

EXCERPTED FROM


The Nonprofit World:
Civil Society and the
Rise of the Nonprofit Sector

John Casey

Copyright © 2015

ISBNs: 978-1-56549-529-6 hc

978-1-56549-530-2 pb



 Kumarian Press

A Division of Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc. • Boulder & London

1800 30th Street, Suite 314

Boulder, CO 80301 USA

telephone 303.444.6684

fax 303.444.0824

This excerpt was downloaded from the
Lynne Rienner Publishers website
www.rienner.com

Contents

<i>List of Tables and Figures</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	xi
1 The Nonprofit World	1
Globalization and Nonprofits, 3	
Definitions, 4	
Is Being Nonprofit Important? 8	
Theoretical Frameworks, 10	
This Book, 11	
2 The Rise of the Nonprofit Sector	15
A Definition of Nonprofits, 23	
The Roles and Functions of Nonprofits, 27	
Classifying Nonprofits, 30	
The Third Sector, 34	
Civil Society, 36	
Nomenclature, 40	
Is There Even a Sector? 46	
3 The Evolution of the Nonprofit Sector	49
Economic Drivers, 51	
Social and Political Drivers, 53	
Resource Mobilization and New Technologies, 56	
Government Sponsorship of Nonprofits, 58	
Business Sector Sponsorship of Nonprofits, 60	
Nonprofit Sponsorship of Nonprofits, 63	
A New Nonprofit “Culture”? 65	
Volunteering, 68	
The Changing Nature of the Sector, 71	
National Differences in Nonprofit Sectors, 76	

4	Comparing National Nonprofit Sectors	91
	Historical Comparisons, 92	
	Comparative Research Projects, 95	
	Other Possible Indicators of Nonprofit Activities, 109	
	The Cultural Frames Revisited, 113	
	Moving Between Frames, 128	
5	The Globalization of Ideas	131
	The Triumph of the “American” Model? 131	
	Compacts and Deliberate Relations, 143	
	Social Enterprise, 153	
6	The Internationalization of the Nonprofit Sector	167
	The Rise of the International Nonprofit Sector, 169	
	The Drivers of International Growth, 177	
	International Nomenclature, 181	
	International Nonprofits and Global Civil Society, 184	
	Classifying International Nonprofits, 189	
	The Largest International Nonprofits, 194	
	The “Top 100” Nonprofits, 198	
	The Internationalization of Domestic Nonprofits, 199	
7	International Nonprofits at Work	209
	Humanitarian Aid, Relief, and Development, 210	
	Global Advocacy, 235	
	Global Communities, 244	
8	Stewarding International Nonprofits	253
	Cosmopolitan Leadership, 257	
	Governance and Management, 260	
	Nonprofit Relations with Other Sectors, 272	
9	Emerging Trends	291
	Megatrends, 294	
	Maintaining Legitimacy, 296	
	The Rise of the South, 297	
	Intersectoral Trends, 299	
	<i>Bibliography</i>	303
	<i>Index</i>	329
	<i>About the Book</i>	356

1

The Nonprofit World

Almost every country in the world has witnessed a boom in its domestic nonprofit sector. In the early 1990s, Lester Salamon (1994) spoke about a global associational revolution, focusing primarily on the growth of nonprofits within each country and their increasing role in internal service delivery and policymaking. But a parallel international dimension to the revolution can also be found. The following examples illustrate the reach of the contemporary nonprofit sector.

- Accion was founded in 1961 by former law students from the United States as a grassroots development initiative in shantytowns in Venezuela. Currently, it is one of the premier microfinance organizations in the world. The microlending work was begun by Accion staff in Recife, Brazil, in 1971 as part of their efforts to support informal businesses and was subsequently extended throughout Latin America. In 1991, Accion established microlending programs in the United States in response to the growing income inequality and unemployment. New programs were established in Africa in 2000 and in Asia in 2005. Currently the US affiliate has an annual income of \$20 million, which is used to support loan programs in the United States and around the world.

- In the mid-1990s, a policy officer at the Australia Council, the statutory body for arts funding and policy advice, became frustrated when she found that no single clearinghouse or organization existed to help in her comparative research on how other countries addressed cultural policy issues. The brainchild of her frustration was a proposal to start an international nonprofit association, headquartered in the Sydney offices of the Australia Council, which would bring together the lead arts and cultural agencies from around the world. From that proposal, a nonprofit organiza-

tion, the International Federation of Arts Councils and Cultural Agencies, was established in 2000. Currently, the organization has national members in seventy-four countries. In many countries the member agency is a government department (a ministry of culture or its equivalent) whereas in others it is a quasi-governmental or nongovernmental corporation (e.g., the US National Endowment for the Arts).

- Shack/Slum Dwellers International is a network of community-based organizations of the urban poor in thirty-three countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. It was launched in 1996 when federations of the urban poor in countries such as India and South Africa agreed that a global platform could help their local initiatives develop alternatives to evictions while also having an impact on the global agenda for urban development. In 1999, the organization became a formally registered entity with a secretariat in South Africa. The Urban Poor Fund International is a subsidiary of Shack/Slum Dwellers International, which provides capital to member national urban poor funds. In 2010, the fund provided \$6.3 million for over 100 projects in sixteen countries.

- In June 2011, the Qatar Foundation became a major sponsor of FC Barcelona, the Spanish football club. The Qatar Foundation is a nonprofit organization started in 1995 by the then emir of that Gulf state and chaired by Sheikha Mozah bint Nasser Al Missned, the second of his three wives. Its goals are to serve the people of Qatar by supporting and operating programs in education, science and research, and community development and to promote international cultural and professional exchanges.

- The Friends of Danang is a volunteer group in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, that raises money for humanitarian projects in and around the city of Danang, Vietnam. It was launched on Veterans Day 1998, and most of the members are military veterans who fought in the US armed forces in the Vietnam War. An unincorporated association that raises some \$50,000 annually, the Friends of Danang partners with more established organizations such as East Meets West, the Vietnam Children's Fund, and the Pittsburgh area Rotary Club to help build schools and medical clinics.

Michael O'Neill (2002) dubbed the United States the "Nonprofit Nation"; perhaps the time has now come to speak of the "Nonprofit World." The goal of this book is to help readers understand the full breadth and depth of a nonprofit world in which domestic and international nonprofits are increasingly influential in policymaking in the areas of economic justice, human rights, the environment, and criminal justice. They have become essential partners in the delivery of overseas aid and capacity-building programs, and they manage international collaborations between professionals in every industry as well as in a broad range of educational, cultural, and sports programs. As the scope of their work expands, nonprofits are faced with multiple organizational, political, and economic challenges.

Globalization and Nonprofits

Since the late 1980s, the world has experienced a new wave of globalization resulting from a combination of economic and political integration, the widespread use of new communication technologies, and cheaper means of transportation. Whether the current globalization is in fact unprecedented in its level of economic integration and what its impact will ultimately be are still widely debated. Even though the current era of globalization is undoubtedly producing startling changes, one must keep in mind that twenty-first-century societies and structures are firmly rooted in the globalization dynamics of the early to mid-1800s, the period in which growing industrialization transformed work and social relations, and the newly invented telegraph, railroads, and steamships meant that the mass of the population could more easily communicate and travel across borders (see Box 6.3). The focus of a recently published book about transnational perspectives on philanthropy is the creation of new institutional forms and “the ease with which ideas cross national boundaries to influence decisions in other countries” (Mendel 2011, 405). That quote suggests a twenty-first-century dynamic, but in fact the author of the book is concerned with the mid-1800s and the rise of philanthropy among urban elites in countries such as Great Britain, Germany, and the United States. These countries were among those to first witness both the wealth and the dislocation created by the Industrial Revolution.

Some authors claim that the new globalization signals the death knell for countries as the primary political units; however, others note that countries, as political bodies, have survived earlier globalization processes and continue to be the strongest entities. National authority may be under siege from global market forces and supranational and multilateral structures, but it has been simultaneously buttressed by the continued strength of national identities, resistance to the loss of sovereignty, and the failure to produce global institutions that can deliver the same effectiveness, decisiveness, and accountability as national-level governments (Bislev 2004). Similarly, competing claims are being made regarding the economic costs and benefits of globalization for nations, regions, and even individuals. Notwithstanding such debates about the political and economic impact of an increasingly connected world, it is evident that the current wave of globalization has resulted in new cross-border flows and networks that are integrating not only economies but also political and social cultures and producing complex relations of mutual interdependence. It is a more complex but also more connected world. Those alive during the past century have witnessed an explosion in population and in the number and size of organizations in all sectors. At the same time, globalization, driven by new communications technologies and swifter, cheaper transportation, has compressed time and

space. The governance of these new realities involves profound shifts in social and political equilibrium.

In many industrialized democracies, the expansion of the nonprofit sector has developed concurrently with pressures to reduce the size of the state and to pluralize service delivery. Globalization has facilitated the spread of market-based new public management and governance approaches to the provision of public goods and services, which have fostered the retrenchment of the state and the privatization of public goods and services, resulting in a surge of contracting to nonprofits (Alcock and Kendall 2011; Anheier and Kendall 2001; Osborne and McLaughlin 2002; Pestoff and Brandsen 2010; Salamon 2002a).

But however impressive the scope of the expansion and globalization of the nonprofit sector, it cannot match the scope and influence of governments, intergovernmental and multilateral institutions, or multinational business corporations. World Vision, one of the largest international humanitarian aid nonprofits, has global revenues of some \$2.67 billion annually and 40,000 employees (see Chapter 6 for more information about the largest international nonprofits). In contrast, multinational corporate giants Walmart and ExxonMobil earn more than \$400 billion each. Even the private security corporation G4S, formerly known as Group 4 Securicor, has annual revenues of more than \$10 billion and more than 600,000 employees worldwide. Only a handful of nonprofits are in the same league as World Vision, but *Forbes* counts some 1,700 publicly traded for-profit corporations that generate annual global revenues greater than \$2.5 billion (*Forbes* 2011), and hundreds more private companies and government corporations generate similar revenue. Thousands of governmental and intergovernmental instrumentalities also far eclipse the size and capacities of nonprofits. The City of New York, for example, has an annual operating budget of some \$70 billion, the equivalent of the combined budgets of the twenty largest international humanitarian aid nonprofits.

Definitions

The key concepts in this book are analyzed in depth throughout the text, but in this introductory chapter some preliminary observations should be made about their usage.

Nonprofit, the term used to designate the organizations that are the focus of this book, is the most common term currently used in the United States, the largest marketplace for such organizations, and one of the most universally recognized terms in current international discourse on the sector. The choice to use the term *nonprofit* was made with full consciousness that other analogous terms are also widely used, and indeed preferred, in

different countries. In Chapter 2, the parameters of the definition of *non-profit* and other common terms for these organizations and the sector are analyzed. *Nonprofit* and corresponding terms in other languages are almost universally recognized, and many other languages have simply borrowed the English word. In Italy, for example, the trading bank Banca Prossima (part of the Gruppo Intesa Sanpaolo) describes itself on its website as “*la banca dedicata esclusivamente al mondo nonprofit laico e religioso* [the bank dedicated exclusively to religious and secular nonprofits].” This description uses the English *nonprofit* even though the Italian translation *senza scopo di lucro* (without a profit purpose) is also widely used in Italy.

The single-word spelling *nonprofit* is favored ahead of the morphological alternatives of *non-profit* and *not-for-profit* primarily for stylistic reasons, so the hyphenated forms will be used only when applicable in direct quotes or in the names and titles of organizations and publications.

Public organization refers to an entity directly under the control of governments and to intergovernmental organizations, whereas a private organization is independent. The term *private* can cover both for-profit and nonprofit organizations, but common usage tends to associate the term primarily with for-profits, and it is generally used in that sense. The analysis in this book clearly demonstrates that the distinction can be blurred between public and private and between for-profit and nonprofit, and countless mixed and hybrid entities exist. But significant differences continue to be found in the logics and dynamics that characterize the public, for-profit, and nonprofit sectors, and the distinctions between them are a core element of the theoretical framework of this book.

Organization generally refers to an entity with its own separate legal personality, but the term is also occasionally used more informally to refer either to an unincorporated group of persons organized for a specific purpose or to a project or program that does not have its own formal legal identity as it is under the sponsorship of a larger organization. The definition of an organization at an international level is also complicated by the reality that what the public might perceive as a single unitary entity may in fact be a complex conglomerate or federation of interdependent, but legally separate, organizations. They may share the same global brand and work with common policies and intervention strategies but are structured as nominally independent in order to meet local legal requirements or to reinforce ownership by local stakeholders (see Chapter 6).

Sector refers to the grouping of individual nonprofits into a collective that is identified by the organizations themselves and by others as a distinct part of the economy and society. When used alone, *sector* refers to the entire array of nonprofits (i.e., the sector as a whole), whereas smaller segments of the nonprofit sector will be referred to by their interest areas (e.g., social services sector, education sector) or as a subsector, industry, or

field (e.g., the health subsector, nonprofit housing industry, the community development field).

International and *global* are used to describe the scope, impact, and agency of nonprofit organizations that breach national borders. Other terms such as *transnational*, *supranational*, and *cross-border* also appear occasionally, particularly when authors and reports are being quoted. Despite attempts to parse such terms depending on the number of countries involved, or whether the relations are between or across nations, significant variations can be identified in how they are used by different authors in this field (Benessaïeh 2011). Perhaps one could argue that an international activity does not attain the status of global until it can claim to be truly universal (yet another term to add to the mix), but in effect people speak of the global aspirations of organizations that have no illusions of operating in all countries or even on all continents. An alternative is the term *multinational*, yet here linguistic fashion intervenes as that term is more often associated with for-profit corporations, and the label *multinational corporation* is often used with a pejorative connotation that suggests rapaciousness. There is no etymological reason not to use the term *multinational nonprofits*, but to most readers such a term simply would not sound right. Generally, *international* is the preferred term, but the other terms will be used alone or in combination (i.e., *international* and *global*) if better suited for emphasis or if a better fit for the context. However, the terms *globalize* and *globalization* are preferred when focusing more on the processes of extending the scope of work into the global arena because of their more common usage, but the terms *internationalize*, *internationalization*, and *internationalism* will also occasionally appear.

Cosmopolitan is used in Chapter 8 to describe the leadership of nonprofits in the international arena. Chosen because it decouples the analysis of leadership from the context of nations or territories and focuses the analysis instead on the leaders' mind-sets instead of on the physical reach of their organizations, *cosmopolitan* is also a deliberate choice to help reclaim the positive meaning of a word that has a long and distinguished history but also a controversial one that serves to illustrate the potential perils of the use of any one term. During much of the twentieth century, particularly in the Nazi and communist eras in Europe and the Soviet Union, *cosmopolitan* was often a pejorative epithet used for those deemed disloyal to a nation or regime and beholden to foreign elements because of their ethnicity, religion, ideology, or worldview. Opponents were branded "cosmopolitan traitors," and the term was often used by anti-Semitic elements as a code word for "Jewish." Recently, however, *cosmopolitan* has been reclaimed as an affirmative descriptor for those who value diversity and are at ease working with different cultures and countries.

“Domestic” organizations and sectors, in contrast to “international” ones, operate primarily within national borders. *Domestic* is generally preferred to the other commonly used terms *indigenous* and *autochthonous* because these are often used to refer to native, precolonization populations. In many countries, the term *indigenous nonprofit* refers only to those organizations that serve the original native population.

Country is used to refer to a sovereign political territory bound by national borders. The term *state* can be used interchangeably with country, although it is avoided to minimize any confusion with a subnational state in a federal system such as the United States. Similarly, *nation* is generally avoided because it technically refers to a community of a common culture that is not necessarily bound by political borders. However, as many countries, even multicultural ones, also define themselves as a nation, that term occasionally slips in. Also the adjectival form *national* is preferred as no equivalent adjective exists for the noun *country*, and the equivalent adjective for *state*, *statal*, is not in common usage. Occasionally, the term *jurisdiction* is used if the emphasis is more on the legal nature of territory.

North and the *West* are used to refer to the wealthier industrialized democracies, while the global *South* refers to poorer, developing countries. These terms are used in this manner fully recognizing that they are both geographically inaccurate (I was brought up in Australia, an industrialized democracy located in the geographic South and East) and imprecise (whichever economic indicator is used as the dividing line, anomalies can always be identified above and below in terms of metrics such as the size of different countries’ nonprofit sectors or their ranking in official development aid tables). However, they are broadly accepted vernacular and are useful shorthand. Other related terms will also be used occasionally throughout the book, such as *low-*, *middle-*, and *high-income* countries, the official designations used by the World Bank and other international institutions to classify economies, or *aid-donor* and *aid-recipient*, even though an increasing number of middle-income countries, such as Brazil and India, are both recipients and donors.

Almost every term identified in these previous paragraphs is contested, and the debates about definitions and demarcations will unfold throughout the book. An emblematic illustration of the possible confusion over core concepts in this book is the term *liberal*. In the United States, *liberal* is currently used, often in a pejorative sense, to define a progressive, left-of-center ideology. But classic liberalism promotes small government and independence from the state, beliefs more commonly associated with conservatives. In Australia, the Liberal Party is the more conservative of two major parties. A contemporary iteration, *neoliberal*, is often used to denote the resurgence of conservative desires to restrict and reduce gov-

ernment through the resurgence of the marketplace, but few conservatives self-identify using that term, and instead it is used mostly in a pejorative sense by commentators critical of that approach. To complicate matters even further, various qualified forms of liberalism appear in the literature to parse the possible ideological range: *laissez-faire liberalism* is used to describe classic liberalism in which the market assures freedom and justice, whereas *welfare liberalism* is used to describe support for a redistributive and more interventionist state.

Is Being Nonprofit Important?

For those interested in, and indeed obsessed with, nonprofits as objects of commentary and research, how other disciplinary contexts seemingly overlook or ignore them is often a revelation. Political science dissects the hollowing out of the state and the competing policy interests, sociology analyzes shifts in collective action and social movements, and the study of international relations explores the expanding role of nonstate actors, yet literature from those disciplines generally makes little or no reference to the organizational forms that operationalize those dynamics. The “nonprofitness” of organized interests, movements, and actors appears to be of little consequence.

In contrast, in this book I focus squarely on “being nonprofit.” Yet one can fairly ask which framework should be used to examine any organization. Does it really matter, for example, that scouting, reputedly the largest youth educational movement in the world, with 30 million youth members in 165 countries, is organized through a network of national and international nonprofit organizations? The Geneva-based World Organization of the Scout Movement is described on its website as “an independent, worldwide, non-profit and non-partisan organization which serves the Scout Movement.” Scouting has a rich and complex history as a global youth movement that began in the United Kingdom in the early part of the twentieth century, quickly spread around the world, and has been adapted with remarkable success to very different societies on all continents (Vallory 2012). Is its legal-institutional status of any consequence? Is the fact that scout groups are nonprofit just an anecdote, an incidental choice forced on them by the vagaries of the incorporation laws of different countries?

In most countries, nonprofits complete a two-step process to fully establish their legal identity. They first create a corporate structure from the array of possibilities available in their jurisdiction and then subsequently apply to the competent authorities to be registered for tax exemptions and other tax-related advantages, including the tax deductibility of donations bestowed on organizations providing public or social benefits. This descrip-

tion is deliberately vague, as wide variations can be found around the world in both the possible corporate structures and the competent authority for adjudicating the status of benefit organizations. In some countries, registering and obtaining the full tax advantages of nonprofit status are relatively easy and quick; however, in others, they are nigh unto impossible to achieve. In most cases such processes lump together a wide range of organizations. The legal UK corporate structure termed a “company limited by guarantee” includes social clubs, membership organizations, residential property management companies, sports associations, workers’ cooperatives, social enterprises, and other nongovernmental organizations, not all of which are qualified to register with the Charity Commission as public benefit organizations (note that under current proposals, the company limited by guarantee will eventually be phased out and replaced by the “charitable incorporated organization”).

Many scholars prefer not to treat such a kaleidoscope of organizations as a single class or genus; therefore, they treat nonprofitness as an incidental legal factoid instead of a core operating and analytical principle. I contend in this book, however, that being nonprofit is important. The fact that nonprofit is the organizational form of choice for certain movements, interests, and collective actions, and that this form has witnessed a dramatic growth since the 1970s, in essence competing with the public sector and market-based forms of organization for social and economic space and relevance, makes the institutional framework of nonprofit a key operating concept.

The example of scouting is emblematic of the issues involved. The official scouting movement is deliberately nongovernmental and nonprofit. Authoritarian regimes have appropriated the iconography and structure of scouting to create their own youth movements as extensions of the hegemonic party (e.g., the Nazi Hitler Youth, the Communist Young Pioneers), but these were never part of the World Organization of the Scout Movement because they did not meet the criteria of independence from the standing government. Similarly, commercial equivalents such as for-profit summer camps offer many of the same activities but do not achieve the local legitimacy or global status of the Scouts.

Some might argue that the fact of being a nonprofit is simply the administrative means that facilitate the desired ends, or it could just be the convenient form that follows the function. Perhaps some readers may feel that I focus too much on the micro- and mesolevel organizational dynamics of nonprofits, but without an understanding of the importance of the existence of the form and of the institutional choice to employ it, the broader picture is incomplete. I do not intend to overstate the role of nonprofits or to be their uncritical booster. I am unapologetic in my normative approach, seeking to strengthen the nonprofit sector (although not necessarily to

expand it) but also to hold it to a high standard of accountability and to analyze it with a critical eye. The nonprofit sector can be an effective deliverer of responsive services, a clear voice for its constituencies, and a loyal partner to institutions from other sectors, but it can also be ineffective, stridently unrepresentative, and manipulative.

Theoretical Frameworks

The centrality of nonprofitness and the focus on nonprofits as the primary units of analysis in this book locate the analyses and commentary at the intersection of two key middle-range theoretical frameworks through which I seek to integrate contemporary empirical research with grand theories of social dynamics.

First is a three-sector framework. The existence of a trichotomy of three distinct societal domains, spheres, realms, or sectors permeates Western thinking, entrenched in academe by the separation between the disciplines of political science, economics, and sociology. In this book, the three sectors are designated as public (government), for-profit (business), and nonprofit, terms also commonly used within the three disciplines to distinguish between the three political, economic, and social domains. Even though debates are long standing about the definitions and parameters of the three sectors, the interplay between them is a core element of modern social inquiry (e.g., the relations between economic and political outcomes or between public goods and private goods). The sectors are distinct but also linked and overlapping (Corry 2010), and the evolving relations between them infuse the analyses in the book. Classical liberal theorists emphasize the separation between public and private, whereas poststructuralists focus on the continuities and cross influence, but I do not necessarily follow either school. The conceptualization of the nonprofit sector as the “third sector” is examined in more depth in Chapter 2.

Second is the institutional framework, which focuses on the structures and processes that continue to shape the dynamics of the nonprofit sector and its relationships with the public and for-profit sectors (DiMaggio and Powell 1983; Selznick 1996; S. R. Smith and Grønbjerg 2006). These structures and processes are “path dependent” in that they are the legacy of the political, economic, and social histories of their polity, but the resulting institutions are now also actors in their own right, pursuing their interests and so determining the future direction of the relations. Since the beginning of the global associational revolution in the 1970s, the market and civic imperatives that characterized the early expansion of the nonprofit sector have been largely institutionalized (Anheier 2014; Saidel 2011; Salamon 2006). Nonprofits are not simply passive inhabitants of societal spaces con-

ceded to them by other actors; instead, they actively operate to reconstruct the societies in which they operate and to redefine their roles and relationships. In this book, I focus on the evolving markers of institutionalization and on the logics that drive the resulting institutional arrangements. I highlight the role of nonprofits in socialization and the creation of collective identities as well as in persuasion and advocacy. Although the preceding may suggest a constructivist approach, the analysis of the work of nonprofits also reveals structuralist-realist elements as the nonprofits seek to exercise power over other actors. To reconstruct the societies they operate in, they employ a wide range of levers.

Occasionally in the book I include passing references to the signature concepts of key social theorists and philosophers whose works are commonly cited in the nonprofit and related social sciences literature. These theorists may not have first developed the concepts or coined the terms, but they are most closely identified with them in the context of the disciplinary debates surrounding nonprofits. Arguably, the theorists most commonly cited in the Western nonprofit canon are Pierre Bourdieu for social and cultural capital and habitus (patterns of action), Michel Foucault for discourse analysis and governmentality (the art of governing), Antonio Gramsci for civil society as a sphere of conflict that promotes or constrains activism, Jürgen Habermas for the public sphere and the role of deliberative democracy, and Max Weber for state authority and bureaucracy.

I have absolutely no pretensions of writing a book in the Foucaultian, Gramscian, or any other tradition. The theoretical terms are borrowed where appropriate to reflect their common usage by nonprofit scholars, but I do not parse the terms nor enter into debates about their interpretation or the merits of their application to the nonprofit sector. Some nonprofit scholars have produced reasoned analyses of the influences of these seminal thinkers (see, for example, the contributors to Edwards 2011a; Reinalda 2011), but most simply cite the concepts as shorthand descriptors for a range of sectoral and organizational dynamics. They are used in this latter sense in this book.

This Book

I seek to offer an analysis that situates the evolution of the nonprofit sector in the broader contexts of domestic and global public affairs while offering a critical analysis of the work of nonprofits that neither overstates their importance nor uncritically makes claims about their impact.

An extensive and growing literature can be found on the domestic nonprofit sectors of countries around the world and the differences between them. Literature also proliferates on the role of nonprofits in international affairs and on their impact in specific areas such as humanitarian aid or

environmental issues. However, relatively little literature exists on the links between the parallel domains of domestic and international sectors. And much of the research and writing on international nonprofits tends to focus on a small subset of large prominent organizations working on hot-button global issues and ignores the work of thousands of smaller organizations and those that work in less high-profile areas such as setting safety standards, fostering international dialogues on hobbies, or fostering student exchanges. The purpose of this book is to help fill in some of the gaps by exploring the full contours of the global reach of nonprofits. By taking this broad perspective, I hope that readers will gain a better understanding of the policy implications of the growing role of nonprofits around the world and of the challenges facing the sector and individual organizations.

In the early chapters of the book, I focus on the comparative study of the nonprofit sectors around the globe by analyzing the different national environments in which contemporary nonprofits operate and the similarities and differences between them. I then shift the focus to the international dimensions of nonprofit work. In the final chapter, I speculate about the impact of future trends on the nonprofit sector around the world.

In detail, in Chapter 2, I analyze the growth of the nonprofit sector around the world and the nomenclature used in different countries. In Chapter 3, I examine the factors that have driven the growth of the nonprofit sector and analyze the determinants of the differences between national sectors in different countries. In Chapter 4, I introduce readers to the various comparative studies of nonprofit sectors around the world and examine the primary cultural frames that have emerged. In Chapter 5, I focus on the cross-national study of three key issues in the nonprofit sector. In Chapter 6, I examine the different dimensions of international nonprofit work, focusing on the increasing cross-border contacts and operations of formerly domestic nonprofits. In Chapter 7, I highlight those nonprofits created to work on international humanitarian aid and relief, to advocate on global issues, and to foster global communities. In Chapter 8, I explore the different management and leadership challenges faced by international nonprofits. And in Chapter 9, I examine the major trends that are having an impact on the future evolution of the nonprofit sector.

Throughout the book, I have included numerous boxes with short case studies and other practical examples of the operations of nonprofits, based on a variety of sources as well as on my personal experiences. When the source is a report, press article, or personal testimony, the adaptation attempts to stay faithful to the “voice” of the original.

This book reflects the linguistic, cultural, and institutional biases that are inherent in any attempt at researching and writing international reviews and comparative studies. I read English and Spanish, as well as some Catalan, French, Hungarian, and Italian and have worked with research assis-

tants with knowledge of Haitian Creole, French, Nepali, Polish, and Tagalog, so the sources for the book are in all those languages. However, the book is still based overwhelmingly on English-language materials, particularly those published in the United States. The United States may not have the largest nonprofit sector in terms of number of organizations (that distinction goes to India), but it does have arguably the most globally influential sector and the most prolific publishing output based on a large community of academics and analysts who work in the United States or have been educated there.

The United States has regulatory and oversight systems that provide excellent access to current data about its nonprofit sector, which greatly facilitates research and writing about nonprofits. No other country can provide the depth of information about its nonprofit sector that is anywhere close to what is readily available to researchers and the public through US organizations such as the National Center for Charitable Statistics at the Urban Institute and GuideStar. Other English-speaking industrialized countries—Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, and New Zealand—also have relatively large nonprofit sectors (see the cultural frames discussion in Chapters 3 and 4), relatively good access to data, and active academic research communities, and strong research communities can be found throughout Europe. In contrast, most other countries have sketchy data and few researchers, and the published research, particularly in English, is restricted to a few seminal tracts that quickly become outdated (see the section on international comparative studies in Chapter 4).

Evidence of the dominant role and profile of the United States abounds. In January 2012, the Swiss magazine *Global Journal* (2012) published its first list of the “Top 100” nonprofits around the world, one-third of which were from the United States (see more details in Chapter 6). The Foundation Center in New York recently published the first report from its working group, International Funding for Human Rights (Lawrence and Dobson 2013). The researchers worked with international partners to identify over 700 human rights funders worldwide, of which 93 percent were based in the United States, with 88 percent of the philanthropic funding coming from US organizations (note that 46 percent of the total philanthropic funds were spent internally in the United States and that in most European countries, government, not philanthropy, funds human rights efforts at home and abroad). Two funders, the Ford Foundation and the Open Society Foundations (see Box 3.7), both headquartered in New York, represented 25 percent of all philanthropic human rights funding.

The reality is that nonprofits from industrialized democracies dominate internationalization, whereas nonprofits in developing countries are generally seen as recipients of the largesse of wealthier countries. In this book, I have the pretention of providing a global perspective on the nonprofit sec-

tor, but the coverage of different continents and countries is uneven. The global aspirations of the book are mediated by the limitations of the data available and of the biases of US and other English-language authors who authored the bulk of the source materials. Just as US paradigms dominate global dialogues on the nonprofit sector (see discussion of the “American” model in Chapter 5), much of the analysis in the book uses the United States as the point of departure.

But perhaps the most difficult challenge of writing this book has been the temptation, or tendency, to fall back on generalizations. The immense diversity of the nonprofit sector is emphasized throughout this book. How is it possible then to make any declarations about the domestic or international nonprofit sectors when they might have to apply to organizations that include a multibillion-dollar hospital in an industrialized country, an international federation of aid and humanitarian agencies, a rural cooperative in a developing country, an international association of manufacturers of commercial products, a touring dance company, and a volunteer group of neighbors? Many times throughout this book, the reader will think, “But surely that does not apply to . . . ?” Chances are it might not. Or it just might. Some thirty years ago, Milton Esman and Norman Thomas Uphoff (1984) noted, in reference to local development organizations, that “almost anything one can say about [them] is true—or false—in at least some instance, somewhere” (54) and that statement could equally be applied to the nonprofit sector today. All efforts will be made throughout the book to specify the parameters of the applicability of the concepts and assertions.