant projects through its network of over 2,000 advisers and partners. In the financial year 2017 (the latest for which figures are available), it awarded $10.2 million to work spread across 60 countries. www.globalfundforwomen.org

Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls.

(UN Sustainable Development Goal No.5)

With and For Girls

With and For Girls describes itself as the ‘world’s only participatory fund by and for adolescent girls’. The fund grew out of a commitment at the 2014 Girl Summit to create an annual awards initiative that would contribute $1 million to empowering local organisations working with and for girls. Partners include Stars, Nike and NoVo Foundations, Mama Cash and the Global Fund for Women. The fund’s focus is on action for, and investment in, organisations and initiatives that amplify the voice and agency of girls to determine the course of their own lives and the development of their own communities and countries. www.withandforgirls.org/

OSF adopts a feminist analysis

Kavita N. Ramdas, director of the women’s rights programme at Open Society Foundations (OSF) writes:

OSF’s women’s rights programme is determined to ensure that gender justice is central and visible in our quest for open societies. Our support of feminist movements allows grantee partners to build enabling environments for feminist activism, community mobilisation, and advocacy. At the same time, we also believe in bringing feminist voices into the deliberations of the OSF network to inform and illuminate our own strategy discussions. We seek to walk the talk inside OSF mirroring our support of the field outside.

Open societies can only exist when all people have voice, agency, and power. At a time when the world is facing extraordinary challenges to freedom, open societies and women’s bodies are a defining battleground in this struggle. Not surprisingly, feminist and queer movements are leading the charge against patriarchal, authoritarian governments. Yet in 2017, women-led organisations received a meagre 6.7 per cent of global philanthropic support. To rise to this challenge, philanthropy must question siloed models – we desperately need intersectional approaches to our funding which look more systematically at structures of oppression.

We are clear that using an inclusive and intersectional feminist framework will strengthen all our leadership in our fight for open societies. As poet and civil rights activist Audre Lorde once said: ‘There is no such thing as a single-issue struggle because we do not live single-issue lives.’ opensocietyfoundations.org
Leading from the South (LFS) is a feminist philanthropic fund financed by a $46 million fund from the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs over four years. The alliance is managed by African Women’s Development Fund, Fondo de Mujeres del Sur, International Indigenous Women’s Forum/AYNI Fund, and Women’s Fund Asia. LFS’s principal objective is to support organisations across the Global South to scale up their strategies for political, social, and economic empowerment of women.

https://leadingfromthesouth.org

Spotlight Initiative

The Spotlight Initiative, which aims to eliminate all forms of violence against women and girls, is a multi-year programme launched by the EU and UN. Designed as a contributory element towards achieving Goal 5 of the SDGs on women’s empowerment, Spotlight brings together public, private and philanthropic donors in a Multi-Partner Trust Fund to build on an initial €500 million, the bulk of which has been contributed by the EU. Its first programme, Safe and Fair: Realising women migrant workers’ rights and opportunities in the ASEAN region, was launched in late 2017. Programmes were also launched in Latin America and in Africa last year.

https://spotlightinitiative.org

Equality Fund

Equality Fund supports women’s rights organisations and feminist movements in Canada and around the world, primarily by providing financial resources and strengthening organisations working at the grassroots but also globally. It is sponsored by MATCH International Women’s Fund whose make-up includes mainly Canadian but also international partners such as AWDF, PAWHR, Toronto Foundation and Community Foundations of Canada, and financial institutions including Royal Bank of Canada and fund managers Yaletown Partners and Calvert Impact Capital.

www.equalityfund.ca

Women Moving Millions

Following pledges by Helen LaKelly Hunt and Swamini Hunt, Women Moving Millions (WMM), a global collective of women making gifts of $1 million or more for the advancement of women and girls, was set up in 2007 in partnership with the Women’s Funding Network. Following an initial round of pledges which raised over $181 million by 2009, an enduring organisation was set up, funded by members of the collective and a $1.5 million dollar seed grant from J P Morgan Chase. WMM now has over 300 members, women and men, in 14 countries. Collectively, members have made gift commitments of over $650 million.

https://www.wmmillions.org

Maverick Collective

The Maverick Collective does not work exclusively with women and girls (one of its focus areas is water, sanitation and hygiene), but they are its main area of concern. Set up under the aegis of Population Services International in partnership with the Gates Foundation (Melinda Gates was the initial co-chair), Maverick makes seven-figure investments in a number of projects to improve the health and well-being of women and girls around the world. Current investments include using youth-powered design to reduce unintended pregnancies among young people in Vietnam, building a brighter future for girls in Côte d’Ivoire and improving sexual, reproductive and sexual health for teen girls in Nepal.

http://maverickcollective.org

Women’s Philanthropy Institute

Housed at the Lilly Family School of Philanthropy at Indiana University, the Women’s Philanthropy Institute researches and teaches about women as donors, rather than as recipients. The institute sees women harnessing their growing wealth and influence to create a more just, equitable, and healthy society and seeks to understand how gender shapes giving behaviour ‘to conduct, curate, and disseminate research that grows women’s philanthropy’. They have partnered with the Gates Foundation under the aegis of Population Services International in partnership with the Gates Foundation (Melinda Gates was the initial co-chair), Maverick makes seven-figure investments in a number of projects to improve the health and well-being of women and girls around the world. Current investments include using youth-powered design to reduce unintended pregnancies among young people in Vietnam, building a brighter future for girls in Côte d’Ivoire and improving sexual, reproductive and sexual health for teen girls in Nepal.

https://womendeliver.org

Philanthropy’s gender pay gap

Light has finally begun to be shed on gender pay gaps around the world. All organisations in the UK with more than 250 employees are required to publish their gender pay gap. The UK’s largest foundation, the only one with more than 250 staff, the Wellcome Trust: notes a 17.4 per cent median gender pay gap on 5 April 2018: better, it remarks, than the previous year’s gap of 17.9 per cent, which was ‘significantly better than the 2017 UK average of 18.4 per cent’. To redress the balance, Wellcome is collecting better diversity data, training staff in mitigation of bias and introducing ‘fairer ways to recruit, support and retain women at senior leadership levels. Most foundations and charities attribute a gender pay gap principally to the disproportionate number of men or women at different levels of the institution, with most of the highest-paid senior roles held by men. In an Alliance reader survey conducted in September 2018, over 80 per cent of respondents believed there was a gender pay gap in the philanthropy sector.

https://womendeliver.org
Care is a very important word

**Peer Dialogue**

Claudia Bollwinkel is senior programme adviser at Dreilinden. @claudia.bollwinkel@dreilinden.org

Nino Ugrekhelidze and Maria Diaz Ezquerro

Dreilinden’s Claudia Bollwinkel talks to Nino Ugrekhelidze and María Díaz Ezquerro of FRIDA

The Young Feminist Fund about the importance of hearing and shifting power to the grassroots and the need for self- and collective care

What does feminist philanthropy mean for you?  

Nino: Feminist philanthropy for me is a very specific way of distributing funding according to the moral compass of feminist values and principles. The aim is to achieve transformative social change and social justice which requires an intersectional approach to challenging patriarchal, heteronormative, colonial and capitalist relationships. It’s about decentralising power and giving it to grassroots activists, and being very flexible, caring, responsive and respectful of the experiences of the different constituencies and movements we try to support. It’s also about the ways of approaching the work, not simply giving money but asking what we can do to best support the social movement?

Maria: I completely agree and just want to add that to me, feminist philanthropy is also a political commitment and act that, on the one hand, acknowledges that resources bring power and on the other, ensures that by establishing more horizontal relationships based on mutual accountability, trust and feminist solidarity, the resources flow into the hands of feminist organisers who are making radical social change in their communities.

Co-creation is a word very much associated with FRIDA. What does co-creating look like in practice?  

Nino: You’re right, co-creation is really the essence of FRIDA, not only as a team of people who work together, but the whole community. All of our day-to-day decision-making and operations stands on co-creation. It’s really constant dialogue and active listening, the aim of which is to understand each other better, it’s part of the deep and very transformative collaborations that we aim at. So we focus a lot on mutual learning and communications. We also try to challenge our practice and ways of thinking. We support each other a lot in unlearning. Because FRIDA’s staff are based all across the Global South, we come with such unique experiences and knowledge and we build on one another and eventually we grow each other up. So that’s co-creation at FRIDA, being open to growth as a collective and as individuals and also becoming vulnerable because sometimes asking stupid questions is part of co-creation as it makes us see things from a different perspective. We understand that it’s very difficult to build trust and it takes time, and we really commit to building systems because co-creation needs systems for working collectively and effectively, and we try to ensure that we have ‘multi-vocality’ in the system – everyone has the right to say something, it’s properly facilitated and we appreciate all perspectives and ideas. Transparency in decision-making, accountability to one another and shared responsibility are also critical pillars of what FRIDA means by co-creation.

Could you say a bit more about how your shared leadership works?  

Nino: We don’t only practise co-leadership on an executive level, but at a programmatic level as well. For example, Maria is co-leading the team of programmes with Jovana. In our systems, we try to have a composition of different experiences and voices so that it’s not just comfortable for one person or identity, but also it’s reflective of the diversity that is FRIDA. And we give a lot of feedback, which we try to internalise to come up with the end product. It’s a very long process and it requires a lot of discipline as well as time.

Maria: I just want to add that co-creation is challenging but really enriching and when we create something – whether it is a new grant or any funding-model project – it’s not us proposing it out of the blue but it usually comes from the community who share with us a need, a gap as well as insights on how to address it. Therefore we collectively, with grantee partners, with advisers, and other allies that we work very closely with, co-create something that’s beautiful, because it responds to real needs and it’s never us imposing anything on the movements or simply doing anything that we feel that FRIDA as a fund needs to do.

How is this reflected in your participatory grantmaking process? Can you explain how that works?

Maria: As you may know, FRIDA is the only global fund that applies participatory practices in its grantmaking but also, as we’ve said, in designing organisational strategies, policies and decision-making processes. We initially adopted this participatory grantmaking model from the Central American Women’s Fund (FCAM) and we adapted it to be able to respond to global specificities. It puts decision-making in the hands of young feminists themselves as agents of change.

FRIDA Happiness Manifesto

Above: CEECNA regional FRIDA community convening.

Left: FRIDA’s guide to collective and self-care.
That really helps to shift the traditional power relationship between us as a funder and grantee partners. We see it as an empowering process that provides participants and young feminists with accountability and agency. In terms of how it works, FRIDA counts on its advisers, who are young feminist activists based in different regions, who support us throughout the grantmaking cycle, developing regional strategies, doing outreach in their communities, then reviewing applications, ensuring criteria are met, and also supporting us with the due diligence process and much more.

When young feminist groups apply for funding, they play a critical role in voting for whom they believe should receive the funding. We have regional groups, and they comment on the top ten choices in their own regions. And, depending on our funds, the top two to three groups from each region will receive funding. The aim is to democratise the funding process, it’s FRIDA’s way of breaking down barriers of power and expertise and empowering groups through the process of collective decision-making. FRIDA’s participatory grantmaking is managed virtually, and has required a lot of labour. As we didn’t have any system in place to ensure that we manage grantmaking in a more efficient way, we invested a couple of years ago in a new grantmaking system, which are we are still working to improve, but it has already reduced our workload and the time required to process applications and reports. Also, with the new system, we will be able to have more effective data collection and tracking so it’s something that’s been challenging but also really worth it.

Last year FRIDA launched the first ever call for proposals to young feminist groups working on environmental justice. Did the issue come from the communities or was it the other way round?

Nino: That first grantmaking cycle was in 2017 and it really came from the movement itself, because we saw the amount of climate justice work they were doing. With the help of our global advisory committee, we selected seven grantee partners in Latin America and the Pacific Islands. Most of those partners are living and working in rural areas. That’s a very good intersection – young, women, or self-identifying as a woman, living in a rural area, working on environmental justice – they are the first people who are attacked and affected by this climate crisis. So we found it really important to fund this work but in addition to grantmaking, we have a climate justice fellowship which we launched this year.

We also want to make sure that young feminists create the narrative on climate justice so we decided to also establish the media fellowship to ensure their message is reaching very different spaces than if they were just writing some community newsletter.

Maria: I’d just add that, as Nino said, there were many young feminist groups doing climate and environmental justice work who we were unable to reach, so that’s where the idea of having a specific call for climate and environmental justice groups came from. In the second call in 2018, we received so many applications from groups doing this type of work and coming from very diverse communities, Indigenous communities, black communities, trans communities, women and girls that are doing climate and environmental justice work. That was a big lesson because we are learning how to better do outreach for these groups and now we are more intentional about it. Because of this, we have now been able to support these groups and ensure that they have access to resources, provide accompaniment and other support.

What did you do differently to reach out to them successfully?

Nino: I think it’s also very important to acknowledge that FRIDA has intentionally put a lot of effort into being multilingual. People can apply in seven different languages and our communications materials go out in seven languages, which is a lot of effort. Obviously that’s not full inclusion, but that’s how much we can afford at the moment.

Maria: Sometimes we have difficulties in reaching out to, say, Indigenous communities who don’t speak mainstream languages. In those cases, what we sometimes do is, with the support of the advisers who are connected to these communities, communicate in their own languages and find creative ways for them to apply, even though they don’t speak the majority language.

So you made sure that the call reached the right people?

Nino: Exactly.
We firmly believe that the organisations and movements that we are part of should care for us as activists, should protect us from burnout and violence, and that our organisations should be healthy and safe workplaces for all of us.

Why feminism is liberating for me

Tobias Troll represents the EDGE Funds Alliance in Europe. 
@tobiasedgefunders.org
@TobiasTroll

Liberation awaits men who dare to stimulate debate about the male condition, and enables them to embrace the feminist call for systemic change

Twenty years ago, my partner and I – at the time avidly absorbing the complete oeuvre of Simone de Beauvoir – introduced me to feminism. It was a revelation: I realised that people are not born as women or as men, but it is society that shapes and projects gender roles, behaviours and expectations. ‘Traditional masculinity is just as crippling a venture as the summons of femininity”, says Virginie Despentes in King Kong Thérèse.

What a liberation! As a heterosexual young man, I didn’t have to be told of football, I could hang out with gay friends, and enjoy the exploration of what is female and gay, and straight and queer in myself. It was this realisation that essentialist projections don’t do justice to the multitude of individual identities and experiences. And that binary thinking – man/woman, good/bad, black/white, yin/yang, nature/culture, body/soul, right/wrong – is at the source of much suffering. Binaries stabilise hierarchies and power relations; they kill the nuance, the subtlety, the complexity to understand and denounce the multiple systemic crises the world finds itself in today need to be addressed through a broader lens.

Feminism offers that lens. Beyond the essential fight for equal rights and opportunities, feminism is an analytical framework that allows us to understand and denounce the dominant system of commodification and exploitation of people and planet through the right of the mighty. Women and girls are among the first and most numerous victims of that system, but they are not the only ones – patriarchy is inherently connected with ableism, white supremacy, anthropocentrism. That makes feminism a systemic alternative to the capitalist-extrovert-patriarchal nexus denounced by intersectional feminists such as Naomi Klein in her brilliant 2014 book This Changes Everything on capitalism and climate change. Indeed, such intersectional, systemic-change feminists tend to understand social change, including for philanthropy.

So what might ‘male feminism’ in the context of a systemic conception of feminism look like? For a start, ‘allyship’ is critical. Men should be careful about the space they take and be willing to step back if their voices are being heard at the expense of women. Working part-time and assuming care responsibilities, for example, also allows men to enlarge their condition beyond masculine stereotypes and expectations. It’s not always easy – I’m working 80 per cent and leaving the office at 16:30 is a constant challenge – but hey, women juggle with much more! And, most of all, it is actually enriching to spend time with your child.

Feminists have deconstructed the female condition over centuries. Men should dare to engage in debates about the male condition, about the parts of their masculinity that have been harmed, morphed and damaged because of patriarchy.

Beyond men ceding space and power, feminism contributes to collective liberation and systemic change. It can guide our quest for radically different ways of organising our societies and our organisations.

Feminist philanthropy is therefore not only about giving money to women and girls. It is not limited to ‘grantmaking with a gender lens’. Rather, it is flipping the coin from a ‘masculinist’ logic of competition, growth, profit, exploitation, impact, targets (note the militaristic etymology of these terms) to a radically different worldview and mindset in all aspects of organisational practice. It is a logic of cooperation, regeneration, healing, care, empathy and deep connection with humans and non-humans alike.

It is philanthropy of trust, it is building horizontal organisations grounded in solidarity and solidarity love for people and planet. It is embodying a systemic alternative through a practice of playful experimentation, hands on and every day. Philanthropy needs the liberation of a truly feminist transformation as much as society as a whole.

EDGE (Engaged Donors for Global Equity) runs a Gender Justice Initiative and regularly trains funders on feminism. 
@kingkongdespentes
@kingkong-despentes


Resolving gender inequality can only be achieved by dismantling patriarchy—a system of male domination deeply rooted in our economic order and racial hierarchy. To do this, strong social justice movements underpinned by clear ideological visions of just, inclusive and equitable social transformation are key. Herein lies the role of funders in supporting these movements. There are two major contributions that women’s funds have made to discourses and movements. The feminist approach to who and how they fund.

Women’s funds are an essential piece of the puzzle in shifting power in relation to gender equality, from capacity building, micro-credit and small enterprise support to setting up African Women’s Development Fund (AWDF) as a direct response to a global funding environment in which women in Africa were consistently framed as ‘bread and butter issues’—daily survival concerns. AWDF co-founder, Bisi Adiyeley-Fayemi recalls that one of the funds’ leadership in lobbying the Dutch government to set aside resources for Feminist Funding from the South (see page 39), a €40 million fund to resource women’s activism in the Global South was awarded as an anchor. This fund was a response to complaints lodged with the Dutch government about an earlier initiative. The fund was awarded to large international organisations to the detriment of established women’s rights organisations in the Global South who do not have access to long-term funding but whose programming credibility and constituency building mettle are equally robust. As Dinah Musindarwezo, the former director of FEMNET once remarked, ‘you are either too big to access resources in Africa or too small to compete for global resources’.

The role of philanthropic advocacy in shifting power in relation to giving has been a key priority for women’s funds. This work in my view is central to achieving gender equality. Money is a political resource—when we get what it funds determines how much closer we get to a gender-just world.

Women’s funds have led advocacy with governments and foundations to change their approach to who and how they fund. Transforming structures and systems is a slow process and few are willing to invest in that, including African philanthropists. They have sought to create room for innovation and patience. While indigenous African philanthropy brings a revolutionary approach, it is still plagued by some of the elements of mainstream philanthropy which favour quota systems or economic solutions like micro-finance. It still tends to be conservative in that it largely supports responses to the local environment, food security or health while staying away from what might be deemed controversial or taboo issues that disrupt gender categories. It sees gender justice as full equality and equity between men and women, a frame that is inadequate to the needs of the diversity of people on the African continent. Support for women is mainly directed towards heterosexual and cis women, neglecting lesbian, bisexual and trans women’s needs.

So, while African philanthropy, importantly, challenges the idea of exclusive North-South movement of resources and support, it still has room to grow. Bringing a feminist lens to philanthropy including African philanthropy could transform a philanthropic culture that has failed to put the people it is meant to support first. Feminist philanthropy is self-aware and recognises that philanthropy is about solidarity for project-specific outcomes do not change the larger structures of mainstream philanthropy which put the focus instead on communities and the people most affected by the issues that need to be addressed so that they can take the lead in their own liberation. And we are seeing this in practice. We see feminist funds on the continent disrupting mainstream and conservative approaches to philanthropy. The African Women’s Development Fund is a unique example along with Urgent Action Fund-Africa, both of which support not just mainstream gender justice but the disruption of gender categories in ways that support and expand equality, autonomy, dignity and self-determination. They are disrupting the dominant discourse of power and profit first, people last.

According to 2017 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) statistics, 15 per cent of philanthropic funding from the largest foundations worldwide went to support gender equality and women’s empowerment. Less than half of this—6 per cent—had gender equality as the primary objective. This is indicative of the low priority given to addressing cis and trans women’s and girls’ rights. However, it’s not just a question of money, it’s a matter of overturning paternalistic approaches to giving— from whatever source—and some funds are taking the lead. There are many challenges in regard to gender issues that funders are mostly supporting band-aid or temporary solutions that do not change the larger structures and dynamics that perpetuate the problems. Transforming structures and systems is a slow process and few are willing to invest in that, including African philanthropists. Too often, the metrics created for project-specific outcomes do not embrace structural change. Supporting processes is about creating room for innovation and shifting from the obsession with short-term results to understanding that change takes time, and gains and drawbacks are part of that journey. It is truly an exercise in trust and patience.

While indigenous African philanthropy challenges the idea of the North-South flow of philanthropy, African philanthropy continues to develop. To achieve long-lasting change African feminist approach is needed.
Revolutionising philanthropy across Asia and the Pacific

Feminism’s purpose is to disrupt power and funders who support it need to embrace this principle to achieve genuine gender justice.

Money represents power, particularly in Asia and the Pacific where resources for social justice work have come from either government sources or the West. The prevailing philanthropic culture has largely been focused on religion or charitable causes, and organising around women’s and trans persons’ human rights often flies in the face of tradition.

The era of the conferences

This has begun to change, in no small part initiated by a series of landmark conventions and international conferences in the 1980s and 1990s. Prior to these events, the focus of both bilateral and foundation giving in the Global South was on ‘development’/empowerment models. It was the feminist rallying call that ‘women’s rights are human rights’ in 1992 at the World Conference on Human Rights held in Vienna that reframed and moved the discourse to a rights-based approach.

The era of the conferences also saw the emergence of the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, in 1981; pushed through by the efforts of women coming together from across the world. National and regional preparations for the conferences were dynamic spaces for taking the feminist analysis of power and resources further. They led to more conscious support for women’s issues, with an effort to include their voices when designing the initiatives.

Gender mainstreaming has come at a cost

However, in the last 15 years, despite resources continuing to be committed to gender equality, its framing has come from a gender-mainstreaming approach. In the interventions which have followed, feminist leadership has been the greatest casualty. This has led to an absence of sustained and engaged feminist design or even analysis of the programmes with the goal of equality and non-discrimination. The result, for philanthropic giving and international aid, has been that the power of resources has not shifted to those who are claiming them. They have remained mere recipients.

While a significant rationale for the creation of women’s funds was lack of resources, it was also informed by a concern for the ownership of these resources. Simply earmarking resources to address violence against women or support ‘women and girls’ was not enough. Those resources are needed to go towards unpacking the socio-political relational dynamic that has produced inequality, discrimination and violence, and be put in the hands of those who have lived those realities. In addition, to be integral to the movements built to challenge and eliminate them, their leadership must be recognised and respected.

Organising around women’s and trans persons’ human rights often flies in the face of tradition.
Those resources are needed to go towards unpacking the socio-political relational dynamic that has produced inequality, discrimination and violence.

The first women’s fund in our region, Tewa, was set up in Nepal in 1995, with the goal of unlocking local philanthropy for women. The Korean Women’s Fund (now known as the Korean Foundation for Women), was set up in 1999 to ensure gender equality, by supporting women’s movements and women’s empowerment. MONES, the Mongolian Women’s Fund, was created in 2001 to provide financial support to women’s groups as well as marginalised women in abusive situations. HER Fund in Hong Kong followed suit in 2004, with the aim of educating givers to fund causes that were about human rights and supporting women. The South Asia Women’s Fund (now Women’s Fund Asia) was also created in 2004 as the first sub-regional women’s fund to work as a catalyst for local giving to women’s rights work in the region. More recently, the region has seen the emergence of regional funds in Asia, realised that it was not receiving applications from groups led by trans people, unless they were in partnership with others. In its regional convergence in 2017, therefore, it sought to understand why. It was taken aback to learn that the groups did not think they were eligible, given the emphasis on the term ‘women’.

WFA’s team and Board of Directors reviewed the vision and mission, and the statements were redrafted to ensure that support for and work with trans communities were made explicit. Accountability, a central tool of dismantling power, was amply demonstrated in Bangkok, as the women’s funds responded to hard questions raised by their partners and allies, from articulating what feminist funding is, to the difference between networks and women’s funds; and even more importantly, clarifying the role of women’s funds themselves, and their relationship to the movements they support. The feminist philanthropy movement in Asia and the Pacific, in addition to mobilising resources that are guided by feminist principles, engages with resources politically, disrupting power relations of those that give and those that claim, as well as ensuring that the mystery of resource control is made transparent and visible. As funders, we ask for a political analysis of the control of resources that examines growth, depth of reach and impact; rather than an application of a simplistic ‘efficiency’ model, which bases it grants on size and management. As we step forward to be held accountable to the movements we support, we call for a more substantive engagement with resources, rather than an adversarial one. Let us be accountable and transparent about ways in which we access and use resources as part of a larger collective; and strengthen the feminist movement for resourcing human rights.

The women’s funds responded to hard questions raised by their partners and allies, from articulating what feminist funding is, to the difference between networks and women’s funds; and even more importantly, clarifying the role of women’s funds themselves, and their relationship to the movements they support. The feminist philanthropy movement in Asia and the Pacific, in addition to mobilising resources that are guided by feminist principles, engages with resources politically, disrupting power relations of those that give and those that claim, as well as ensuring that the mystery of resource control is made transparent and visible. As funders, we ask for a political analysis of the control of resources that examines growth, depth of reach and impact; rather than an application of a simplistic ‘efficiency’ model, which bases it grants on size and management. As we step forward to be held accountable to the movements we support, we call for a more substantive engagement with resources, rather than an adversarial one. Let us be accountable and transparent about ways in which we access and use resources as part of a larger collective; and strengthen the feminist movement for resourcing human rights.

The author wishes to thank Claudia Bolderwinkel and Alexandra Gafita and all the co-thinkers in WFA for their invaluable contributions to this article.
Climate change is not gender neutral
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A feminist approach rooted in local communities can provide a powerful source of protecting the environment and achieving gender justice.

In mid-2016, the Canadian company Orezone Gold Corporation arrived in Bomboré, a town in the Ganzourgou province of Burkina Faso, to explore the area for potential gold mining. Since its arrival, the local community has resisted the mining project, as it would affect around 700 hectares of land, destroy 75,000 trees and force the relocation of 600 families to land that currently is infertile and non-arable. Furthermore, the project has already forced 3,500 people to cease artisanal mining, a major source of income for local families.

Women’s leadership has been key to the local resistance in Bomboré. Through their own enquiries and with the support of Organisation pour le Renforcement des Capacites de Développement (ORCADE), local women became convinced that they did not want a mine. So they started to organise for changes. The women have achieved a short-term victory as the company is now offering them the same financial compensation as the men in the community, given that their loss of livelihoods hadn’t previously been recognised. However, aware that this financial support is not enough, the women of Bomboré are now demanding more long-term change to ensure they have fertile land to live and work on.

This scenario is not surprising, nor is it unique. Corporations in extractive industries, working with development banks and national governments, have been pushing large-scale infrastructure and agro-industry projects for decades. The impacts of these mega-projects invariably have damaging consequences for local economies, livelihoods and the environment, and they often spark local opposition, just as they did in Bomboré.

To respond to the negative impacts of these types of projects, local communities often receive support from international not-for-profit and philanthropic organisations. While they come into the community with the aim of providing support, they struggle to balance their own ideas with the knowledge, experiences, interests and demands of the different levels of these types of projects, local communities often receive support from international not-for-profit and philanthropic organisations. While they come into the community with the aim of providing support, they struggle to balance their own ideas with the knowledge, experiences, interests and demands of the different communities they want to work with.

The Global Alliance for Green and Gender Action (GAGGA) has been experimenting with a new approach. A multi-actor network active from local to international level, GAGGA is a political alliance that acts in solidarity with local movements fighting for gender and environmental justice across the globe. The network includes local activists, groups and collectives, often women-led, and supports their political agendas related to pressing environmental issues, including environmental sustainability, disaster mitigation and climate change.

GAGGA’s deepest ambition is to show that a feminist approach to tackling environmental challenges, whether at the local or global level, is key to realising a democratic transition to just societies that respects planetary boundaries. GAGGA sets out to strategically connect the women’s movements and environmental justice movements to bring forward women-led visions for change.

For this to work, GAGGA has developed a flexible and decentralised approach to funding, partnering with an array of actors, including national, regional and global women’s funds, environmental justice funds and NGOs. It reaches more than 360 groups and collectives working to secure women’s rights to environmental justice across 30 countries.

This has led to amazing results. For example, in Guatemala, the women of the Ixquisis community have been able to successfully submit a complaint to the Inter-American Development Bank on its lack of compliance with its gender policy in the development of two hydro-power dams in their territory. In Asia, organisations from Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Mongolia and the Philippines have formed the Women in Action on Mining in Asia (WAMA) coalition. This provides skills-share workshops for women from affected communities at national and regional levels to further understand the gendered impacts of mining, deconstruct the economics of mining and build a strong regional evidence-based platform for women’s demands to the mining sector. Through this coalition, the group has been able to effectively engage in the United Nations Forum on Business and Human Rights.

Since 2016, the GAGGA network has been able to show that when local communities are listened to, profound systemic change will ensue, just as the women in Burkina Faso succeeded in getting an international mining giant to start changing its ways.

The authors wish to thank GAGGA coordinator, Malta Smet, for her contribution to this article.

Above: Women of Bomboré attend a workshop organised by ORCADE and Wafa.

Left: Visit to a mining site during a WAMA skills-share programme in Palawan, the Philippines.
The future of foundations is female

Inspired by the work of international foundations, in 2017 the Association of German Foundations (BDS) launched an additional group, Gender and Diversity. This was to supplement its existing thematic networks. Women and Foundations, and begin the strategic integration of gender justice in the German foundation sector. The group is growing and has attracted partners such as the new initiative Fair Share of Women Leaders, Open Society Foundations, PHINEO and Wider Sense. At the group’s first meeting, one consultant said: ‘The future of foundations is female.’ In some respects, so is the present. Women make up at least 70 per cent of the civil society workforce. More women set up or co-found foundations and the third sector. 35 German foundations were led by women.

A strong signal of BDS’s intention to secure gender equity came at its 2018 annual conference when the philanthropist Ise Bosch received Germany’s most important founder’s award. This year’s winners have a commitment to human rights globally, her work in improving the living conditions of girls and women and in protecting sexual minorities. When the awardee, with more than 30 international grantees of all binary and non-binary sexes, rocked the floor, a very special atmosphere could be felt in the hall. At the same time, a blog post in Alliance by Anke Pätsch noted that only three out of the top 35 German foundations were led by women.

Filling the data gap
With statistics on questions of gender within foundations few and far between, in March this year, PHINEO and BDS conducted a survey of 183 German foundations, supplemented by five qualitative interviews with foundation representatives. The findings confirm that gender equity is still in its infancy in the German foundation sector. Eighty per cent of foundations surveyed have been involved in projects in the field of gender justice. These primarily involve projects to counter violence against women, to fight discrimination and to question gender stereotypes. Approaches to reflecting on masculinity are very rare.

Foundations can consider gender equity in all their support and project activities, even if this is not the main thrust of their work. But in practice, this so-called ‘gender mainstreaming’ rarely takes place. Fifty-seven per cent of grantmaking foundations said they have not yet considered gender mainstreaming and do not consider it necessary in the future. Only 24 per cent of operating foundations take this view.

Women are still under-represented in the highest governance bodies of foundations (board of directors or comparable). In 72 per cent of the foundations surveyed, women were in the minority on the board and, in 29 per cent of cases, the boards did not have a single woman member. There is a correlation between the work of a foundation and its internal gender structure: foundations working in the area of women/girls and gender justice are more equal internally than foundations with other priorities.

There is a correlation between the work of a foundation and its internal gender structure: foundations working in the area of women/girls and gender justice are more equal internally than foundations with other priorities. Ninety-one per cent of them have at least one woman on the board of directors and use instruments and measures for a balanced gender relationship much more frequently.

A change is on the horizon
More positively, 46 per cent of foundations in the survey would like to develop the subject of gender equity further. Representatives from foundations and the third sector have strong arguments:

• Gender justice is a prerequisite for achieving global sustainability goals.
• Equity is a fundamental right – and therefore a premise for foundation action.
• Foundations can make a difference in this area.

Foundations working in the area of women/girls and gender justice are more equal internally than foundations with other priorities.

• Gender-sensitive foundations have a more sustainable impact through their funding and projects.
• Gender-sensitive foundations are modern and innovative. At the 2019 BDS conference in Mannheim, all panels organised by the association itself for the first time had almost equal numbers of women (44 per cent) and men. The number of women on the committees of the association has increased significantly as a result of new appointments.

Probably the most important step so far is the redrawing of the principles for good foundation practice. Approved by 4,500 members in June this year, these include a new resolution recommending that foundations’ strive to implement gender equity in their work and to realise the opportunities offered by diversity. In a sense, this looks like two steps forward and one step back, a cautious formulation of a still conservative sector.

A member amendment proposing that foundations ‘implement gender equity and strengthen diversity’ was rejected. Nevertheless, general secretary Felix Oldenburger announced that the association is committed to ‘invest the necessary additional resources in order to make gender equity a lived reality among all our members’. A task force in early September developed concrete measures to be implemented in the near future, including a strong visible representation of women in the sector, a practical gender equality toolbox with case studies, checklists and guidelines, in-depth data analysis and a means of ensuring female presence in events and publications.

We want to inspire foundations to take up the topic of gender justice. The process is ongoing in our own offices, a process that develops with the organisation, opens your eyes to your own unconscious bias and opens doors, when you knock loudly enough. We hope that all foundations will look beyond their current horizons, question their own attitudes and actions and... draw the right conclusions. For all women! For all men! For all gender!
A world free from violence: let’s move
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NoVo’s Move to End Violence ten-year history has instructive lessons for dismantling structures and narratives of oppression

In the past decade, we’ve seen an alarming increase in policies that undermine human rights, and a continuing rise in state violence, with a particularly devastating effect on girls and women. In the midst of this, we’ve witnessed powerful, thriving grassroots feminist movements working to dismantle oppressive forces and effect lasting social change.

At the NoVo Foundation, all of our work is rooted in ending systems of violence and exploitation, particularly gender-based violence. From the very beginning, we’ve prioritised uplifting the leadership of girls and women in their communities and Indigenous wisdom as a catalyst for global social change. The movements led by our partners in the US and the Global South have deeply informed our own core values, which include respect for lived experience, social justice, and radical hope, and continue to guide us in our learning.

Through the NoVo Foundation’s $80 million commitment to Move to End Violence (MEV), we’ve helped nurture a bold vision for those working to end violence against women and girls – including cis and trans women and gender non-conforming people – by supporting a robust network of change agents. The majority of MEV’s participants, called ‘Movement Makers’, are women of colour, Indigenous and LGBTQ leaders who work at the intersections of advancing gender justice.

In Move to End Violence, we started by listening and learning. We spoke with hundreds of stakeholders committed to ending violence against women and girls and asked what they needed to achieve enduring social change and an end to gender-based violence. They shared their challenges including burnout, resource scarcity and inability to rise above the daily work to think creatively. Some of the things they recommended included prioritising advocacy, leadership that is transformative, visionary and movement-based, and developing self-care practices at individual and organisational levels. At the beginning, the expectation was to build community and align around a world free from violence. Over the years however, the programme has evolved and deepened in powerful ways.

One key deepening is the programme’s sharpened commitment to building alliances with leaders from the US and leaders based in the Global South. While the commitment to transnational movement building was part of Move to End Violence from the beginning, we have learned that this kind of work is time-intensive and requires deep care and intentionality to facilitate relationship-building grounded in deep solidarity to emerge.

From the very beginning, we’ve prioritised uplifting the leadership of girls and women in their communities and Indigenous wisdom as a catalyst for global social change.

This year, Movement Makers took part in an International Exchange in Guatemala, where our fourth cohort spent time with NoVo partner JASS, a global network that strengthens the voice, organising power and safety of women activists and movements. The convening brought together Mesoamerican and US-based women of colour to exchange methodologies and histories and included a visit to the Landscapes of Memory memorial for victims of the 36-year armed conflict in Guatemala, to learn how US imperialism played a role in the 200,000 people who died. MEV and JASS organisations took part in a ceremony facilitated by Indigenous human rights advocates Rosalina Tuyuc and Nobel Peace Prize winner Rigoberta Menchú Tum where they collectively understood how US-supported resource extraction led to violence against the earth and its connection to the displacement, torture and murder of thousands of Mayan girls and women. Everyone was inspired by how activists are continuing to defend their lands from extraction, challenging racial and class traditions, and by their steadfast activism against injustice and repression.

Another way the programme has evolved is in how it grapples with tensions that have historically existed within social justice movements. Some of these include challenging anti-Blackness and transphobia. During our Domestic Exchange in March, we hosted a roundtable of activists who are leading powerful work in Black and Brown communities in Texas, including Latinx and trans activists of colour. Leaders pointed out the ways in which Black cis and trans immigrants are targeted for punishment and criminalisation in detention centres, ‘another way that anti-Blackness shows up’. The discussions highlighted the need for solidarity and cross-community organising, while also underscoring the nuances and complexities in our struggles.

Movement Makers have also named and addressed Indigenous invisibility within movements, most recently illustrated by the lack of attention to the epidemic of missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls and two-spirit people (MMWGS) in North America. MEV members have been able to partner with organisations such as the Minnesota Indian Women’s Sexual Assault Coalition by marching and raising attention to this literally invisible crisis, countering systemic patterns of colonialism and violence.

Our programme has also allowed us to witness the transformative power of storytelling drawn from the lives of marginalised girls and women.

Our programme has also allowed us to witness the transformative power of storytelling drawn from the lives of marginalised girls and women. Movement Makers have also named and addressed Indigenous invisibility within movements, most recently illustrated by the lack of attention to the epidemic of missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls and two-spirit people (MMWGS) in North America. MEV members have been able to partner with organisations such as the Minnesota Indian Women’s Sexual Assault Coalition by marching and raising attention to this literally invisible crisis, countering systemic patterns of colonialism and violence.

Our programme has also allowed us to witness the transformative power of storytelling drawn from the lives of marginalised girls and women. Movement Makers have also named and addressed Indigenous invisibility within movements, most recently illustrated by the lack of attention to the epidemic of missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls and two-spirit people (MMWGS) in North America. MEV members have been able to partner with organisations such as the Minnesota Indian Women’s Sexual Assault Coalition by marching and raising attention to this literally invisible crisis, countering systemic patterns of colonialism and violence.

Our programme has also allowed us to witness the transformative power of storytelling drawn from the lives of marginalised girls and women. Movement Makers have also named and addressed Indigenous invisibility within movements, most recently illustrated by the lack of attention to the epidemic of missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls and two-spirit people (MMWGS) in North America. MEV members have been able to partner with organisations such as the Minnesota Indian Women’s Sexual Assault Coalition by marching and raising attention to this literally invisible crisis, countering systemic patterns of colonialism and violence. Our programme has also allowed us to witness the transformative power of storytelling drawn from the lives of marginalised girls and women.
Making Aid Agencies Work
Terry Gibson

Terry Gibson’s book outlines the major challenges that prevent INGOs from responding effectively to the experience and knowledge of people they claim to help. It’s an accessible read drawing on many stories from the author’s experience of working in this sector. Gibson does a good job of challenging the dichotomy between so-called development and humanitarian interventions and highlighting the disconnection between INGOs and the people and communities whom they serve. He rightly questions our preference for political and scientific knowledge above actual experience and highlights the extent to which participatory tools, meant to more effectively involve communities, have come to be used in the sector as something of a performance. At the end of the book he proposes that INGOs should find ways to truly evolve towards what Gibson calls the ‘Change Agent INGO’, by using their experience and stories to their own context. At the end of the book they are equipped with a personal giving philosophy and an actionable plan. All based on the invitation to continuously reflect on our own practice of giving. Buchanan encourages donors to leave their ‘bubble of positivity’, and face honest feedback loops to increase the impact of giving.

The book has been widely reviewed. What can be added besides the playful map metaphor? Well, the 200 pages are an accessible, easy read. Buchanan’s table on ‘10 Differences Between Ineffective and Effective Givers’ is a synopsis that may turn into a classic in philanthropy. Of interest to European readers, the table stresses the importance of participation, listening, collaboration in giving. This is in line with a growing discourse in Europe on exactly these traits as a means of strengthening philanthropy’s legitimacy.

What will really stick with many readers is Buchanan’s pledge to free the concept of strategy in philanthropy from that of the business world. For him, these are different sectors with different drivers: ‘uniqueness and distinct positioning’ in business, ‘shared approaches’ in philanthropy. The sentence, ‘In philanthropy, if your strategy is yours alone, it will almost surely fail.’ says it all. So much for the constant drive to be the most innovative or the owner of an idea in the sector.

Buchanan’s Giving Done Right is the right map for philanthropy in these changing times. It fulfils both the function of guide for newcomers but it also draws in the detail of resources, discourse and ideas that practitioners in the middle ground have been looking for. Recommended for everyday use to explore both charted and uncharted territory in philanthropy-land.

Giving Done Right: Effective philanthropy and making every dollar count
Phil Buchanan

He concludes that we need ourselves to ‘be the change’ and I agree, but I was surprised that, given its robust critique of current practice, the book didn’t really challenge the assumption that there is inherent usefulness in the INGO. While Gibson suggests that it is very difficult for large professionalised and bureaucratic structures to change, he stops short of challenging us to completely re-think how we work. In addition, the book lacked a detailed analysis of how race and power play into the problems in the INGO sector and are rooted in injustice that we need to both resist and heal. For me, this is the real reason resources and power continue to be concentrated in the Global North. While there is plenty of food for thought in this book, there is little about how funding should or could change. There is no mention, for example, of the participatory approaches to funding being put into practice by funders like With and For Girls Collective, FRIDA or UHAI and the book also has little to say on the potential for direct funding to grassroots organisations all over the US. He shows how charting this middle ground for donors, philanthropy professionals and everybody else who feels passionate about positive social and environmental progress. He includes marshlands, quicksand or hard-to-cross rivers and canyons. This land of giving is one of ‘uncertainty and concern’ as the author frames it.

One of the book’s assets is that Buchanan, who is president of the Center for Effective Philanthropy and brings nearly 20 years of experience and distinct positioning in business, ‘shared approaches’ in philanthropy. The sentence, ‘In philanthropy, if your strategy is yours alone, it will almost surely fail.’ says it all. So much for the constant drive to be the most innovative or the owner of an idea in the sector.

Buchanan’s Giving Done Right is the right map for philanthropy in these changing times. It fulfils both the function of guide for newcomers but it also draws in the detail of resources, discourse and ideas that practitioners in the middle ground have been looking for. Recommended for everyday use to explore both charted and uncharted territory in philanthropy-land.

Giving Done Right
Phil Buchanan

If you drew a map of philanthropy-land Giving Done Right would be the vast, fertile, middle ground situated between the mountains of Giving is like Business, the ocean of All Giving is Good and the great lake Government Can Do It Better. This map includes many ponds, deserts and fault lines with names like ‘Good Intentions’, ‘Impact Sand’ or ‘Disruption through Measurement’. The author charts this middle ground for donors, philanthropy professionals and everybody else who feels passionate about positive social and environmental progress. He includes marshlands, quicksand or hard-to-cross rivers and canyons. This land of giving is one of ‘uncertainty and concern’ as the author frames it.

One of the book’s assets is that Buchanan, who is president of the Center for Effective Philanthropy and brings nearly 20 years of working with both donors and foundations, has intensively shadowed the work of grassroots organisations all over the US. He shows how important they are for the ecosystem of social change and that often change is reached place by place, person by person. Based on these narratives Buchanan’s reflex is not the one road or bridge that will solve all problems. He sticks to the role of a curious, encouraging but humble travel guide.

Reflection questions at the end of every chapter allow the reader to transfer the ideas and stories to their own context. At the end of the book they are equipped with a personal giving philosophy and an actionable plan. All based on the invitation to continuously reflect on your own practice of giving. Buchanan encourages donors to leave their ‘bubble of positivity’, and face honest feedback loops to increase the impact of giving.

The book has been widely reviewed. What can be added besides the playful map metaphor? Well, the 200 pages are an accessible, easy read. Buchanan’s table on ‘10 Differences Between Ineffective and Effective Givers’ is a synopsis that may turn into a classic in philanthropy. Of interest to European readers, the table stresses the importance of participation, listening, collaboration in giving. This is in line with a growing discourse in Europe on exactly these traits as a means of strengthening philanthropy’s legitimacy.

What will really stick with many readers is Buchanan’s pledge to free the concept of strategy in philanthropy from that of the business world. For him, these are different sectors with different drivers: ‘uniqueness and distinct positioning’ in business, ‘shared approaches’ in philanthropy. The sentence, ‘In philanthropy, if your strategy is yours alone, it will almost surely fail.’ says it all. So much for the constant drive to be the most innovative or the owner of an idea in the sector.

Buchanan’s Giving Done Right is the right map for philanthropy in these changing times. It fulfils both the function of guide for newcomers but it also draws in the detail of resources, discourse and ideas that practitioners in the middle ground have been looking for. Recommended for everyday use to explore both charted and uncharted territory in philanthropy-land.
Dates for your diary

PEAK 2020
9–11 March 2020
Washington, USA

Yale Philanthropy Conference 2020
14 February 2020
Connecticut, USA

DAFNE Philanthropy Europe Networks Forum
23–24 January 2020
Madrid, Spain

AVPN Southeast Asia Summit
12–14 February 2020
Bali, Indonesia

Sankalp Africa Summit
27–28 February 2020
Nairobi, Kenya

DAFNE Philanthropy Europe Networks Forum
23–24 January 2020
Madrid, Spain

AVPN Southeast Asia Summit
12–14 February 2020
Bali, Indonesia

Fundraising Institute Australia Conference
26–28 February 2020
Brisbane, Australia

10th Annual Sustainable Innovation Forum
9–10 December 2019
Santiago, Chile

For more conferences, visit
alliancemagazine.org/conference-calendar

LOOKING AHEAD...

March 2020

Indigenous philanthropy

Indigenous territories cover 80 per cent of the earth’s global biodiversity and almost a quarter of the world’s land surface. Its peoples constitute the world’s largest minority, encompassing more than 370 million people in over 90 countries. The world of philanthropy has begun to recognise that support and funding for self-determination efforts led by Indigenous peoples is critical to solving many of today’s complex problems. This ground-breaking special feature will explore effective ways to partner with Indigenous peoples and place Indigenous values at the heart of philanthropic practice.

Guest editors:
Mónica Alemán
Ford Foundation

Manaia King
J R McKenzie Trust

Coming up in Alliance extra...

• Coverage from the Philanthropy Europe Networks PEXforum 2020
• Interview with Ashden’s new CEO, Harriet Lamb on climate action and sustainability
• What’s next for the globally connected landscape of philanthropy? Coverage from #NextPhilanthropy event in London

All content delivered straight to your inbox. Subscribe today and make sure you keep up to date with philanthropy and social investment worldwide.
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