

# Are All National Nonprofit Sectors Around the World Becoming “American”?

John Casey

Baruch College, City University of New York

E-mail: [john.casey@baruch.cuny.edu](mailto:john.casey@baruch.cuny.edu)

Publications website: <https://sites.google.com/site/johncaseypublications/>

## *Conference Paper*

Presented at:

American Society for Public Administration (ASPA)

Section on Public Administration Education

39th Teaching Public Administration Conference

*Balancing Theory & Practice in Public Service Professionalization*

May 24 & 25, 2016

School of Public Affairs and Administration (SPAA)

Rutgers University-Newark, New Jersey

## *Citation*

Extracted from:

Casey, John (2016). *The Nonprofit World: Civil Society and the Rise of the Nonprofit Sector*. Kumarian Press, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc. pp. 131-143

## INTRODUCTION

This paper analyses how the U.S.<sup>1</sup> norm is reflected in the growth of the nonprofit sector around the world. The purpose is to provide background for educators at the 2016 Teaching Public Administration Conference seeking to introduce more cosmopolitan perspectives on the nonprofit sector.

## THE TRIUMPH OF THE “AMERICAN” MODEL?

“The American social revolution that Alexis de Tocqueville observed in the early 19th Century, of citizens joining groups of every conceivable kind, is about to go global, forever changing the relationship between citizens and their governments, and governments with each other. The Arab revolutions are but the first taste of this larger change” (Slaughter, 2011, p. 2).

There has been a worldwide expansion of the nonprofit sector – in countries with a longer tradition of an active nonprofit sector there has been a significant growth spurt in the last

---

<sup>1</sup> The use of the term “American” in the title reflects its common English language usage as a reference to the United State of America. However, wherever possible in the article the more correct acronym version “U.S.” is used.

decades; in countries where independent nonprofits have in the past been largely absent, there is clear evidence of the emergence of a growing and newly confident sector seeking wider legitimacy.

Each country is unique, subject to the path dependency generated by its national historical baggage, as well as by contemporary institutional transformations, and even by the personal dynamics of key policy entrepreneurs or champions. But, decontextualized, the rhetorics and processes of change in countries around the world seem remarkably similar, with a marked convergence in discourses and models. There is a common international trend towards an increased capacity of the population for independent organizing and action; changing public expectations of the role of nonprofits; a shift to governance and partnership approaches that involve third-party arrangements and the privatization of the public sector; the increasing commercialization and marketization of the work of nonprofits; and the corporatisation of an elite segment of the nonprofit sector.

The quote from Slaughter above suggests that this convergence is a to U.S.-style combination of neo-Tocquevillian civic participation and neoliberal outsourcing in search of efficient and effective service delivery. Similarly, Eberly (2008) sees compassion, in the form of a bottom-up organized civil society, as “America’s most consequential export.”

Are these claims mere chauvinism or do they truly reflect a global Americanization of nonprofit sectors and of the broader economic and social systems and cultures? The U.S. nonprofit sector is not the largest in numbers – that distinction goes to India – but in terms of its economic strength and influence within its own domestic polity and international discourses, it is arguably the world’s most powerful. The international flow of ideas about the nonprofit sector is largely driven by the economic and military muscle of U.S. foundations, government aid programs, and the sheer volume of U.S. academic and professional publications that directly spread the nonprofit gospel, as well as by a range of institutional counterparts that promote wider concepts such as democracy, transparency, and civil and human rights, which are correlated with a stronger nonprofit sector (DeMars, 2005; Hammack & Heydemann, 2009). The U.S. nonprofit model may be one more of the economic and cultural artifacts it exports, along with Coca-Cola and Hollywood movies (Hunter & Yates, 2002).

It is also driven at more micro-levels by human mobility – there is a growing global cadre of nonprofit professionals who have worked or studied in the U.S., absorbed its worldview and then returned home or moved on to other countries, as well as stronger “diaspora philanthropy” links created between immigrant communities in the U.S. with their home countries. The sum of these dynamics is resulting in a “mimetic and normative isomorphism” (Abzug & Webb, 1996; H. Anheier, 2005; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), as the globetrotting cadre grows and as U.S. nonprofit workers and consultants are called on to share their wisdom with colleagues in emerging democracies. Box 1 illustrates how an Africa-focused nonprofit was established in Hungary by a diaspora entrepreneur influenced by a U.S organization.

**Box 1: *Afrikáért Alapítvány***

*Afrikáért Alapítvány* (Foundation for Africa) is a small Hungarian nonprofit aid organization that “facilitates development, aid and the forming of civil society through providing help in the fields of education, society and health care in Africa and organizing cultural programs and lectures to introduce the continent to Hungary.” *Afrikáért Alapítvány* focuses on education, social issues and health care in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In the capital, Kinshasa it helps maintain a school and orphanage,

and provides medicine and surgical instruments for several health care centers in the capital and rural areas. In 2007, *Afrikaért Alapítvány* began a program of humanitarian tourism, in cooperation with a U.S. partner organization.

*Afrikaért Alapítvány* was registered in Hungary in 2002 and later in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in 2004. The founder and Executive Director, France Mutombo Tshimuanga, is a citizen of the Democratic Republic of Congo who studied theology in Hungary and later married and settled there. In 1999, he participated in a humanitarian mission organized by the U.S. evangelical organization Steps To Life, and his experiences from that trip prompted him to found an organization in his country of residence to provide aid to his homeland.

Source: <http://afrikaert.hu/en/>

## **What is the U.S. Model?**

The U.S. is the quintessential [neo]liberal country with an extensive and powerful nonprofit sector. Some commentators compare its influence – with only the merest hint of hyperbole or jest – to that of the military, defense and security industries by speaking of a “nonprofit industrial complex” (Buffett, 2013; Incite, 2007).

The path dependency of the U.S. national script is well-documented: the cultural, political, and institutional roots of the contemporary sector can be traced back to collective ethos of the colonial settler communities, and to the protection of individual liberties and voluntary association embodied in the founding charters of the new nation (Hall, 1992, 2010). The U.S. nonprofit sector has grown dramatically in the last decades, but the conditions for its growth continue to be attributed to a historical predisposition. However, if we release the narrative from its historical moorings and take a snapshot of the current U.S. nonprofit sector, we can distill the following defining elements of the political, economic and social climate, and of the characteristics of the sector.

### Political, Economic and Social Climate

- There is a social-cultural preference for “smaller government” and a profound distrust of political institutions and centralized authority. The most visible manifestations of these attitudes are a resistance to higher taxation, and the widespread disparagement of the quality and effectiveness of government service delivery.
- Paired to the preference for small government is the exaltation of market forces and of private solutions to social challenges. The U.S. economic system facilitates the accumulation of individual wealth and accepts considerable wealth disparities, but there are also considerable institutional and social incentives for nonprofit charitable activity, which has engendered a culture of philanthropy and a high level of trust in nonprofits.
- There are relatively few administrative barriers to the creation and registration of nonprofit organizations and to obtaining tax deductibility of donations. It is a relatively simple, quick and cheap administrative process that has low rejection rates, with regulating bodies seeking to be as inclusive as possible rather than exclusive. Nonprofit status confers substantial tax-exempt and tax-deductible benefits, and there are generous tax incentives for private and corporate donations.

- Federal, state and local governments have diminishing capacities to operate unilaterally, so there is strong reliance on private-public partnerships and on outsourcing the provision of public goods and services to private organizations, both forprofit and nonprofit, in a series of “third-party government” or “indirect government” arrangements. In social policy areas, there is a general institutional preference for contracting with nonprofit organizations. With the growing role of the nonprofit sector, there is a conceptual and operational redefinition of the “public sector” to include nonprofits.
- Forprofit corporations play a significant role in funding, promoting and partnering with nonprofits. Donations, sponsorships, and other corporate contributions to the nonprofit sector are high and key corporate employees who distribute these resources, such as the “Vice President for Corporate Responsibility”, play key roles in determining nonprofit sector strategies and outcomes.
- There is an increasing emphasis on market and business-like solutions to social concerns and increasing hybridizations of organizational structures and activities. Social enterprise initiatives based on individual entrepreneurs play an increasingly central role in the ideation of the nonprofit sector. New forms of incorporation and new financial instruments are being developed which combine business principles with social missions.
- Third-party and contracting arrangements are regulated though performance-based competitive tendering processes which require increasingly complex processes of accountability and transparency. The tax returns of nonprofits are public documents and there are numerous organizations that provide access to those documents to facilitate oversight and analysis.
- The decreasing participation in and support for traditional social actors – religions, unions, political parties and mutual societies – has opened up social and political space for independent nonprofits with looser partisan affiliations (Box 2).

### **Box 2: Nonprofits as Political Parties and Labor Unions**

Political parties have long used a range of nonprofit legal structures for their organizations, but a new generation of political groups present themselves not as parties but as movements or organizations that identify as nonprofits. They include:

- The Tea Party which describes itself as “a national grassroots organization.” Tea Party Patriots, Inc. operates as a social welfare organization organized under section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code.
- MoveOn.org describes itself as a “community of more than 8 million from all walks of life who use innovative technology to lead, participate in, and win campaigns for progressive change.” The MoveOn family of organization includes MoveOn.org Civic Action, a 501(c)(4) nonprofit organization focused on education and advocacy, providing civic engagement tools to the public and building the progressive movement, and MoveOn.org Political Action, a federal PAC, focused on demonstrating MoveOn members’ power at the ballot box.

A similar dynamic is evident in labor organizations. While labor unions are one of the 501c categories (c5) and the union movement has long been the breeding ground for many spin-off nonprofits, the last decades have witnessed the emergence of new nonprofits with no formal institutional ties to traditional unions but still focused on promoting worker’s rights in the U.S. and around the world. These organizations,

identified as *alt-labor* by those seeking to emphasize commonalities with the union movement or as part of the *new mutualism* by those who seek to minimize them, include:

- The Freelancers Union (freelancersunion.org) for independent workers.
- Organization United for Respect (forrespect.org), also known as OUR Walmart, a Walmart employees group.
- The Fair Labor Association (fairlabor.org), which focuses on labor rights around the world.

Source: Author

### Sector Characteristics

- Much of the focus and energy of nonprofits is spent on cultivating relationships with corporations, foundations and individual donors. This is driven by a strong and aggressive fundraising industry that captures increasing amounts of private donations from individuals and corporations.
- There is an increasing emphasis on earned income activities, with the introduction of new or increased fees for services, and monetization of formerly free services.
- While nonprofits are generally seen as independent with few formal partisan affiliations, there are extensive connections with individual members of the political and economic elites. Nonprofits can provide a key political base and have become centers of patronage – many elected officials, particularly at more local levels, have worked in nonprofits previous to holding office, and most elected officials, along with most business executives, serve on boards or are active members and supporters of numerous nonprofits.
- The “high end” of the sector is increasingly professionalized and corporatized, and there is a large labor market for nonprofit employees. While frontline wages and benefits in the sector are generally lower than many equivalent public and private sector positions, there are increasingly well-remunerated positions at executive level in the larger professionalized organizations, often exceeding the salaries of equivalent positions in the public sector. There is a “revolving door” of senior staff moving between the public, forprofit and nonprofit sectors, and previous government or business experience is increasingly required for executive positions in larger nonprofits.
- There are strong industry associations at sector and subsector levels that lobby in the interests of their member organizations, and there is an extensive support network of nonprofit and forprofit capacity-building entities, think-tanks and organizational consultants. Teaching and research in nonprofit issues have become a substantial (sub)discipline in universities and other higher education institutions, which provide an increasing array of undergraduate and graduate degrees and continuing educations programs in nonprofit policy and management.

Given the preference for, and the size of, the nonprofit sector, in the U.S., the equilibrium in the social contract between the State and its citizens has moved away from the funding of many public goods and services through tax revenues and their provision by government employees. Historically in the U.S. there has always been a significant presence of nonprofit organizations in higher education, health, and culture, but in the mid-20<sup>th</sup> Century, there was also a social and political consensus that tax revenues should pay for, and government agencies should deliver, services in key areas such as primary and secondary education, child protection, arts and culture, and parks and recreation.

This consensus has largely disappeared over the last 30 years and many public goods and services which in other countries are directly publicly funded and government operated, or closely associated with government, are operated by nonprofits in the U.S., and increasingly relying on private funding. This includes national “public” radio and television networks, broad swathes of health and social service provision, and public amenities such as parks. An increasing amount of public infrastructure (buildings, parks, monuments, etc.), is sponsored by, and often named after, major donors, and increasingly the default option for funding new social initiatives is to seek private funding.

Nonprofit activity has long been touted an integral element of the economic and social development of the U.S. (Drucker, 1990, 1994; Filer Commission, 1975), and it continues to be a key marker of contemporary public affairs. As an Italian commentator notes: “The U.S. government recognized, perhaps earlier than any other democratic country, that [the nonprofit sector] was essential to economic and political growth ... [and that nonprofits] supported the entrepreneurialism, comity, stability, and innovation that America has used to prosper over time (Gaudiani, 2007, p. 1).”

The sector is generally considered to be a driver of progressive reforms, (notwithstanding the substantial presence of deeply conservative nonprofits such as the National Rifle Association and the Christian Coalition). However, the boundaries of reform continue to be highly contested. A broad spectrum of progressive liberals, neopluralists, and neomarxists (often buttressed by conservative critics) combine ideological, structural and operational analyses to argue that the operations of nonprofits help legitimize economic structures that have fostered the accumulation of private wealth, and so mask exploitation and perpetuate societal hierarchies (Abzug & Webb, 1996; Brecher & Wise, 2008; Fisher, 1998; Incite, 2007; Joassart-Marcelli, 2012; Roelofs, 2003, 2006; T. Wallace, 2003).

### **Is There Convergence to the U.S.?**

U.S. nonprofits are supported by a strong philanthropic culture that contributes a significantly larger share of GDP than other countries to both domestic issues and international aid (Charities Aid Foundation, 2006, 2011; Hudson Institute, 2012). The large, powerful nonprofit sector enjoys a high level of public trust and demonstrates a strong entrepreneurial spirit, combined with highly developed governance processes and strong transparency mechanisms, increasingly based on a performance culture that is continually seeking to document and disseminate its achievements. There is a strong skill base in the sector, with a particularly skilled and aggressive fundraising profession, and there is a strong labor market that can compete with other sectors for the best and brightest professional talent. Powerful industry associations lobby on behalf of the sector and knowledge generation is supported by an extensive network of education and research through universities, think-tanks, and consulting companies. The tax returns of some 1.6 million registered nonprofit organizations are freely available in the public domain through organizations such as GuideStar, Charity Navigator, ProPublica, and the Urban Institute’s National Center for Charitable Statistics provides open source data tools that allow interested observers to dissect the sector from multiple perspectives.

The U.S. nonprofit sector has long been admired by foreign commentators (see Skocpol, 2011), and the expansion of national nonprofit sectors around the world appears to reflect an increasingly shared discourse ostensibly based on these U.S. templates. Practical examples abound in both the developed and developing world:

- In Newcastle, Australia, local government subcommittees charged with reviving

- neglected commercial areas of the city have been converted to independent nonprofit business improvement associations.
- A German foundation sponsors an annual study tour to the U.S. which focuses on teaching fundraising to executives of nonprofits so that they can attract donations to organizations that have previously been fully supported from tax revenues.
  - In India, new private foundations are being created to restore historical monuments that have fallen into disrepair under government tutelage.
  - In Latvia, public universities are for the first time creating foundations to attract alumni donations.
  - The Mexican government is working closely with local and foreign foundations to develop strategies for expanding and strengthening the nonprofit sector, which has traditionally been one of the smallest in Latin America.

The U.S. philanthropic culture and environment are used as a benchmark to which other countries aspire (Charities Aid Foundation, 2014) and U.S. entities are frequently called on to teach about fundraising and resource development. Box 3 profiles the educational outreach of the Kennedy Center, the Washington D.C. performing arts center.

### **Box 3: Kennedy Center Teaches Fundraising to the World**

Cultural diplomacy usually comes in the form of a traveling art exhibit or a celebrity visit to a war torn country. But there is a new kind of diplomacy taking place at the Kennedy Center. Since 2006, arts managers from around the world have been coming to D.C. for training on how to improve their organizations back home. Each year's cohort of fellows come from every corner of the globe: Pakistan, Russia, Ecuador, Zanzibar, Cambodia and China to name a few.

In most of these countries, nonprofit staples like capital campaigns and membership drives are unheard of. "The funding system in the U.S. is different than most of the world", says Kennedy Center President Michael Kaiser. "We developed this private philanthropy model because of a separation of art and state that really emerged from the Puritans who thought that music and dance were evil. Today, an entire U.S. industry, known as fundraising for nonprofits, has evolved from that evil."

But the question remains: How applicable are these U.S. tools in, say, Nigeria? According to Michael Kaiser, "We're not saying *our* culture is important; we're saying *your* culture is important and we want to make your organizations more robust." The program teaches the participants to apply fundraising tools in the context of their cultures.

Source: Adapted from <http://www.npr.org/2011/08/11/139240605/world-art-managers-find-new-funding-models-in-d-c>

On a more conceptual level, policy shifts and official discourses also indicate convergence, with an increasingly broad accord in favor of expanding the nonprofit sector and encouraging it to deliver a greater share of public goods and services. In 1999, the Labor Party Prime Minister of the U.K., Tony Blair, and the Social Democrat Chancellor of Germany, Gerhard Schroeder jointly issued their *Third Way-Die Neue Mitte* (New Middle) manifesto culminating more than a decade of social democrat governments around the world embracing New Public Management approaches. The Third Way ideology sought to combine neoliberalism with a communitarian agenda and although the manifesto itself did not directly address the role of nonprofits – indeed there is no direct mention of them – it contained language such as “the State should not row, but steer,” and “the public

sector bureaucracy at all levels must be reduced,” which promoted the opening of government services to contestation and decentralization, and so elevated nonprofits to a more central role in service delivery and policymaking (Blair & Schroeder, 1999). While the labels *Third Way* and *Neue Mitte* quickly fell out of favor as they were too closely identified with the personal political projects of Blair and Schroeder, their attempts to create a middle path between statism and neoliberalism helped reframe discourses on the role of non-State actors.

While commentators note the continuing differences between neoliberals who seek change through marketization and social democrats who stress active citizenship, at an operational level the impact of these contrasting ideologies are comparable – government retrenchment and an expanded nonprofit sector. The expansion of outsourcing is generally cited as a conservative, neoliberal agenda, but progressive agendas use the language of citizen participation, coproduction and entrepreneurship to seek a reorganization of the delivery of public goods (H. Anheier, 2005; Pestoff & Brandsen, 2010) that implies a larger nonprofit sector.

Since the Blair-Schroeder era, the shift to the nonprofit sector has become even more evident in the English-speaking industrialized world, particularly where conservative governments have [re]gained office. The *Big Society* rhetoric of the U.K. Conservative Party-Liberal Democrat coalition that won government in 2010 highlighted the importance of volunteering and local decision-making in responding to community needs through the provision of services previously delivered by the State, and the government has continued to open more public services to be run by the private and voluntary sector. In 2011, the ongoing reforms of the Conservative Harper government in Canada were dubbed as being “inspired by British Prime Minister David Cameron’s Big Society experiment, in which social responsibilities that traditionally fell to the State are put in the hands of the citizenry and private sector” (Curry, 2011).

In Sweden, the quintessential social democratic country, a parliamentary panel known as the *Ansvarsutredning* (Responsibility Investigation) focused on the need for citizens to take greater responsibility, for their own welfare by becoming coproducers of the services they use (Pestoff, 2009), and even State-centric Asian regimes are increasing opening spaces for civil society to participate in service delivery. While Asian welfare provisions are still lean by Western standards, there is rising prosperity in that region and a growing middle class that has less faith in the State-centered outcomes offered under current regimes. As many developing nations around the world surpass the level of wealth that in the early 20<sup>th</sup> Century helped drive the creation of the welfare state in industrialized democracies, there is an increasing search for institutional structures that can help redress inequalities.

The nonprofit sector is even injecting itself into the different national narratives that describe revolving door sinecures for former legislators and senior civil servants. The nonprofit sector has long offered such opportunities in the U.S., but more recently the French term *pantouflage* and the Japanese *amakduri*, which previously focused only on the flow between government and government-run corporations or private sector jobs, have in the popular vernacular now also been extended to include nonprofits.

The narratives and statistics from around the world indicate that many countries are becoming a little more “American”. But are there limits to the convergence? Will the sum of incremental changes eventually institute the U.S. system everywhere? Is there an inevitable “death spiral” in which atrophied government services reach out to private initiative to top-up funding, only to find that when they are successful legislators use that as an excuse for further reducing tax revenue funding, and for citizens to pay fewer taxes?

Will increasingly effective fundraisers in more countries convince the public that nonprofits do it better than government, and so they should give directly to nonprofits instead of paying taxes? There may still be competing ideologies, but is the “American way” winning most of the battles and eventually the war, if for no other reason than the dynamics of unintended consequences?

In recent years, there have been controversies over philanthropy and foundation activities in countries around the world, which seem positively quaint when seen from a U.S. perspective. In China and Australia, there have been protests when universities have named buildings after prominent donors (universities in those two countries are mostly public sector institutions and until recently their buildings were generally only named to honor distinguished scholars and public figures). In Barcelona, Spain, when the city council allowed the *Fundació Barcelona Comerç*, the coordinating body for the business improvement associations in the city, to install a seasonal fee-based ice-skating rink in the main square there were protests against the privatization of public spaces. Perhaps the most important feature of all these cases is not that there were protests against commercialization, but that they essentially fell on deaf ears, and that such philanthropic naming rights are now becoming the new norm in those countries.

Now, with the global financial crisis there are considerable cutbacks in social services education, culture and international aid, and organizations providing these services are increasingly looking towards philanthropy for support. As industrialized democracies become less able and willing to continue to function as 20<sup>th</sup> Century welfare states, their citizens look elsewhere for what they had expected the State to provide.

What label should be put on such dynamics of a potential homogenization to a political and cultural norm? Is this a process of “Americanization”, “Westernization”, “modernization”, “neoliberalization”, or even the much-debated “end of history” triumph of liberal democracy? Is this part of the global imposition of the U.S. model; an inexorable consequence of a more prosperous, more middle class and more democratic world that is fostering universal desires for self-organization; or is it simply organizational isomorphism driven by the easy instant availability of information about good practice? With the influx of foreign advisors into transitional countries, is it inevitable that traditional grassroots collective structure and formerly clandestine political oppositions (historically described with terms such as community, social capital, civil society, social movements, or political activism) are transformed into a contemporary nonprofit sector, and which model does the emerging sector reflect?

Perhaps it is a cultural-generational dynamic fostered by the emergence of a globally-connected “NGO generation” that has fully assumed post-industrial cosmopolitan values and places an increasing trust in independent collective action and nongovernmental organizing? There may even be a “Sean Penn – Angelina Jolie effect” as youth around the world seek to mimic the charitable work of celebrities, just as they adopt U.S. fashions, music and culture. In recent years, many countries have adopted the U.S. custom of Halloween and trick-or-treat, so why shouldn’t they adopt its nonprofit culture?

However, instead of a convergence to a U.S.-inspired neoliberal model, there may be an evolution to the newer emerging post-neoliberal frameworks such as neocorporatism (Reuter et al., 2012), a resurrection of the mutualist and cooperative ideals of the sector through new mutualism (Birchall, 2001), or the renewal of social economies through the blurring of the sectors and social enterprise. The global reach of U.S. political and cultural influences may be combining in different countries with existing models to create new dynamics that have yet to be labeled. Do we have the terminology to describe the different national variants of the emerging post-industrial, post-partisan political cultures that

promotes values such as self-administration, voluntary community service and citizenship, all of which embody some version of the shifting power from political elites and bureaucracies and dispersing it to a broader range of collective actors?

Convergence to a U.S. model is contingent on the continued hegemony of American power and of the Western democratic model, yet there is a steady stream of authors who portend their decline (Kupchan, 2012; Zakaria, 2009). The Japanese decade-long stagnation and the recent global financial crisis have engendered reticence towards market-based small-government ideologies, while the rise of China and its increasing economic and political influence means a more State-centric model is regarded more favorably by governments and the public, particularly in those developing nations and where there has already been an authoritarian bent to the regime.

The Washington Consensus of the post-Second World War period may have entrenched neoliberalism in many parts of the world, but there is now also an emerging “Beijing Consensus” (Halper, 2012) based on neoauthoritarian State-capitalism in which non-State actors (whether they are forprofit or nonprofit) are allowed to operate, but only within the narrow parameters permitted by the ruling regime. In 2013, an internal document of the Communist Party of China, known as Document 9, warned against subversive Western tendencies, including “constitutional democracy”, “universal values of human rights”, “civic participation” and “pro-market neoliberalism” (Buckley, 2013). In 2014, the Prime Minister of Hungary, declared that his country would follow “illiberal nationalism” and that “nations whose systems are capable of making us competitive in the global economy are not Western, not liberal, not liberal democracies, maybe not even democracies” (The Washington Post, 2014).

Many authoritarian and illiberal regimes around the world share such sentiments, although they allow a nascent nonprofit sector to gain a foothold. Even when the growth of the nonprofit sector is not necessarily seen as such a direct threat, the primary alternatives to neoliberalism currently being touted usually signify greater State control of nonprofits, and so as South-South dialogues between developing countries increasingly compete with the earlier North-South development logics, new paradigms for the nonprofit sector may emerge.

There also continue to be key structural constraints on convergence. The size of the U.S. economy and its institutional and social incentives that favor giving means that a large philanthropic funding pool is generated that is unlikely to be replicated in other countries. Moreover, in the U.S. it is the large historic nonprofit institutions – universities, hospitals, and cultural institutions – that power the philanthropic culture and help assure continued public and regulatory support for the sector, but their equivalents in other countries are likely to remain primarily in government hands.

The nonprofit sectors in almost all countries will continue to expand, so that at a broad brush level they are all becoming more like those in the U.S. and other liberal industrialized democracies. But there are also cultural, ideological, and structural “glass ceilings” that make it unlikely that other countries will fully adopt the U.S. model (Charities Aid Foundation, 2014) While there is increasing mistrust in the ability of current governments around the world to deliver services and an increasing clamor for expanded spaces of non-State actions, nonprofits in other countries are unlikely to be handed the reins of such a broad swath of services as in the U.S. or to be allowed to openly engage in contestation.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Abzug, Rikki, and Natalie J. Webb. 1996. “Another Role for Nonprofits: The Case of Mop-

- Ups and Nursemaids Resulting from Privatization in Emerging Economies.” *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 25 (2): 156–73.
- Anheier, Helmut. 2005. *Nonprofit Organizations: Theory, Management, Policy*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Birchall, Johnston. 2001. *The New Mutualism in Public Policy*. London; New York: Routledge.  
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=71378>.
- Blair, Tony, and Gerhard Schroeder. 1999. “Third Way Neue / Mitte Blair Schroeder Manifesto (Copy on The Amsterdam Post Online).”  
<http://adampost.home.xs4all.nl/Archive/arc000006.html>.
- Brecher, Charles, and Oliver Wise. 2008. “Looking a Gift Horse in the Mouth: Challenges in Managing Philanthropic Support for Public Services.” *Public Administration Review* 68 (S1 (December)): S146–61.
- Buckley, Charles. 2013. “China Takes Aim at Western Ideas.” *The New York Times*, August 20 edition.
- Buffett, Peter. 2013. “The Charitable-Industrial Complex.” *The New York Times (Online)*, July 27 edition. <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/27/opinion/the-charitable-industrial-complex.html>.
- Charities Aid Foundation. 2006. “International Comparisons of Charitable Giving.” CAF Briefing Paper. Kent: Charities Aid Foundation.
- . 2011. “World Giving Index 2011.” <https://www.cafonline.org/publications/2011-publications/world-giving-index-2011.aspx>.
- . 2014. “Give Me a Break: Why the UK Should Not Aspire to a ‘US-Style’ Culture of Charitable Giving.” 1. Giving Thought Discussion Paper. Kent: Charities Aid Foundation.
- Curry, Bill. 2011. “Ottawa Looks at Rewriting Rules on Charitable Giving - the Globe and Mail.” *The Globe and Mail (Online)*, October 28 edition.  
<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/life/giving/giving-news/ottawa-looks-at-rewriting-rules-on-charitable-giving/article2216738/>.
- DeMars, William E. 2005. *NGOs and Transnational Networks: Wild Cards in World Politics*. London: Pluto Press.
- DiMaggio, Paul, and Walter W. Powell. 1983. “The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields.” *American Sociological Review* 48 (2): 147–60.
- Drucker, Peter. 1990. *Managing the Non-Profit Organization*. New York: Harper Collins.
- . 1994. “The Age of Social Transformation.” *The Atlantic* 274 (5): 53–80.
- Eberly, Don E. 2008. *The Rise of Global Civil Society: Building Communities and Nations from the Bottom Up*. New York: Encounter Books.
- Filer Commission. 1975. “Giving in America: Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector: Report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs.” Washington: Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs.
- Fisher, Julie. 1998. *Nongovernments: NGOs and the Political Development of the Third World*. West Hartford: Kumarian Press.
- Gaudiani, Claire. 2007. “Let’s Put the Word ‘Nonprofit’ Out of Business.” *Chronicle of Philanthropy*. <http://philanthropy.com/article/Lets-Put-the-Word-Nonprofit/55354/>.
- Hall, Peter Dobkin. 1992. *Inventing the Nonprofit Sector and Other Essays on Philanthropy, Voluntarism, and Nonprofit Organizations*. Baltimore: Johns

- Hopkins University Press.
- . 2010. “Historical Perspectives on Nonprofit Organizations in the United States.” In *The Jossey-Bass Handbook of Nonprofit Leadership and Management*, edited by David Renz, 3rd ed., 262–98. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Halper, Stefan. 2012. *The Beijing Consensus Legitimizing Authoritarianism in Our Time: With a New Preface by the Author*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hammack, David C., and Steven Heydemann, eds. 2009. *Globalization, Philanthropy and Civil Society: Projecting Institutional Logics Abroad*. Philanthropic and Nonprofit Studies. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hudson Institute. 2012. “Index of Global Philanthropy and Remittances 2012.” Washington: Center for Global Prosperity, Hudson Institute. <http://www.hudson.org/content/researchattachments/attachment/1015/2012indexofglobalphilanthropyandremittances.pdf>.
- Hunter, James Davidson, and Joshua Yates. 2002. “The World of American Globalizers.” In *Many Globalizations: Cultural Diversity in the Contemporary World*, edited by Peter L Berger and Samuel P Huntington. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Incite. 2007. *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex*. Cambridge: South End Press.
- Joassart-Marcelli, Pascuale. 2012. “For Whom and for What? Investigating the Role of Nonprofits as Providers to the Neediest.” In *The State of Nonprofit America*, edited by Lester M. Salamon. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
- Kupchan, Charles. 2012. *No One’s World: The West, the Rising Rest, and the Coming Global Turn*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pestoff, Victor. 2009. *A Democratic Architecture for the Welfare State*. Routledge Studies in the Management of Voluntary and Non-Profit Organizations 11. London; New York: Routledge.
- Pestoff, Victor, and Taco Brandsen. 2010. “Public Governance and the Third Sector: Opportunities for Co-Production and Innovation?” In *The New Public Governance? Emerging Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Public Governance*, edited by Stephen Osborne, 270–300. London: Routledge.
- Reuter, Marta, Filip Wijkström, and Johan von Essen. 2012. “Policy Tools or Mirrors of Politics. Government-Voluntary Sector Compacts in the Post-Welfare State Age.” *Nonprofit Policy Forum* 3 (2): Article 2. doi:10.1515/2154-3348.1062.
- Roelofs, Joan. 2003. *Foundations and Public Policy: The Mask of Pluralism*. New York: SUNY Press.
- . 2006. “Why They Hate Our Kind Hearts, Too.” *CounterPunch*, no. May 13/14. <http://www.counterpunch.org/roelofs05132006.html>.
- Skocpol, Theda. 2011. “Civil Society in the United States.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Civil Society*, edited by Michael Edwards. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie. 2011. “Problems Will Be Global – And Solutions Will Be, Too.” *Foreign Policy*, no. September/October 2011. [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/problems\\_will\\_be\\_global\\_and\\_solutions\\_will\\_be\\_too](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/problems_will_be_global_and_solutions_will_be_too).
- The Washington Post. 2014. “Hungary’s Prime Minister a Champion for Illiberalism.” August 6. [http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/harold-meyerson-hungarys-prime-minister-is-a-champion-of-illiberalism/2014/08/06/143a53ae-1d9d-11e4-82f9-2cd6fa8da5c4\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/harold-meyerson-hungarys-prime-minister-is-a-champion-of-illiberalism/2014/08/06/143a53ae-1d9d-11e4-82f9-2cd6fa8da5c4_story.html).
- Wallace, Tina. 2003. “NGO Dilemmas: Trojan Horses for Global Neoliberalism.” In *Socialist Register 2004*. London: The Merlin Press.

Zakaria, Fareed. 2009. *The Post-American World*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Are All National Nonprofit Sectors Around the World Becoming "American"? January 2016. John Peter Casey. This paper analyses how the U.S. norm is reflected in the growth of the nonprofit sector around the world. The purpose is to provide background for educators seeking to introduce more cosmopolitan perspectives on the nonprofit sector. Extracted from: Casey, John (2016). *The Nonprofit World: Civil Society and the Rise of the Nonprofit Sector*. Kumarian Press, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc. pp. [Show full abstract] 131-143. Branding in the nonprofit sector appears to be at an inflection point in its development. Although many nonprofits continue to take a narrow approach to brand management, using it as a tool for fundraising, a growing number are moving beyond that approach to explore the wider, strategic roles that brands can play: driving broad, long-term social goals, while strengthening internal identity, cohesion, and capacity. And GBCHealth was one of several organizations completing a rebranding process. Brand managers in these pioneering organizations were focusing less on revenue generation and more on social impact and organizational cohesion. Indeed, some of the most interesting brand strategies are being developed in endowed, private foundations with no fundraising targets at all. the Nonprofit Sector, Hammack, who is currently on the staff of. Case-Western Reserve University, has had a long and distinguished teaching. career. Clearly, their thinking is of critical importance to "Making the Nonprofit. Sector." But in this connection, neither of two seminal articles, nor sections. thereof, by Carnegie ("Wealth" [1] and "The Best Fields for Philanthropy" [2]). States. The Commission's more immediate mandate would soon become exploring. possible connections between Rockefeller holdings in the Colorado Fuel and Iron. Company, the Rockefeller Foundation, and a confrontation between members of the. National Guard armed with machine guns, and strikers, at one of the company's. sites, in. Ludlow, Colorado.