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Abstract
This study explores how high net worth immigrants are contributing to the new golden age of philanthropy. Who are the actors behind the transnational philanthropic class? How are local and regional diaspora networks sustained through charitable giving? What role do non-profits, governments, corporations, and the media play in advancing a model minority aesthetic? These questions are brought to life through an analysis of forty in-depth interviews with immigrant philanthropists and volunteers, fundraising executives of large non-profits, and executive directors of settlement charities conducted from 2013 to 2015 in Toronto, Canada. Through these voices, a number of social, political, and economic themes are explored. First, drawing on Jacques Derrida’s writings about hospitality and gift exchange, I consider how the philanthropic actions of elite immigrants challenge the rules of engagement between the old and new establishments. Second, I explore how the making of a philanthropic diaspora is a translocal process that reinforces a growing divide between have and have not charities. Finally, I look at the role of high net worth immigrants in the development of a philanthropic state within the context of financialization. Ultimately, this study articulates how diaspora philanthropy is entering a new evolutionary phase that is strategically incorporating the rhetorics of diversity and inclusion, philanthrocapitalist models of investing, and a variety of domestic and global initiatives aimed at reconciling politics, giving, and the expansionist logic of advanced capitalism. Moreover, this study suggests that large charities uniquely offer elite diasporas with an opportunity to bundle their humanitarian, business, and community interests through strategic
investments while advancing macro-level political and economic agendas that further stratify the charitable sector in Canada.
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Chapter 1: The Charitable Soul of the New Canadian Establishment: Perspectives and Issues

Introducing the philanthropy of the new Canadian establishment

There is considerable room to explore and problematize the role of philanthropy in the making of emerging elite subjects within Canada and beyond. My interest in this topic was initiated, in part, by a personal feeling of uneasiness about the recent upswing in professional development and training activities geared towards non-profit leaders and fundraisers in search of best practices to engage “diverse” prospects in their charities, as well as a growing number of media reports celebrating mega donations made by the new Canadian establishment. For me, these two observations have unearthed a number of practical and philosophical questions: What is the value of diaspora giving? What are the charitable differences and nuances between the old and new establishments? What institutional factors enable and restrict local and cross-border giving? How does philanthropy reinforce social stratification? What is the relationship between giving and notions of belonging and citizenship?

These are very complex questions mostly because philanthropy is regarded as an unruly field where informal exchanges of capital can go unaccounted for, much like other forms of giving, such as remittances and volunteering (Hudson Institute, 2012; Ratha et al., 2012; Horst & Van Hear, 2002). Consequently, governments and charities all over the world remain challenged in collecting accurate information about the magnitude and potency of philanthropy (Greenberg & Walters, 2004). Also, on the sidelines, advanced discussions and debates about fundraising and diversity underscore a growing desire to bring together good social imperatives and promising economic solutions for the third sector (Hasmath, 2011; Vertovec, 2007).

Much of the early scholarly work on philanthropy in Canada has focused on various domestic issues and policy problems (Evans & Shields, 2000; Berger & Azaria, 2004; Meinhard
& Foster, 2003). These case studies are important building blocks, however, for understanding macro-level tensions within the non-profit industrial complex and their impact on transnational and translocal philanthropic practices. Other studies have uncovered a variety of institutional problems, mostly around sustainability and funding, within the context of an eroding social welfare system and the financialization of society. Overlaying these themes are other relevant factors, such as interstate agreements (Wade, 2003), local experiences of settlement (Li, 2003), gender and race issues (Bhattacharyya et al., 2002), accumulation of capital (Bourdieu, 2008), familial and social networks (Erickson, 1996; Granovetter, 1983), and digital communications (Brinkerhoff, 2009).

Arguably, for most immigrants, the story of giving does not begin and end in Canada. In fact, case studies of diaspora giving throughout the Global North have not only shown that philanthropy is a common value across cultures, but also that ties to back home are sometimes strengthened through giving. For bureaucrats and fundraisers, the circulation of philanthropic capital has called into question the role of the nation-state in getting a better handle on these transactions, particularly as concerns about the funding of terrorism, war, and tenuous global economic conditions become mainstay issues.

The purpose of this study is to draw on the voices of immigrant philanthropists, fundraisers, non-profit leaders, and other key actors to uncover the interplay between a growing transnational capitalist class (Sklair, 2001) and the non-profit sector, particularly within the context of economic and social restructuring and the monopolization of capitalism. This interdisciplinary project is inspired by key debates and discussions that cut across a variety of subject areas – global studies, third sector research, business, history, sociology, politics, geography, and philosophy – to build a conceptual and theoretical framework for advanced studies on diaspora philanthropy. Ultimately, the intention of this investigation is to establish a
critical approach to the practice of fundraising and to make a meaningful contribution to the growing body of literature focused on philanthropy, transnationalism, non-profits, and shadow state systems. I also expect that this study will serve as a launch pad for a long-term investigation that may include an international comparative study with a quantitative research component.

Study overview and rationale

Drawing on a series of key informant interviews, this dissertation will explore how high net worth immigrants are contributing to the non-profit sector through charitable giving, and the conditions and institutional factors that direct and restrict philanthropy. The “non-profit sector” represents a vast number of organizational types (volunteer groups, professional associations, member-based parties, and registered charities) that are often grouped together based on sector affinities (education, healthcare, arts and culture, social services, and so on). In Canada alone, there are over 165,000 charities, half of which are formally registered by the federal government (Imagine Canada, 2013). Although giving occurs informally at times, for the purposes of this study, “charitable giving” and “philanthropy” refer to donations and pledges of cash to registered charities. I will delve deeper into the terminology used in this thesis in Chapter 2.

The development of immigration policies in Canada is another important conceptual building block for this study. Needless to say, people come to Canada for a variety of reasons and apply for residency and citizenship based on criteria established by the federal government (e.g., refugee, live-in caregiver, and investor/entrepreneur classes). While the philanthropists I interviewed came to Canada under different auspices, they have accumulated at least $1 million in assets and have made formal charitable pledges of at least $500,000 within the last 5 years. Based on these parameters, my primary research question is: How does the philanthropy of diaspora actors in Toronto interplay with the strategic growth of the non-profit sector?
To address this question, I interviewed 40 participants, representing four groups: immigrant philanthropists (IPHIL); immigrant fundraising volunteers (IFV) who serve as “door openers” into their communities; chief fundraisers of large non-profits (CFLNP); and settlement agency executive directors (SAED). These interviews were central to developing a nuanced understanding of the following: a) the role of philanthropic diasporas in the making of a diverse and productive civil society; b) how professional fundraisers perceive immigrant philanthropists as part of their work in advancing the shadow state; and c) the impact of philanthrocapitalism and financialization on diaspora-focused charities.

To my knowledge, this is the first academic study in Canada focused on affluent immigrants and philanthropy. My hope is that this study will stimulate new discussions about the role of philanthropic capital in inter-state relations, notions of citizenship and belonging, and the globalization of the non-profit sector in Canada and beyond.

**Thesis organization**

This thesis is divided into six chapters. For the balance of this chapter, I offer a review of the literature connected to immigrant and diaspora giving in an effort to establish a foundation upon which my arguments can be interpreted and integrated into the voices of the study participants. In Chapter 2, I provide a detailed account of the research methodology and processes that I pursued, along with sections on key terms and participant briefs. I also take the opportunity to provide a personal statement that situates my own subject position within the debates that come to the fore throughout this investigation. Chapters 3, 4, and 5 are written as publishable papers/manuscripts. Chapter 3 begins with an overview of Derrida’s ideas on hospitality and the gift followed by an analysis of their application and relevance to modern gift exchange. In Chapter 4, I investigate the ways in which the making of the new guard can be configured as a translocal process that reinforces a “have and have not” non-profit sector. In
Chapter 5, I explore the implications of financialization, diaspora philanthropy, and institutional diversity programs on the growing privatization and corporatization of social welfare in Canada. Finally, in Chapter 6, I provide a commentary on the practical and academic contributions of this study, and how the aforementioned topics roll-up into a new series of critiques about philanthrocapitalism, the workings of social inclusion in fundraising and non-profit activities, and the role of elite diasporas, governments, and corporate bodies in market-driven social purpose movements.

Literature review

In June 2013, a major financial institution reported that almost half of Canada’s wealthy are either immigrants or first generation Canadians (Bank of Montreal, 2013). Bolstered by a steady stream of rags-to-riches narratives, this figure not only amplifies an emerging perception about the value of diversity on individual prosperity and nation-building, but also speaks to the supposed resilience of Canada’s economy amidst ongoing concerns about the potential collapse of global markets. More importantly, however, these sorts of data points and stories open up a new frontier for corporate, government, and non-profit actors in search of innovative ways to advance their interests and get ahead of the competition. This promise is held by a growing group of elite transnational millionaires whose investments are making waves at home and back home. This group is also known as the “new Canadian establishment.”

As billions of dollars are poured into ethnic and multicultural marketing initiatives each year, it is evident that the corporate sector has embraced, and even propped up, the diversity rhetoric. The explosion of business and marketing literature focused on the spending habits of immigrants suggests that there is much to gain from understanding the needs, values, and interests of diverse communities (Gao et al., 2013; Parzer & Kim, 2013; Cho, 2012). Today’s entrepreneurs and marketers can even enroll in post-secondary level courses to learn how best to
penetrate and manage ethnic consumers (Hasmath, 2011). Public sector leaders have also been fine-tuning their strategies to secure the minority vote for many years now.¹ This becomes most visible at election time, when political hopefuls find themselves surrounded by diverse and sometimes-costumed subjects at media-saturated events and meetings.²

Following suit, charity leaders have turned their attention to the giving potential of immigrants and their networks. On the one hand, this interest stems from a realization that with substantial buying power and political influence, diasporas remain an untapped charitable resource and key players within an increasingly powerful shadow state system. On the other hand, advanced discussions and debates about diversity and philanthropy point to a growing consciousness from within fundraising circles that inclusion and equity issues bring together good social imperatives and promising economic solutions for the third sector. No matter how one approaches this issue, what becomes evident at the outset is that a burgeoning charitable diasporic class serves as a marker of a strong and enviable democracy-building enterprise.

What do we know about diaspora investing at home and back home?

While diaspora philanthropy is a fairly new topic within non-profit studies, scholars and policy makers have already begun to look at a distinct, multipronged – or transnational – strand of giving focused on cross-border and inter-regional transfers. Various reports on remittances have served as a useful primer for their investigations, not only because of its quantitative focus on the circulation of capital, but also because of its inherent blurriness with private giving

¹ Kristin Michelitch (2015), Maria Sobolewska et al. (2013), John Huber (2012), and Jóhanna Birnir (2006) offer compelling critiques of minority voting strategies during electoral seasons, both in Canada and abroad.
² In 2011, Progressive Conservative candidate Ted Opitz was caught up in a controversy involving the solicitation of Canadians who would be willing to wear ethnic costumes when posing for a photo with former Prime Minister Stephen Harper. For more on this story, see Wallace (2011).
activities. In 2009, remittances from all nations to the developing world totaled $307 billion (Hudson Institute, 2012, p. 19). The most recent edition of the World Bank’s Migration and Remittances Factbook (Ratha et al., 2011) showed that recorded remittances from the same year were nearly three times the amount of official aid and almost as large as foreign direct investment flows to developing countries (p. x). To put these numbers in perspective, some developing countries count diaspora transfers in their GDP figures. In 2012, the Migration Policy Institute published a paper that provides additional context to how governments and policymakers might be able to build a body of knowledge on this particular mode of transnational networking (Agunias & Newland, 2012). I propose that the motion towards creating a global strategy for tracking remittances strengthens the economic ties between donor and beneficiary countries, and provides greater legitimacy to the development of state-sanctioned monitoring tools to quell concerns over public safety, pending economic crashes, and mushrooming international social/political unrest.

It is at this very juncture where researchers and activists have begun to document the impact of surveilling and surveilled bodies on remittances and charitable giving. No longer are these transactions regarded as simple acts of altruism; it has been said that giving is occasionally linked to unlawful and underground activities, from human trafficking and drug wars to wide-scale terrorist attacks. For example, in a recent study of remittances by Sub-Saharan African migrants, Juliet Elu and Gregory Price (2012) made claims about the connections between terrorism and diaspora investments – to the tune of six and seven digits per violent episode.

---

3 Claudia Buch and Anja Kuckulenz (2010) have written a detailed report on recent remittance flow tracking and GDP measuring.

These sorts of studies are substantiated by media reports depicting fundamentalism and militancy at their worst, as we have observed in recent sensationalist reports about the role of the Somali diaspora in al-Barakat operations. In essence, diasporas may find themselves implicated – even embroiled – in larger economic, social, and political happenings at home and back home with a simple click of a “donate now” icon (Omeje, 2007).

**Articulations of philanthropy**

It must be noted early on that, while related, remittances and philanthropy are not interchangeable terms. For many, the former refers to the act of sending money to one’s kin through, for instance, wire/online transfers and cash exchanges. This is often regarded as a one-way exchange between migrants working in North America and Europe and their relatives in the Global South (Chami et al., 2003) and, as Luis Eduardo Guarnizo (2003) pointed out, serves as the “measuring stick” (p. 666) for exploring transnationality among diasporas. Gary Magee and Andrew Thompson (2006) also contended that remittances are rooted in feelings of obligation and familial responsibility: “Required remittances displayed certain characteristics: 1) the amount sent each year should have remained stable, and 2) the flow of monies from any particular place ought to have been correlated to changes in that place’s stock of recent migrants, the more important required remittances should have been” (p. 182).

Philanthropy, however, is commonly defined as voluntary action directed towards issues and causes outside of the traditional family structure. Even though volunteering falls under this category, donations of cash, property, and assets constitute what is commonly known as philanthropy. Most of these gifts are directed to registered non-profits and are generally characterized as having no strings attached; however, this notion is easily complicated by varying rules of engagement and stewardship practices found throughout the sector. More nuanced interpretations of remittances and philanthropy indicate that these lines will always be
fuzzy, especially when we consider gifts sent back to one’s country of origin through foreign aid and rescue agencies (Hergnyan & Makaryan, 2007). Overlaying these issues are different cultural approaches and traditions of giving, which inform how much, how often, and to whom funds are directed.

**Immigrant success and the archetypal diaspora myth**

As mentioned earlier, an increasing number of public announcements about mega-donations by first generation immigrants in the US, UK, and Canada have given rise to a skewed perception that some diasporas may be more successful than others, or what John Armstrong (1976) called the “archetypal diaspora myth” (p. 401). But what exactly constitutes success? While scholars like Jan Rath (2002) believed that the term may have many interpretations, few have actually taken up the task of defining it with precision. Nonetheless, I find Pnina Werbner’s (1999) description best supports this investigation: “Success [is] the competitive achievement of prestige and honour, and of the symbolic goods signaling these, within a specific regime of value. Success may be collective or individual, but even individual success depends on a context of sociality, which elicits, facilitates, and finally recognizes success as success” (p. 551). Within philanthropy, it seems fitting that economic success becomes our measuring stick for articulating belonging and citizenship. This definition is important because it makes way for new critiques about the production of the model minority (Hsu, 2015; Hartlep, 2013; Bascara, 2006). While few would argue that the public recognition of immigrant success should be cast away completely, the issue unsurprisingly comes to a head when some groups are pitted against others through the comparison of successes and supposed failures.

How, then, can we begin to articulate the value of diaspora giving? What institutional factors enable local philanthropy and restrict cross-border giving? What are the charitable differences and nuances between the old and new establishments? How does philanthropy
reinforce class stratification? What is the relationship between giving and notions of belonging and citizenship? Needless to say, these enquiries are diverse in and amongst themselves, and any research undertaking naturally lends itself to an interdisciplinary approach that focuses not only on temporal and spatial factors, but also on social and regulatory practices. Borrowing from Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s (1987) oft-cited rhizome metaphor to explain the multiple entry points for sociological research, I argue that the ever-changing structure and varying interpretations of diaspora philanthropy could render the entire field as porous and unruly. In *A Thousand Plateaus*, the authors refuted the notion that only one logical or binary system can accurately explain social phenomena and problems. Instead, they favoured the concepts of multiplicity and heterogeneity in which knowledge is always context-driven and constantly evolving. This does not mean, however, that the process of defining a research project is inherently limited or unproductive. In this case, there are a number of enduring qualities, features, and patterns in philanthropic studies, especially institutional and cultural effects, which can produce a semblance of understanding and useful discovery. Accordingly, I would like to start this discussion by reviewing and evaluating existing debates – and emerging conversations – on diasporas, philanthropy, and the connections between both.

**Diaspora philanthropy and transnational circulation**

Over the past twenty years, transnationalism has become one of the most instructive reference points for articulating the continued impact of globalization on cultural production, international relations, economic systems, and class development. Furthermore, it has reinvigorated discussions on the primacy of neoliberal capitalism and has helped connect seemingly-disparate issues and disciplines, such as marketing, information technology, network analysis, history, and political geography. While diaspora philanthropy appears to be one of the newer strands of enquiry within the complex web of global studies, transnationalism itself is far
from new. I believe that there are some contemporary features, however, that may contribute to this discussion.

According to Steven Vertovec (2009), since the 1920s, research on migrants tended to focus on their settlement and adaptation issues. However, the field bore witness to a “transnational turn” (p. 13) beginning in the early 1990s as scholars began to pay greater attention to how diaspora networks and bonds back home are reestablished, maintained, and strengthened. This focus on the new transnational subject is marked by several differentiating features, including the rise of hometown associations and remittance economies, growing government programs focused on special investment schemes, and access to mobile and digital communications that instantly connect diasporas to their contacts back home. Referring to the latter point, Vertovec contended that, “the speed and intensity of communication has created a ‘normative transnationalism’ in which migrants are ever more closely aware of what is happening in the sending context and vice-versa” (p. 15).

This observation is important to keep in mind as I explore the ways in which charitable dollars are transferred from one jurisdiction to another. I would even argue that accurate and timely cross-border communications are essential to propelling the entire charitable world forward, particularly as international news and events are consumed in real-time through the ether. Take, for example, how people used their mobile devices to bring to life the Arab Spring movement. Mainstream news carriers circumvented government control of the newswire by relying on civilian handheld mobile technology to show what was happening in Cairo and its surrounding areas. Only a few days after the turmoil broke, several leaders of the Egyptian community in New York City established the Tahrir Square Foundation, a charitable organization that facilitates diaspora giving for educational, humanitarian, and developmental initiatives in Egypt. This project stands beside the hundreds of other online diaspora engagement
and crowdsourcing vehicles used to influence and channel support back home.\textsuperscript{5} Cindy Horst and Nick Van Hear (2002) called this phenomenon “armchair nationalism” where “diaspora groups are often able, through their considerable resources, to exert substantial influence on the homeland without having to bear the consequences of the interventions, particularly in terms of social tension, conflict, and violence” (p. 23).

The significance of global cities on philanthropy

Within the transnationalism literature, I am particularly interested in ideas about the global city – a critical node for exchange, settlement and growth. As Janet Abu-Lughod (1999) noted, “Cities embody social, political, and economic transformation” (pp. 170-171) and within these spaces, issues and themes that matter to diasporas cross-pollinate and flourish. Saskia Sassen (2002) called global cities “thick enabling environments... [that] help people experience themselves as part of global non-state networks as they live their daily lives” (p. 217). Drawing on macro-level data, Ulrike Schuerkens (2005) also claimed that, “the theory of global systems underlines that transnational migrations are directed to global cities, which control and orient foreign investments” (p. 542). This special convergence of micro and macro politics, financial and cultural forces, and varying “conceptualizations of home” (Ramji, 2006, p. 658) are key to understanding transnational urbanism (Smith, 2000) and cosmopolitanism (Appiah, 2010), notwithstanding the fact that the majority of the world’s advanced fundraising campaigns are situated in diverse metropolises.

What makes a city “global” and why is this important to the study of diaspora philanthropy? I would like approach this question by looking at Vertovec’s (2007) concept of

\textsuperscript{5} Give2asia.com and adforchange.com are two other popular online giving portals that facilitate diaspora giving, not to mention all of the mainstream sites international aid charities, like the Red Cross, Amnesty International, and UNICEF.
“super-diversity.” Through his analysis of contemporary demographic changes in Britain, he characterized super-diversity as a “dynamic interplay of variables among an increased number of new, small and scattered, multiple-origin, transnationally connected, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified immigrants who have arrived over the last decade” (p. 1024). This definition is useful because it speaks to the need for a specific saturation point in order to develop a theoretical framework that fits with an investigation like mine. However, as Jeffrey Alexander (2000) noted, we must recognize that other features of civil society bear great significance as well: “I criticized pluralistic approaches for not recognizing that broad conceptions of justice are achieved when the solidarizing claims of the civil sphere interpenetrate and restructure the more restrictive spheres of religion, economy, state, ethnicity, family, and science” (p. 14). Floya Anthias (1998) also warned that,

The idea of diaspora tends to homogenize the population... at the transnational level.
However, such populations are not homogeneous; for the movements... may have taken place at different historical periods and for different reasons, and different countries of destination provided different social conditions, opportunities, and exclusion. (Anthias, 1998, p. 564)

For our study, the concept of super-diversity is useful insomuch that it takes its cues from the context-driven transnational side of the global city dialogue without undermining the discursive elements found within the sometimes-contested discussions about assimilation (Bissoondath, 2002) or hybridity (Bhabha, 1994). As Alejandro Portes, Luis Eduardo Guarnizo, and William Haller (2002) observed:

Transnationalism has been described in the anthropological and cultural studies literature as an alternative to assimilation. In reality, it is not at all clear that the two processes are at odds. As an escape from low-paid, menial occupations, transnational enterprise can
offer first-generation immigrants a more desirable path, including the economic means to support the successful adaptation of their offspring. (Portes et al., 2002, p. 294)

Richard Alba and Victor Nee (2003) agreed, noting that while “pluralism, or its new form of transnationalism, allows for autonomous cultural centers,... and segmented assimilation theory... it appears to inflate the magnitude of the underclass population and overlooks various cultural models within an ethnic group.... Neither theory rules out the possibility that assimilation will play a major role in the long run or in future generations” (p. 1309).

Situating this project within the global city also allows us to “capture not only the upper, but also the lower circuits of globalization” (Sassen, 2002, p. 219). This is important for two reasons: First, it makes room for multiple compare-and-contrast opportunities based on various transnational affinities that cut across class and party lines. Second, it serves as a reminder that the study of elite transnational philanthropists should in no way minimize the institutional and everyday problems of working class or poor immigrants. Accordingly, Gurcharan Basran and Singh Bolaria’s (2003) assertion that “the visible success of a few masks the economic and social inequalities faced by many” (p. 219) underscores the continued pervasiveness of equity and justice issues that characterized much of the earlier writings on multiculturalism and diversity (Guarnizo et al., 2003).

Transnational elites and looking “from above”

As I focus on the “transnational capitalist class” (Sklair, 2001), it makes sense to address the notion of transnationalism from “above” and “below.” Jonathan Beaverstock (2002) observed that the frequency of international mobility of elite actors between cities, “feeds global corporate knowledge structures, cultural diversity, social practices, wealth, consumption, cultural capital, and agency in the global city” (p. 8), thereby establishing a new class that easily slips in and out
of various contexts and settings. Luis Eduardo Guarnizo and Michael Smith (1998), on the other hand, adopted a more critical take on transnationalism from above:

The nation-state is seen as weakened “from above” by transnational capital, global media, and emergent supra-national political institutions. “From below” it faces the decentering “local” resistances of the informal economy, ethnic nationalism, and grassroots activism. These developments are sometimes viewed in celebratory terms. For some they bring market rationality and liberalism to a disorderly world “from above.” For others they generate conditions conducive to the creation of new liberatory practices and spaces “from below” like transnational migration and its attendant cultural hybridity. In more pessimistic readings, these developments are seen as preludes to a new form of capitalist modernization that is bound to nudge the entire planet into “global consumerism.” (Guarnizo & Smith, 1998, p. 4)

Despite the varying interpretations of transnationalism from above, most researchers agree that there remain great gaps in our understanding of this particular stratum of the diaspora. Jonathan Beaverstock, Philip Hubbard, and John Rennie Short (2004) stated that while the literature on transnationalism sheds light on the movement of people from one country to another, it has yet to “provide an adequate basis for understanding the mobile lifestyles of the super-rich (a group who are, in effect, perpetually between nation-states, to the extent that they dwell in global time-space, not the space of the nation-state)” (p. 405). Even though this was articulated over decade ago, students are only now beginning to research elite transnational actors, particularly in Canada.⁶

⁶ David Ley’s Millionaire Migrants (2011) is one of the first in-depth studies of elite Chinese immigrants in Canada.
Building on the problem of context and setting, I would like to briefly address how transnational social fields (or social spaces) are established and used. While earlier studies on diversity and immigration highlighted the importance of physical spaces – particularly ethnic enclaves and community hubs – in minimizing feelings of isolation and culture shock, transnational studies have extended the notion of space well beyond a specific location to include new territories for networking and building solidarity. The most obvious example is how digital and wireless technologies have given rise to a new social space where a decent internet connection is more important than the physical location of the actors. This social field or “technoscape” (Appadurai, 1996) occupied by “digital diasporas” (Brinkerhoff, 2009) has opened up new conversations about “imagined communities” (Anderson, 1991) and “network societies” (Castells, 1996).

Thinking further on the temporal and spatial issues related to diaspora philanthropy, Peggy Levitt and Nina Glick Schiller (2004) claimed that “by conceptualizing transnational social fields as transcending the boundaries of nation-states... individuals within these fields are, through their everyday activities and relationships, influenced by multiple sets of laws and institutions” (p. 1010). This assertion has influenced my field work and analysis for a couple of reasons. First, it has encouraged me to consider the complexity of locale (within and beyond the nation), an issue that has given rise to the term “translocal” (Appadurai, 1996; Ong, 2006). Second, intrastate rules, that either enable or restrict the transfer of charitable funds across a variety of jurisdictions, must be carefully considered in order to accurately expose the power and political systems involved in the making of elite subjects.

Before I delve into the nuances of contemporary giving practices, I would like to briefly acknowledge the scholarly contributions to gift theory. More specifically, several authors have spent a good proportion of their careers looking at the social dimensions of gift exchange, so
much so that a small yet meaningful body of work on the sociology of giving serves as a cornerstone to this study.

Philanthropy, reciprocity, and the sociology of giving

Marcel Mauss (1966) is often credited with initiating a dialogue on giving and exchange. Writing at the turn of the century, he drew on a number of historical examples to show that gifts are integral to social relations, particularly those between the giver and the taker. More importantly, Mauss raised an important point about the role (and sometimes absence) of capitalism in gift giving and exchange. In fact, it appears that the issue is not really about the actual gift as much as it is about understanding of how everyday social relations are created through the gift. While I devote an entire chapter to unpacking the very essence of the gift, I would like to give a nod here to Jacques Derrida’s analysis of Mauss’s take on gift giving. As Terence Evens (1999) stated:

Neither Mauss nor... any other anthropologist has truly addressed the question of the gift. For [according to Derrida] the gift is annulled in the economic odyssey of the circle as soon as it appears as gift or as soon as it signifies itself as gift, “so that” a consistent discourse on the gift becomes impossible: It misses its object and always speaks, finally, of something else. One could go so far as to say that a work as monumental as Marcel Mauss’s The Gift speaks of everything but the gift: ...economy, exchange, contract.

(Evens, 1999, p. 23)

What, then, constitutes a gift? Nathan Miczo (2008) sensitively grappled with this question based on general perceptions about the expectation of return and specific one-to-one

---

7 For example, Grégoire Mallard (2011) draws on Mauss’s The Gift to expose the entanglements of giving and debt repayment during WWI.
relations that are built through the act of giving (also known as ‘singularization’). He grouped gifts into three categories: Charitable gifts (low expectation of return, low singularization); sacrificial gifts (low expectation of return, high singularization), which validates the uniqueness of the giftee; and finally, bartered gifts (high expectation of return, low singularization), which is considered to be an economically-oriented form of exchange (p. 150). While these categories serve as a useful foundation for this study, it must be acknowledged that the lines between them remain fuzzy, especially between charitable and bartered gifts where in both cases a donor may be rewarded with a name on a building, access to new networks, media attention, and so on. As Will van den Hoonaard (2000) surmised, “The gift interrupts the circle of economic exchange (because it is not utilitarian, rational value), but it can also close that circle as soon as the gift begins to be regarded as an economic exchange” (p. 485).

Common amongst these clusters is the notion that reciprocity, in one form or another, remains a social fact or, as Luca Guizzardi (2009) described, a “force for giving” (p. 89). Related to this issue is how gifts create group solidarity (Flynn, 2005) and engender trust. Miczo (2008) elaborated on this by stating:

The feeling of basic trust in the reality of the world rests upon two anchors. First, it depends upon a sense of the durability and permanence of the human-made world of things. Human-made objects (which may also include social objects of discourse in the fashion of Michel Foucault) provide the objective indicators which define the spatio-temporal relations between people. Second, it is derived from a sense of validation and confirmation that comes from being seen and heard by others. (Miczo, 2008, p. 134)

Similarly, Derek Larsen and John Watson (2001) believed that the gift-giving experience is based on economic, functional, social, and expressive values (p. 891). These indicators are also important building blocks for this investigation, even though they require deeper analysis,
particularly when gifts fall into two or more categories. For example, a major donation to a school will clearly have an economic impact both on the donor and beneficiary, but will likely have a social and expressive value as well.

Several decades after the publication of Mauss’s *The Gift*, Pierre Bourdieu (1977) picked up on the cultural dimensions of gift giving as part of his larger oeuvre on class structuration and symbolic capital. In *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Bourdieu pointed out that Mauss’ “phenomenological” (subjectivist) approach rested on a series of opposing “truths” centered on the (ir)reversibility of the gift exchange. He stated, “Any really objective analysis of the exchange of gifts... must allow for the fact that each of these inaugural acts may misfire and that it receives its meaning in any case from the response it triggers off” (p. 5). To put it simply, as Evens (1999) noted, “It is this (subjective gift) structure, argues Bourdieu that allows a pattern of exchange ever open to definition...” (p. 22). There are two important points here. First, “truth” (as it relates to gift giving) can be exchanged for “trust” insofar as it refers to the outcome or feelings derived from the exchange. These sorts of emotive elements produce, then, a kind of social value that influences class structuration. Second, for Bourdieu, gift giving had a unifying undercurrent that helps people understand the impact of symbolic goods. Ilana Silber (2009) articulated this succinctly:

As reflected in [Bourdieu’s] vocabulary – which refers in the singular to the gift, or gift exchange, or gift economy – he remains throughout within the frame of a basically unitary, general theory of the gift, striving steadily for a unified, synthetic, and paradigmatic conceptualization of all gift phenomena, and by extension, of all economies of symbolic goods. (Silber, 2009, p. 188)

The symbolic gift is an important concept that I will return to in Chapter 3.
In light of these discussions, I would like to make a few additional observations. First, within the context of global financialization and cross-border philanthropic activities, transnational capitalist class actors serve as agents that purport norms around giving. Second, since philanthropy cuts across race and gender lines, capitalism arguably becomes the driving force in class development. Finally, I propose that the gift is part of a larger strategy to advance government and corporate interests through the civilian economy. This deliberate politicization of the *mise en scène* will help us think critically about philanthrocapitalism.

**Building the shadow state**

While there are many case studies focused on macro-level issues in the voluntary sector, the literature on shadow states lends itself to a complex critique of government control and provides a solid framework for analyzing the role of local actors in the production of citizenship (Sidel, 2009). Furthermore, discussions about the shadow state and diasporas can shed light on the enduring connections between translocality, bureaucratic systems, and philanthropy, as I shall try to address in this section.

What does “shadow state” mean? Jennifer Wolch (1990), who is often credited for formally introducing the term within social studies, described it as a “para-state apparatus comprised of multiple voluntary sector organizations administered outside of traditional democratic politics and charged with major collective service responsibilities previously shouldered by the public sector, yet remaining within the purview of state control” (p. xvi). What is commonly misunderstood about shadow states is that they are not separate systems

---

8 The shadow state is also used to describe an underground system of mafia-style control based on criminal activity and corruption, usually by warlords located in the Global South (Grayson & Logan, 2012; Funke & Solomon, 2002; Reno, 2000). In this case, the shadow state is characterized by its informal organization and the clandestine interests of those in power.
working independently from the public sector. In fact, the opposite is true: the connections between governments, private firms, and non-profits are becoming tighter, making charities a fertile ground for experimenting with state-endorsed venture philanthropy initiatives and public-private partnerships (Guzmán & Sierra, 2012; Trudeau, 2012; Evans & Shields, 2000).

Studies of shadow states have tended to expose the underbelly of the neoliberal enterprise, a critique on the abdication of accountabilities to a weakening and overworked charitable sector (Guzmán & Sierra, 2012; Selsky & Parker, 2005). Needless to say, it is a deeply politicized terrain fueled by discussions on how decades-long assaults to social welfare have propelled the growth of the non-profit industrial complex. In February 2013, Bill Curry wrote about how the federal charitable tax credit system in Canada has forced charities to “pick up the slack” as bureaucrats continue to focus on balancing budgets and creating efficiencies through government restructuring. The reality is that while tax credits may serve as a tangible stimulus for individual and corporate donors, non-profits are subject to an “increasingly competitive funding environment” (Brainard & Siplon, 2004, p. 439) where private interests can shape everything from service delivery and policy development to operations and administration (Nickel & Eikenberry, 2009, p. 974). While these factors empower the shadow state, it remains vulnerable to neoliberal government agendas, aggressive fundraising targets, and venture capital investment schemes. Martin Carnoy and Manuel Castells (2001) poignantly articulated how these factors have expanded the non-profit sector:

The way to establish legitimacy in the new historical context is the decentralization of state power to sub-state levels: to sub-national groupings, to regions, and to local

---

9 According to Andreas Wimmer and Nina Glick Schiller (2002), “The economic restructuring of current globalization dates back to the 1970s, marked by the end of Bretton Woods, the movement of industrial production from the USA and Europe to sites with lower labour costs, and the development of new ways to organize and expedite the rapid flow of capital” (p. 321).
governments. This increases the probability that citizens will identify with their institutions and participate in the political process. While nation states cede power, they also shift responsibility, in the hope of creating buffers between citizens’ disaffection and national governments. Legitimacy through decentralization and citizen participation in non-governmental organizations seems to be the new frontier of the state in the twenty-first century. (Carnoy & Castells, 2001, p. 16)

We must be careful about comparing local grassroots NGOs to large publicly-oriented charities, like post-secondary institutions and hospitals. While charities are organized based on sector interests and goals – such as, social services, healthcare, education, arts and culture, advocacy, and so on – it must be acknowledged that there are considerable differences within each cluster. Common to these organizations, however, is the fact they all rely on philanthropy, albeit to varying degrees. To give greater semblance to the field, Lori Brainard and Patricia Siplon (2004) asked us to consider two general categories or models – a economic model, which emphasizes business-like methods, and the “voluntary spirit” model, which focuses on participation and membership (p. 435). These classifications are instructive for this research project insofar as they help identify links between the motivational forces behind diaspora giving and the specific orientation of the charities in which they invest. Interestingly, the authors concluded that the voluntary spirit model winds up serving as “democratic actors” (p. 436), reinforcing the idea that giving and volunteering are essential components of civil society. This notion has its critics; in fact, the literature tends to favour a paradigm where the case “for more

10 According to Jonathan Greenberg and David Walters (2004), the restricting of Canada’s postwar welfare state has made health and education “among the most critical and contested areas of policy development and change, and thus a subject of considerable public and media attention” (p. 396).
philanthropy to solve social issues instead of addressing the fundamental mechanisms of marginality and poverty...may in effect serve to cement marginality and inequality” (Villasden, 2011, p. 1060). In another way, the case for fundraising is often depicted not only as a means of survival but also as a political movement to bolster “ethical citizenship and responsible community” (Rose, 2000, p. 1398), a sentiment inspired by Alexis de Tocqueville’s (1956) valourization of early American philanthropy.

Some of the writings on shadow states address the ways in which citizenship is articulated through philanthropy and volunteering. Several authors proposed that giving back and volunteering not only symbolize one’s allegiances to the nation, but are central to (re)building democracy (Lamarche, 2014; Reich, 2014; Barry, 2006; Brainard & Siplon, 2004; Dicken et al., 2001; Evans & Shields, 2000). As we consider the unruliness of philanthropic flows, the definition of citizenship remains hotly contested, especially for transnational actors who may give to places where the project of democracy is still in the works. Overlaying these issues are slick international aid campaigns that put donors in a highly emotive state, fueling a desiring machine (Deleuze & Guattari, 1977) focused on transplanting democratic ideals around the world (Latief, 2015; Müller, 2013).

**Philanthropy and civil society**

Thinking further about the fundamental character of shadow states, it makes sense to spend some time on the most relevant, topline assumptions about civic engagement and civil society. I would like to take our cue from Alexander (2000) who problematized the notion civil society as a unifying factor for community building:

Empirically...civil society can never be separated from the rest of society. Its regulating ideals and hypothetical, imagined relationships, while socially very significant, are opposed, denied, and corrupted in systematic ways. Yet, to one degree or another, this
imagined community does exist as a distinct empirical sphere, and it often sustains quite
a bit of autonomy from other spheres. Insofar as it is separate, in fact, civil society can be
conceived as a sphere that has its own culture, its own institutions, even its own
psychology and forms of interaction. Insofar as civil society is not very independent, this
web of culture, institutions, and interaction will serve, not the imagined whole, but a
fragment of it; they become subordinated to others kinds of institutions and other
demands. (Alexander, 2000, pp. 19-20)

Alexander rightfully pointed out that civil society has its own culture that values freedom,
individual prosperity, and equality. The pursuit and strengthening of these things become known
as civic engagement initiatives. This is most evident in the corporate sector, where donations
from private firms become part of a larger corporate citizenship strategy. Any deviation from
these activities could render individuals as undemocratic or ungrateful leeches on the shadow
state. Since philanthropy is often considered to be a part of the civic engagement toolkit, I
propose that we consider giving as a key component to the making of a model citizen, especially
in nation-states where the non-profit industrial complex is experiencing a significant growth
spurt.

There are a few scholarly works that have mapped the rise of Canada’s shadow states.
Drawing on a variety of empirical evidence, Mitchell Evans and John Shields (2000) surmised
that neoliberal policy prescriptions of the mid-1970s represented “an assault upon the Keynesian
welfare state […] drawing attention to the role and place of non-profit organizations in society”
(p. 7). Similarly, Katharyne Mitchell (2001) drew convincing links between a rising neoliberal
tide and the growth of the charitable sector in Canada through her analysis of the philanthropic
investments of Hong Kong immigrants to a Vancouver-based charity. Her article offers
“glimpses of hegemonic production in action” (p. 184) through a detailed report of how
immigration policies, deregulated banking programs and state-endorsed economic stimulus initiatives for immigrant entrepreneurs led to the “increasing scope and power of interstitial voluntary organizations located between the state and society” (p. 166). Through a detailed overview of neoliberal reforms and waning government support, particularly in Ontario throughout the late 1990s and early 2000s, Deena White (2006) uncovered how partnerships between state and non-profit organizations have created “third way citizenship regimes” (p. 2) that supposedly cement “egalitarian relations with the state” (p. 23). While these studies tackle the issue of shadow states head-on, many other authors have contributed to my understanding of the growing pressures placed on non-profits, even though they do not explicitly use the term ‘shadow state’ in their writings (see Berger & Azaria, 2004; Greenberg & Walters, 2004). Together, however, these works provide a thorough state-of-the-union on transnationality that I further consider later in this investigation.11

How do diasporas contribute to the development of the charitable sector? In some ways, this question gets to the heart of my research topic, particularly as we begin to look more closely at the role of highly mobile transnational actors and the deterritorialization of philanthropy (Nickel & Eikenberry, 2010). With all of the connections I have explored between diasporas and charities thus far, the most salient problem is rooted in the “location” of diasporas and the legitimization of a new global citizen. Roger Waldinger and David Fitzgerald (2004) articulated the potential gravitas of this emerging field:

Civil society actors in both host and destination countries raise questions regarding the allegiance and political bona fides of persons whose social identities are largely framed

11 According to Lloyd Wong (2008), “Those engaged in transnational identities and practices are viewed as practicing a ‘thin’ citizenship with limited active citizenship engagement within Canada and minimal shared values, cultural identity, and sense of belonging to Canada” (p. 80).
by their connections to two states. The terms of national belonging are almost always the subject of conflict; variations in political culture ensure that they also differ from one nation-state to the other. (Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004, p. 1178)

This discussion has also uncovered a new fault line between nationality and citizenship, two terms that are often (and dubiously) used interchangeably in social studies. John Rundell (2004) saw citizenship as a pacifying or unifying motion between diverse actors: “Apart from the construction of the myth of nationhood, this tension between competing identities and ethnicities was... partly resolved at the political level through the category of citizenship” (p. 90). In addition, Eric Snel, Godfried Engbersen, and Arjen Leerkes (2006) forecasted that citizenship may “emerge as the more dominant descriptor, with all of its implications on equality and rights” (p. 717). From a transnational perspective, the question of citizenship remains largely unresolved since the state ultimately controls and legitimizes citizenship through the authorization of visas and passports, even though most diasporas maintain their links to their countries of origin without state interference. Transnational philanthropy, then, poses a new concern for receiving states that need permanent and temporary (im)migrants not only for labour and economic development, but also for the advancement of the voluntary sector.

One of the greatest challenges to the sovereignty of shadow states centres on the formal laws that nation-states impose on giving. In 2013, the Hudson Institute published a report comparing the incentives and barriers to cross-border donations between 13 countries of varying GDPs and populations. The findings showed that high income countries tend to rank high on the “philanthropic freedom” scorecard, reflecting the long history of philanthropy and civil society in those countries. Additionally, some emerging economies scored higher than anticipated, due to improving conditions for giving. For example, South Africa and India moved up the scale, thanks to the recent implementation of policies that promote a “healthy civil society” (p.9) and
tax incentives for donors. The report also found that both countries have fairly progressive schemes to promote philanthropic activity, including tax exemptions for civil society organizations that “complement and support a more open regulatory environment” (p. 15). While the report does not provide any substantive commentary on the role of immigrant actors in developing a climate of philanthropic freedom, there seems to be great potential for further analysis based on formal bilateral arrangements focused on diaspora-specific investment and giving programs.

**Giving and governmentality**

Even though there are only a few explicit references to governmentality within the non-profit literature (see Death, 2011; Peters, 2009; Fyfe, 2005; Bryant, 2002), there are several related themes that have informed this investigation on diaspora philanthropy. While I address the issue of governmentality more fully in Chapter 5, I would like to highlight some of the key issues now, in an effort to draw connections between the conceptual and theoretical ideas I have unearthed thus far.

Michel Foucault asserted that the locus of social power rests amongst elite administrative and legislative bodies that “direct conduct” (Fontana & Bertani, 2003, p. 284). The most obvious examples are elected officials who govern not only through formal laws and standards, but also through their involvement in spin-offs centered on finance and social capital, such as non-profits and volunteer organizations. While Foucault used the terms “governmentality” and the “art of government” interchangeably, his ideas are firmly rooted in the interplay between power and capitalism. He noted:

The art of government...is essentially concerned with answering the question of how to introduce economy – that is to say, the correct manner of managing individuals, goods and wealth within the family (which a good father is expected to do in relation to his
wife, children and servants) and of making the family fortunes prosper – how to introduce this meticulous attention of the father towards his family into the management of the state. (Foucault et al., 1991, p. 92)

To be clear, Foucault provided a definitive outline of what he meant by governmentality:

1) The ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analyses and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power, which has as its target population, as its principal form of knowledge political economy, and as its essential technical means apparatuses of security;

2) The tendency which, over a long period and throughout the West, has steadily led towards the pre-eminence over all other forms (sovereignty, discipline, etc.) of this type of power which may be termed government, resulting, on the one hand, in formation of a whole series of specific governmental apparatuses, and, on the other, in the development of a whole complex of saviors;

3) The process, or rather the result of the process, through which the state of justice of the Middle Ages, transformed into the administrative state during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, gradually becomes ‘governmentalized’. (Foucault et al., 1991, pp. 102-103)

To help students of governmentality further along, Wanda Vrasti (2013) stated that Foucault wanted us to “begin with a broader understanding of power, its uses and impact, before delving into the deconstruction and analysis of institutions that are governed by it” (p. 53). Power, as an overarching concept, then, becomes the foundational base for the hegemonic performance of governmentality and the germinating force behind programs that feed into the structuration of ruling relations. The growing preference to develop public-private partnerships – for example, schools working with governments and entrepreneurs to mobilize “innovation” – symbolize the
complex interplay between non-profit and for-profit sectors, which makes power and capital part of fundraising’s endgame.

Several authors have concluded that governments serve as only one of the rulers of governmentality; corporations are colluding with governments in the financialization of the global economy and everything that stems from it (see Sawyer & Gomez, 2012; Vallentin & Murillo, 2012; Murray Li, 2007). A more contemporary take on the art of government exposes how transnational firms and their actors orchestrate and regulate the movement, behaviours and actions of people, particularly those labelled as “from below.” For example, in their ethnographic study of programs for internationally trained professionals, Usha George and Ferzana Chaze (2012) showed how governments and private educational programs have intercepted the system by making deals with government departments and companies looking to advance their own neoliberal agendas.

However, Foucault admitted that governmentality is not a totalizing venture, and that societal disruption and activism stand in the way of the unrealized omnipotence of governments and corporate bodies. As Sara Mills (2003) pointed out, “If power is relational rather than emanating from a particular site such as the government or police; if it is diffused throughout all social relations rather than being imposed from above; if it is unstable and in need of constant repetition to maintain... then it is difficult to see power relations as simply negative and as constraining” (p. 47). In this sense, Foucault problematized the notion of governmentality through individual and group agency – on-the-ground civilian activity that pushes against state and corporate control. This idea, of course, makes the entire field dynamic and unwieldy or, as Foucault admitted, leads to a “semi-obscure domain of the state and population” (Foucault & Senellart, 1978, p. 116).
What does governmentality have to do with immigrant philanthropy studies? As mentioned in the shadow state section of this chapter, in some ways the entire modern charitable sector has been created through contractions of state support. In fact, I would argue that non-profits – particularly small, grassroots charities – may be seen as having dual roles, as agents of government and victims of governmentality. The role of diasporas here is particularly important, as private capital accumulated by immigrants becomes part of a global strategy for “local” investments. In a sensitive analysis of the circulating capital of the Caribbean diaspora, Alissa Trotz and Beverley Mullings (2013) explored the issue of the “diaspora option,” a policy framework that draws on diaspora investments back to the region, mostly for development initiatives. These are not simple emotive, give-back-to-the-motherland appeals, but part of a larger “diaspora governmentality” strategy. As they stated: “Institutions such as the World Bank and the Latin American Development Bank have played an active role in encouraging governments to view their diaspora as potential investors, or as one press release put it, ‘an untapped pool of oil’” (p. 162). This statement is particularly important for this investigation, especially as I explore how diasporas serve as a bridge or bonding agent between various localized governmentalities and a foil to the criticism Foucault received for focusing on intrastate governmentality alone (see Vrasti, 2013).

Financialization and philanthrocapitalism considered

So far, I have wrestled with variety of case studies and debates, both old and new, to help build a conceptual framework for advanced research on immigrants and giving. To accompany these works, the balance of this chapter focuses on a provocative theme that has reinvigorated – and deeply politicized – the entire non-profit sector: philanthrocapitalism. First, however, I would like to briefly turn our attention to the issue of financialization and monopoly capital.
In 1968, Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy (2010) ushered in the concept of monopoly capital, writing extensively about its relevance to neo-Marxist theory – beyond Marx, so to speak. Their *Monopoly Capital* begins with critiques of both social science and Marxist approaches to capital. In the case of bourgeois social science, Baran and Sweezy pointed to the paradox “of more and better trained social scientists failing ever more glaringly to explain social reality” (Foster, 2012, p. 9). This could be seen as a slight to Bourdieuvian scholars, who would appear – at least to financialization writers – overly consumed with understanding capital as a social phenomenon and problematically agnostic about economic hegemony and corporate imperialism through modern capitalism.

Underpinning monopoly capital is the idea that surplus value is accounted for through the accumulation of profits, interest, and rent. In the context of cross-border flows of capital, the coordination of monopoly capital relies on the power of transnational corporations and elites – and the incorporation of their subjects. According to John Bellamy Foster (2012), “The question of profits by deduction (or reduction per alienation) and its relation to monopoly power has been globalized today through the global labor arbitrage organized around the systematic exploitation of cheap labor in the Global South at levels below the value of labor power, i.e., the costs of reproduction of the workers” (p. 21). In some ways, contemporary global financialization and monopoly capital are rooted in inter-state agreements on social welfare and development due, in part, to the establishment of the IMF and World Bank. As Neil Smith (2005) described, this era marked a revolutionary turn for local and international economies:

If the apparatus of global financial control had to take a back seat to Washington’s political pursuit of the cold war over the next three decades, Bretton Woods nonetheless did establish a postwar international system of monetary control and financial and currency exchange. Bretton Woods did not bring a complete deregulation of finance
markets; rather, it put in place a global apparatus of financial regulation where none had existed previously. The building blocks of that system were undoubtedly the national economies themselves, and this provided the central limitation of the postwar international financial regime. (Smith, 2005, p. 96)

Smith’s analysis of historical texts, monographs, policies, correspondences, and official agreements exposed how the IMF and World Bank have served as instruments of US imperialism. Speaking directly to the development of the IMF, he wrote: “Member states paid annual dues to the IMF for which they received specific drawing rights on the bank, but voting rights were also calibrated according to a country’s contribution to the fund, giving the US Treasury Department, which contributed nearly 30 percent of the Fund’s total, effective control of the new organization” (p. 95). This interpretation corresponds with Jamie Magnusson’s (2013) important claim that “neoliberal policies... become a necessary means of opening up subordinate economies, and to shift the burden of financialization internationally” (p. 75). On a macro level, financialization describes the blanketing effect of monopoly capital across societies, state borders, and institutions. However, this does not mean that there are no identifiable conductors in this mass orchestration. In fact, I argue that the collusion between government leaders and transnational corporate executives have reorganized labour and other institutions as “financialization institutions” which also speaks to the relevance of Foucault’s version of governmentality.

Magnusson (2013) reminded us that financialization is nothing new: “Given that Lenin provided a detailed analysis of financialization as a critical dimension of monopoly capital in his famous treatise on imperialism, it is more appropriate to understand financialization as an historical process and not a brand new phenomenon” (p. 70). What is new, however, is how monopoly capital and financialization has led to what Magnusson called the “intensification of
“precarity” (p. 71), particularly of labour and education. Under this rubric, Bill Maurer (2012) explained how financial capital plays a curiously omniscient role in the exchange of goods and power, particularly in terms of digital and mobile technological advancements. He noted that, “There is nothing linking currency to its chain of owners or to its history of exchange and transaction. This anonymity represents a kind of freedom: one’s currency does not in and of itself bind one to a system of rank or social hierarchy” (p. 303). Returning to the issue of the “diaspora option” (Trotz & Mullings, 2013), immigrants, then, serve as the “face” of these larger agreements between governments and corporations. As an overlay, Trotz and Mullings (2013) asserted that, “If today that elite group is not territorially bound, it remains tied by consanguinity” (p. 170). This idea is important for this study, especially as I review the emotive appeals behind giving and the “responsibility” of diasporas to invest in local immigrant settlement projects.

In 2006, Matthew Bishop penned *The Birth of Philanthrocapitalism*, an article that immediately captured the imaginations and sensibilities of a variety of non-profit actors, especially fundraisers and charity leaders looking for new and creative ways to secure mega gifts for their organizations. Followed by a lengthy book on the same topic by Bishop and Michael Green (2008), a new opportunity has emerged – one that uses business strategies and practices to solve the world’s greatest challenges. Accordingly, philanthrocapitalism is regarded as a hands-on, donor-driven activity focused on problem-solving through entrepreneurial methods:

First, a micro-level definition: it is a new way of doing philanthropy, which mirrors the way that business is done in the for-profit capitalist world. Entrepreneurs don’t just want to write cheques. They want to be hands on, bringing innovative ideas to scale by investing their time and energy.... Second, philanthrocapitalism describes at the macro level the ways in which capitalism itself can be philanthropic, working for the good of
mankind. It is not just that, at its best, capitalism drives innovation which tends to benefit everyone, sooner or later, through new products, higher quality and lower prices. The winners of capitalism increasingly see giving back as an integral part of being wealthy. More and more business leaders, particularly following the financial crisis, are realising that they need to think long term and play a part in tackling global challenges like climate change. (Bishop, 2013)

In one way, philanthrocapitalism – also known as ‘venture philanthropy’ – can be summed up as “doing good by doing well” (Chernev & Blair, 2015; Goldsmith et al., 2014; Kremer et al., 2009). However, using entrepreneurial techniques to eradicate poverty, deliver quality healthcare, and cure diseases have led researchers and activists to question the efficacy of pairing philanthropy and capitalism (Eikenberry, 2013; Daly, 2012). More pointedly, Peter Lorzeni and Francis Hilton (2001) asked, “Is philanthropy a diversion, a conversion, or a perversion of capitalism” (p. 399)?

A question like this unearths a series of philosophical and ethical concerns, particularly about the plausibility of no strings attached and arm’s length giving, two hallmarks of the traditional philanthropy model. In fact, philanthrocapitalism works in direct contrast to these ideals by asking donors to not only give, but also steer the ship. This can be seen through philanthropic celebrities like Bill Gates, Warren Buffett, George Soros, Carlos Slim, Azim Premji, Sulaiman bin Abdul Aziz Al Rajhi, and, more recently, Mark Zuckerberg, who have achieved their notoriety as owners of the means of philanthropic production. As Kavita Ramdas (2011) observed, these sorts of figures have even become evangelists for philanthrocapitalism.

While issues like education (Hogan, 2014, Ball, 2012; Brown, 2012) and the environment (Brooks, 2015; Holmes, 2015; Holmes, 2012; Jones, 2012) have been subject to the philanthrocapitalists’ gaze, nowhere else has venture philanthropy been so hotly contested than
in the healthcare and international development arenas. Samantha King (2013) claimed that the “healthification of everything” is a direct result of the lure and promises of philanthrocapitalism. Similarly, through a series of interviews with international NGO actors, Linsey McGoey (2009) demonstrated that the rules around gift giving,\(^\text{12}\) namely reciprocity and the expectation of exchange, are alive and well under philanthrocapitalism. Her study of international healthcare philanthropy shows that the return on investment was a public pronouncement of the “viability of US and European economic and foreign policy interests” (p. 1). In terms of foreign aid and international development, the colonizing undercurrents of venture philanthropy schemes are most evident in studies where philanthropy is exchanged for highly commoditized resources such as oil, minerals, and offshore labour (Edwards, 2008; Taylor, 2008; Barnes, 2005; Hamann, 2004). Nevertheless, there is little acknowledgement by philanthrocapitalists of the power differentials between donors and beneficiaries, leading Guru Madhavan and Barbara Oakley (2011) to conclude that a “pathological altruism” (p. 3) has permeated the collective consciousness of both donor and donee groups.

One of the precursors to the philanthrocapitalism movement is microfinance, a way to build capital through lending programs mostly within rural areas of the Global South. Popularized by Muhammed Yunus of the Grameen Bank, microfinance systems have been lauded for creating hospitable environments for market practices to germinate and flourish (Chopra & Fisher, 2012). Like in the philanthrocapitalist tradition, microfinanciers are loan officers in that they are authorized to monitor, support, and evaluate the progress of each project, and work with beneficiaries on appropriate low-interest payback agreements (Rock et al., 1998). Microfinance programs come with their critics, many of whom have coalesced around one

\(^{12}\) For more on the sociology of giving, see Sanghera (2015), Silber (2009), Berking (1999), Bourdieu (1997), and Komter (1996).
question succinctly articulated by Jonathan De Quidt, Thiemo Fetzer, and Maitreesh Ghatak (2012): “Is it possible that...innovative lending methods...can be a potent tool of rent extraction in the hands of a for-profit lender with market power” (p. 2)? Peter Dicken, Philip Kelly, Kris Olds, and Henry Wai-Chung Yeung (2001) problematized this issue even further: “Keeping things at ‘ground level’... makes it difficult to keep structural power relations within the global economy in the same frame. It may be true that ‘capitalism’ is too abstract a category to be very useful in understanding spatial specificity in the global economy or the finer empirical contexts of economic life (necessarily incorporating the non-economic)” (p. 105). The ethical issues surrounding microfinance have informed many case studies that have exposed the questionable practices and adverse effects of credit/lending programs on the development of emerging economies (see Kent & Dacin, 2013; Gustavsson; 2012; Khavul et al., 2012). Just as the critics of philanthrocapitalism have noted how giving has become a tool for expanding global capitalism, microfinance researchers have shown that while the lines between for-profit and non-profit are becoming porous, the owners of capital continue to win.13 Gregor Campbell (2010) called this confusion “neoliberalism’s endgame” (p. 1081).

The big business of philanthropy: Putting the numbers in perspective

When Buffett and Gates began their quest to convince other billionaires to sign on to their Giving Pledge initiative in 2010, philanthropy became an overnight darling of the public relations machine, a way for elites to openly declare their commitment to solving the greatest problems of our time. In an analysis of the motivations behind those who have made the pledge to date, Jana Sadeh, Mirco Tonin, and Michael Vlassopoulos (2014) noted that many of these

---

13 Online microfinance initiatives have recently cropped up, allowing working and middle class people to act as lenders as well. The best example of this is kiva.org, where people can choose to support a variety of initiatives through a crowdsourcing platform (see Hartley, 2010).
donors approach their philanthropy with a business-like attitude, referring to charitable giving as an investment with a focus on outcomes. This observation underscores the unique position philanthropy has occupied for some time now, where the excesses of accumulation and capital are lauded for their capacity to perform good deeds and solve big problems. Furthermore, the launch of the Buffett-Gates project coincided with the aftermath of the 2008 economic downturn, pointing to the resilience of the ruling class in times of monumental crisis.

What makes the Giving Pledge unique is that it not only calls on the world’s oldest family dynasties to break from the tradition of intergenerational wealth transference, but it has also attracted a new wave of unapologetic self-made billionaires who have climbed up the ranks to become the owners of the means of production and financialized capital. Much of this “wealthification” (West, 2014) has been secured through risky venture investing in real estate, resource development, and technology (see Sanandaji, 2014; Torgler & Piatti, 2013; Sanandaji & Leeson, 2013; Holmes, 2012). To help articulate the magnitude and impact of this new wealth, the WEF (2014) reported that 0.7% of the population now own 41% of the world’s wealth. According to several studies of public activism (see Fletcher, 2014; Costanza-Chock, 2012; Razsa & Kurnik, 2012), these sorts of figures served as the kindling of the occupy movement of 2011, which unearthed what Jacquelen Van Stekelenburg (2012) described as a “potpourri of grievances” (p. 228) based on mounting corporate greed and elite concentrations of power.

Corresponding to this meteoric rise of the ultra-wealthy class, fundraising has become a booming industry throughout the Global North, particularly in North America, over the last ten years. However, given that there are no international standards for reporting on charitable giving, we remain challenged in obtaining an accurate account of philanthropic flows worldwide. The 2013 Global Index of Philanthropy and Remittances (Adelman et al., 2013) is the only comprehensive study that offers an aggregate analysis of international charitable giving. Drawing
on data from the OECD and the Centre for Global Prosperity, the report states that recent philanthropy flows amounted to $58.9 billion (p. 12). This figure precludes private international aid and remittance investments, which, I believe, could easily quadruple this estimation. A more recent study conducted by the Charities Aid Foundation (2015) synthesized Gallop Poll data collected over five years from 152 countries and found that of the top 20 charitable nation-states, only five were members of the G20. In fact, eleven G20 countries were ranked outside of the top 50, and three of these were outside the top 100. These figures serve as a telling reminder that advanced economies are not necessarily the most philanthropic.

Overall, Canadian census data on giving is more comprehensive than that of other countries and offers several empirical insights into the nature and scope of domestic philanthropy. According to the last Canada Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating (CSGVP) $10.6 billion was donated to registered charities in 2010 (Turcotte, 2012). Of particular relevance to our study of elite philanthropic actors is the analysis done on the number of top donors to Canadian charities and non-profits. The CSGVP found that while this group constitutes only a quarter of all donors, the cumulative amount of their gifts comprised 83% of the total amount collected by all charities. An examination of the 10% of people who made the largest donations shows that this group alone contributed 63% of all donations (p. 26). The CSGVP also shows that education and networks influence giving behaviours and patterns. For Martin Turcotte (2012),

Beyond income, people with a higher education level have other social characteristics and attitudes that have been found to be associated with larger donations. Among these are a greater tendency to trust others generally, and hence a higher degree of social trust, and more extensive and diversified social networks, which contribute to increased solicitations. (Turcotte, 2012, p. 23)
There are a few other data points concerning charitable giving amongst immigrants in Canada that are worth noting. According to Derrick Thomas (2012), while immigrants were as likely to donate money as Canadian-born individuals, the former contributed more money on average. The median amount given by immigrant donors was also higher ($155 versus $111 for the Canadian-born) (p. 55). While these amounts may seem immaterial at first glance, when it comes to middle- and upper-income households, the gap in charitable giving becomes considerably wider. Thomas (2012) observed that “immigrants with an annual household income of $100,000 or more gave about $250 more, on average, than Canadian-born donors with the same income. Moreover, immigrants as a whole donated a larger percentage of their household income; they gave 1% on average, while Canadian-born donors gave about 0.7% of their pre-tax household income” (p. 56).

There are several cautionary notes to highlight based on the evidence referenced above. First, while the data accounts for other kinds of charitable acts, such as volunteering, it does not provide the full picture of philanthropic giving, particularly when it comes to cross-border exchanges like remittances or transnational philanthropy. Second, while the numbers demystify a perception that immigrants solely play a beneficiary role in Canada, its revelatory tone underscores the pervasiveness of what Cecilia Menjucar and Sang Kiln (2002) called a “benevolent rhetoric” (p. 160). Finally, the data also indicates that effective courting of the diaspora yields profitable fundraising results. It is, therefore, worth the effort to get a handle of the giving interests of this emerging donor community. The latter point is further supported by a growing body of literature on the buying power and consumer habits of immigrants (see Tharp, 2014; Pusaksritik & Kang, 2014; Laroche & Park, 2013; Poulis et al., 2013).
Philanthropy as activism?

I would like to briefly draw our attention to the recent cooption of the term “activism” in media accounts of mega-philanthropy. While the classical definition of philanthropy refers to anyone who expresses an altruistic “love for humankind” (see Sulek, 2010; Nickel & Eikenberry, 2009; O’Neill, 1994), Francesca Sawaya (2008) pointed out that “like aesthetics, [philanthropy] is a term that has embedded in it critical and utopian – and thus also debatable – longings for transcendence of the contemporary economic and political scene” (p. 202). From my own observations, contemporary narratives of philanthropy, particularly in North America and Europe, mostly portray white, heterosexual males who wield tremendous power and influence in both the public and private sectors. Take, for example, how former US president, Bill Clinton is simply described as an “activist” when he delivered a TED talk about “reviving” Rwanda in 2007. Clinton joins many other media personalities who move along the CEO-politician-philanthropist-celebrity-activist continuum with relative ease. But what exactly makes these individuals activists? Is it their ability to mobilize their followers to do good? Or do they provide a neutral, mediating voice to hotly contested topics? In an article published in The Guardian in 2014, Latoya Peterson asserted that, “white men are encouraged to champion anything and everything, while women and people of color are encouraged to discuss issues that are closer to their gender and racial identity.” Her article entitled, “Ben Affleck, Leonardo DiCaprio and the cult of the white male celebrity activist” described how whiteness serves as an authoritative and unbiased voice in the public imagination. Drawing on Jacques Derrida’s ideas about the nature of power and hospitality, it could be argued that white elites are assigned the role of the authoritative and all-knowing host, therefore casting the “other” as, to borrow from Gayatri Spivak (1988), the subaltern who must not speak – or better yet: the subaltern who will not be heard.
However, the rules of engagement seem to change when the promise of new money is brought to the table. How does surplus/philanthropic capital complicate Derrida’s sense of the host and foreigner? How does charitable giving compound these social relations? These questions formed a distinct focus on the hospitality-gift nuance within my study of elite immigrants within the non-profit sector, which is the basis of Chapter 3.

**Charitable giving, humanitarianism, and colonization**

Needless to say, those with great resources are ripe for giving. In fact, class stratification is, indeed, based on one’s access to and use of various forms of capital (Bourdieu, 2008). After all, the most internationally celebrated philanthropists in modern history were also major industrialists – namely Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie – who established charitable foundations to help, in part, manage surplus capital and build their empires through imperialist initiatives. Masked as a humanitarian effort, philanthropy has been an effective tool for white supremacy and colonization throughout various historical periods. I would like to take a brief detour to further explore this issue by drawing on Richard Brown’s (1980) seminal account of the Rockefeller Foundation’s philanthrocapitalist investments in China. Throughout the 1920s, the Foundation spent $45 million to establish the Peking Union Medical College (PUMC) so that the Chinese population would abandon traditional medicine in favour of Western medical practices. In the words of John D. Rockefeller Jr., the PUMC was expected to offer “the best that is known to Western civilization, not only in medical science, but in mental development and spiritual culture” (Brown, 1980, p. 123).

At that time, missionary efforts were met with great disdain in China, so Rockefeller had to be creative if he wanted to advance his mission. The Chinese government welcomed the Foundation’s seemingly innocent interest in expanding medical education, especially free teaching and access to prescribed medications. Brown’s study of Rockefeller’s monographs and
correspondences uncovered the Foundation’s intention to establish an offshore labour force that would produce goods for American consumption. In order to further exert American influence, the Foundation funded courses in English; communicating in Chinese was, in fact, strictly forbidden, and traditional medicines were systematically excluded from the curriculum (Brown, 1980, p. 135). The rationale behind these actions may be obvious now, however, at the time, the Foundation promoted them solely as an opportunity for students to have access to the most advanced medical texts and journals. The Foundation’s efforts to colonize China were eventually brought to a halt with the rise of communism under Chairman Mao. While this example exposes the hand-in-glove relationship between philanthropy and colonialism, perhaps more striking is the role industrialization played in funneling colonization efforts through a charitable filter (O’Brien, 2015). Within this context, it seems especially worthwhile to underscore how early capitalism ushered in a complex series of relationships between nation-states based on commercial and material production.

Returning to my investigation of immigrant philanthropy, another feature that has permeated the philanthrocapitalism literature centres on the importance of measurement and evaluation (Edwards, 2008). Borrowing measuring tools from the business world, progress in the charitable sector is commonly understood by quarterly reporting of investments and returns, especially within large multi-layered non-profits. In fact, for most countries in the Global North, governments require third sector organizations to report on their fundraising results at least once a year. David Bosworth (2011) described the hegemonic effects of reporting in the US:

This doctrine, which I have been calling quantiphilia, has so saturated American culture that, like any commonsense belief, it now appears to be immune to effective critique. Despite a near total collapse of the global economy as generated by the egregious incompetence of corporate finance, the core notions of quantiphilia, including the
idealization of corporate techniques, still dominate the position papers of our policy elite, and with our final assessment of value in all things now commonly defined as “the bottom line,” its logic has also succeeded in “monetizing” our everyday speech.

(Bosworth, 2011, p. 382)

For Canadian non-profits, the quantiphilia phenomenon is gaining momentum, particularly as the scope and magnitude of the non-profit sector are still being defined (Evans & Shields, 2000; Berger & Azaria, 2004; Meinhard & Foster, 2003). Also, since all levels of government have a stake in the funding and surveilling of charities, there seems to be no greater equalizer than quantitative data in helping bureaucrats make decisions on how best to allocate their shrinking spending envelope. Consequently, more and more non-profit managers are spending their time collecting data about “impact” in order to sustain their core funding.

With a focus on macro-level global change, philanthrocapitalism tends to bypass these issues, posing a variety of challenges to domestic rules around giving. From an internationally competitive stance, however, individuals and corporations that participate in large scale cross-border philanthropy are perhaps unknowingly helping transform some nation-states into “donor countries” (Lahiri & Raimondos-Møller, 2004). Lester Salamon (1994), one of the world’s leading scholars of the non-profit sector, acknowledged that the internationalization of the third sector is growing at such a fast pace that it is creating a revolution of sorts:

Indeed, a veritable “global associational revolution” appears to be underway, a massive upsurge of organized private, voluntary activity in literally every corner of the world. Prompted in part by growing doubts about the capability of the state to cope on its own with the social welfare, developmental, and environmental problems that face nations today, this growth of civil society organizations has been stimulated as well by the communications revolution of the past two decades and by the striking expansion of
educated middle class elements who are frustrated by the lack of economic and political
dexpression that has confronted them in many places. (Salamon et al., 2003, p. 4)

Salamon (1994) asserted that this revolution has been in the works for centuries and it would be
a mistake to presume that Western practices of contemporary philanthropy are *par excellence*; he
called this false consciousness the “myth of immaculate conception” (p. 121).

To what extent is philanthrocapitalism, as Michael Edwards (2009) asked, “oversold” (p. 41)? Can business strategies really solve any of the problems that non-profits have been
contending with for years? Edwards noted that “philanthrocapitalism is in danger of diverting
energy and resources away from efforts to transform the social, political and institutional
landscapes at ultimately determine poverty and inequality in favor of investments that increase
some poor people’s access to materials and services” (p. 40). As we monitor current flows of
philanthropic capital through the diaspora, Edwards’ and Salamon’s warnings become all the
more important, especially as we start to draw connections between state control, diverse cultural
practices, and individual motivations for giving. What, then, is the current and potential role of
the transnational capitalist class within the philanthrocapitalist movement?

**Beginnings/conclusions**

This chapter has pointed to a number of challenges and possibilities for transnationalism
and philanthropy students. From this literature review, a series of interwoven issues have
emerged – the use of digital and mobile technology, the role international agreements and
strategic partnerships, the emotive responses to local and cross-border philanthropy, cultural
norms of giving, marketing, and policy prescriptions – that have shaken existing presuppositions
of “methodological nationalism” (Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002) and given greater profile to
elite immigrant actors within the shadow state.
With these and other texts in hand, it comes as no surprise that global restructuring efforts have made these donors important actors in the story of democracy building at home – no matter how they define “home.” Therefore, the active participation of diverse markets in the non-profit sector serves not only as a marker of individual citizenship, but also showcases the nation-state’s charitable soul on the global stage. Having successfully maneuvered through the conditions that limit one’s citizenship, transnational philanthrocapitalists have captured the imaginations of government, corporate, and non-profit leaders who are not necessarily looking to fund a disruption to the status quo, but rather find solutions and drive innovation without compromising neoliberal interests. While the jury is still conferring on the evidence, it is clear that globalization and capitalism have taken on new guises when it comes to the charitable sector – and elite immigrants are key players in this game.

For me, opening the door to critiques of philanthropy unsettles the foundations upon which local and international non-profits are built. Some may argue that it would be more fruitful to focus on how civil society, governments, and corporations can work more closely together to bring about a new social order, build capacity, and advance medicine and education. On the other hand, I believe that the more we understand the evolving context of the sector, the better we will be at maneuvering through these new social, political, and economic entanglements.
Chapter 2: Methodology, Terminology, and Reflexive Statement

The qualitative interview is a key venue for exploring the ways in which subjects experience and understand their world. It provides a unique access to the lived world of the subjects, who in their own words describe their activities, experiences and opinions. (Kvale, 2008, p. 9)

Chapter overview

This chapter chronicles the process through which this study was conducted. It begins with a review of the primary research question and sub-questions that inspired my analysis of the data. I then provide a rationale for why I chose an interview-based methodology, some of the debates found in ethnographically-oriented interviewing, and an outline of best practices in qualitative field work. I also provide clarification of the key terms and definitions, followed by an overview of the benefits and limitations of this investigation. Finally, I aim to situate myself within the discussion through a personal note about my experiences and perspectives on this topic.

Research question

My overarching research question is: How does the philanthropy of Toronto’s immigrant elites interplay with the strategic growth of the non-profit sector? To explore this question in greater detail, I have developed three sub-questions, which inform the body chapters of this dissertation: 1) How does immigrant philanthropy disrupt preconceived notions of giving between hosts and the other? 2) What role does immigrant philanthropy play in the making of the new Canadian establishment? 3) How do governmental regimes and financialization influence relations between immigrant-oriented charities and immigrant donors? These questions were
developed in consultation with my thesis committee and led to three different “journeys” with the same data set. Accordingly, Chapters 3, 4, and 5 are written as individual publishable manuscripts. In Chapter 3, I took a philosophical journey, using Derrida’s writings of hospitality and the gift to analyze my data; in Chapter 4, I took a more experiential journey, examining the process through which diaspora is ‘made;’ and in Chapter 5, I pursued an economic perspective to show how philanthropy, migration, and the state work together to produce the non-profit sector as we know it today. The final chapter serves as an opportunity to draw connections between these journeys, to carve paths between them – and, of course, to more pointedly address the foundational question of this study.

**Methodological rationale**

Inspired by Alex Broom (2005), I use the term “in-depth qualitative interview” to describe the nature and structure of the interviews used in the study. Broom noted that the semi-structured and unstructured interview methods in social sciences are “mere typologies” (p. 66) that can sometimes limit the ways in which information is gathered and solicited. Accordingly, for those study participants who responded more favorably to a formal question-and-answer format, I adjusted my interview style to ensure their comfort while drawing out meaningful responses. More often than not, however, the participants expected more of a “conversational interview” (Weiss, 1995), so I found myself sometimes referring to the interview guide to keep the discussion from drifting too far away from the main topic.

For Meryl Brod et al, (2009) the process of interviewing is “an iterative one whereby each interview informs the next, and subsequent interviews are used to explore issues raised in previous interviews. The goal is not to reach consensus” (p. 1265). Over the course of the fourteen months that I conducted interviews, I refined my line of questioning in order to be able
to probe further into recurring issues brought about by the first few interviews. For example, I observed early on that several immigrant philanthropists and immigrant fundraising volunteers regarded philanthropy (and volunteering) as a way to gain acceptance from the old establishment. As a result, I repeatedly asked about the experience of ‘joining a club’ to the remaining participants in order to determine its validity and depth of value.

In two cases within the IPHIL grouping, there was minimal interaction between myself and the interview subject; after each question, they gave responses that sometimes were 15 minutes in length, without any interruptions. I decided to allow them to tell their story in this manner, which in hindsight provided rich and meaningful retelling of a situation or memory. In some ways, there was a level of analytical depth that I was able to use, particularly in Chapter 3, where the context of past experience plays a vital role in philanthropy. In these situations, I was reminded of Broom’s statement about the value of taking a back seat role in the interview process: “Being impromptu and flexible is part of being a good interviewer, so do not be scared of ‘going with the flow’” (Broom, 2005, p. 70). Furthermore, giving the interviewees space to ‘conduct’ the interview allowed for a certain level of that relationality that is meant to minimize researcher-subject power relations. In this regard, Helen Vandenberg and Wendy Hall (2011) defined “relationality” as “the responsibility of researchers to share power with participants in decision making and social action. Relationality requires researchers to contemplate possible outcomes affecting participants and larger communities and it includes the community of participants as arbiters of quality, thus bridging the gap between research and ethics” (p. 30). In preparing for the interviews, I was also influenced by Steinar Kvale and Svend Brinkmann (2009), who claimed that the interview leads to the development of theories, ideas, and assumptions, not the other way around:
At the backdrop to the increasing popularity of qualitative methods stands what may be
called qualitative stance. From this stance, the processes and phenomena of the world are
described before theorized, understood before explained, and seen as concrete qualities
before abstract quantities. The qualitative stance involves focusing on the cultural,
everyday, and situated aspects of human thinking, learning, knowing, acting, and ways of
understanding ourselves as persons, and it is opposed to “technified” approaches to the
study of human lives. (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 12)

In thinking about how best to interview the SAEDs, I intentionally developed my
interview guide based on what is called a “sociological intervention” where the “participants are
invited to trace the history of their struggle, the various incidents that have marked their
collective action” (Hamel, 1997, p. 97). The line of questioning addressed a diverse range of
issues including precarious funding, racism, sexism, and other so-called taboo topics. While it
was clear that many of the SAEDs knew one another, there was a sense of solidarity amongst
them as well, particularly when it came to experiences of fundraising. Accordingly, they were
inclined to “see their struggle as part and parcel of a social movement” (Hamel, 1997, p. 97).
Throughout my interviews with the SAEDs, I reminded myself to maintain a balance between
valuing individual experience and how collectively their voices could develop a dangerously
reductionist understanding of how this group operates. As Jacques Hamel (1997) explained:

The real interest of the sociological intervention lies in this sole aspect. Indeed, it
maintains convincingly that a collective struggle can, from a methodological point of
view, be reduced to a group whose participants possess the theoretical qualities necessary
for its analysis. Nonetheless, this method poses certain problems in this regard. By
focusing on the militant quality of the participants, as figureheads, their
representativeness in the sociological intervention tends to be limited to a political level. (Hamel, 1997, p. 98)

For novice researchers like me, the topic of power invariably evokes a Foucauldian-inspired analysis where, as Susan Bordo argued, “the fact that power is not held by anyone does not entail that it is equally held by all. It is ‘held’ by no one; but people and groups are positioned differently within it” (as cited in Day, 2012, p. 67). The role of reflexivity in this case, then, is to encourage a disruption of power and how it is positioned on both individual and institutional levels. During the interview phase of this study, I observed that these power-oriented discussions occurred when the recorder was turned off and the interview was formally completed. As a result, I have referenced them as general observations in Chapters 3, 4, and 5 without attributing comments to particular interview subjects.

I argue that the in-depth interviewing method allows for renewed opportunities to uncover issues of power within fundraising. Thinking about “power as a possession” (Day, 2012, p. 67) provided the SAEDs (and me, for that matter) with a new view into how organizational agency is structured by the institutions of government, finance, private capital, and societal norms. These perspectives, particularly in Chapter 5, made way for a more holistic and conceptual framework that allowed for seamless alignment between the participants voices and issues of governmentality and financialized monopoly capital. In Chapters 3 and 4, the experiences of the interviewees (and my analyses of them) served as a tool for “elucidating our imaginaries, to uncover, for example, how injustices... are instituted and simultaneously mystified so as to perpetuate them” (Westbrook, 2009, p.24).

As an aside, I was also acutely aware that my fieldwork required me to go into the interviewees’ environments, which may have had a minor impact on the researcher-participant power dynamic. For Dvora Yanow (2009), this idea is one of the cruxes of ethnographic
research: “Ethnography, however, is based on researchers going out to participants’ domains – and this constitutes a different wrinkle in power/knowledge relationships” (p. 196).

Hugh Wardle and Paloma Gay y Balsco (2011) define “ethnography” as “the analysis of the social and cultural life of an aggregate of people as if their interactions and communications were coordinated along logical, or at least quasi-logical, lines” (p. 118). For me, the ethnographic interview, then, aims to understand the foundations and implications of these interactions, specifically through personal narrative and voice. In this study, I use the in-depth interview approach to elicit a variety of perspectives that not only contribute to both emerging and established ideas in diaspora and philanthropy studies, but also express the nuances of experience that make a ‘logical end’ difficult to achieve. Wardle and Gay y Balsco (2011) asserted that ethnographic research yields an authoritative tone: “It is precisely out of a multiplicity of relationships in the field and ‘at home’ that ethnographic authorship emerges as individual and authoritative, rather than as shared and precarious” (p. 122).

To me, the subject of ethnography positions the complexity of relations and institutions as a social problem, thereby initiating a series of questions that interrogate how reality is produced and reproduced. In a book review about ethnography, John Morton (2009) asked, “What roles are played by memory and context” (p. 383)? This question influenced the development of the interview guide and shaped the line of questioning for each cluster/grouping. Indeed, the interview guides served more like guidelines, providing me with the opportunity to probe further on an issue or idea as needed.

Through the interview process, I was also reminded of Thomas Diefenbach’s (2009) commentary about the interviewer’s ability to uphold his or her “methodological awareness” in which the interviewer is responsible for observing the “downsides of subjectivity, the generalization of the findings, conscious and unconscious biases, influences of dominant
ideologies, and mainstream thinking” (p. 875). Diefenbach (2009) surmised that the selection of interviews is part of “organizational politics” (p. 880) in which the interviewer asserts some authority on the broader subject matter. Consequently, I was particularly concerned about interviewing people I knew or with whom I had a donor-beneficiary relationship. I had met almost 50% of the fundraisers, philanthropists, volunteers, and agency directors at least once in either a professional setting (through my employer) or in a volunteer setting (through my involvement with the Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP)). These informants introduced me (often by email) to the remaining participants. Informant referrals were tremendously helpful in securing interviews with other key players in philanthropy and helped establish my credibility as a researcher. As Diefenbach (2009) observed, “The selection of interviewees is part of organizational politics. Only interviewees selected have the opportunity to put forward their worldviews and, therefore, influence the outcome of the research” (p. 880).

In Chapter 3, I draw heavily on Derrida’s ideas of hospitality and the gift, which for him were understood based on their deconstructionist value. In this instance, I deliberately privileged language in my analysis, exploring how certain words and phrases were used in my interviewees’ experiences. Yanow (2009) noted that it is important to study language before conducting fieldwork “as well as learning something about [a particular] ‘culture’ through reading previously published monographs about its kinship structures, rituals and ceremonies, and so forth” (p. 194). To this end, I completed the bulk of my readings on hospitality and the gift prior to conducting the interviews. In addition, I garnered further inspiration by reviewing a number of philanthropy-oriented case studies that paid attention to various cultural and social contexts that influence how “giving is done.” Together, these readings allowed me to consider the relevance and tensions within Derridean thought – all of which are discussed in greater detail in the following chapter. Also, for Chapter 4, I drew on a related approach called “global
ethnography” that “broadens the horizons of traditional ethnography by redefining the ‘locality’ of the field in light of transnational populations” (Mirza, 2012, p. S8). In essence, while this study focused on in-depth interviews, there are a number of ethnography-inspired specificities that I used to collect and analyze the data, as noted in the following section.

Identifying and soliciting participants

In an analysis of doctoral research projects, Mark Mason (2010) found great variation in sample size for qualitative interviews, where the number and frequency of interviews depended on the kind of study one undertakes. For example, some projects had less than ten participants who were interviewed two or three times. That said, Mason observed that the saturation point commonly hovered between 20 and 30 one-hour interviews, particularly for PhD students in the social sciences. Initially, I had proposed to conduct 30 interviews for this project; however, early on in the interview process I observed that there was another interview cluster that could provide another important perspective to the discussion: immigrant fundraising volunteers. As a result, I conducted an additional ten interviews over a five month period. The four clusters are described more fully here:

**Immigrant Philanthropists (IPHIL):** I recruited ten immigrant philanthropists for this study. These participants immigrated to Canada from various countries and each have a net worth value of $3 million or greater, as determined through media reports and public filings. Each has also made charitable contributions to formally registered charities in the amount of $500,000 or more within the past five years. I interviewed one more individual who was not an immigrant, but is often referred to as the “child of an immigrant” in the popular media. I deliberately decided not to apply an age restriction to my participant criteria. In other words, while the majority of informants arrived as adults (some married with children), three arrived as either a child (under the age of 10) or as teenagers. In Chapter 3, I explore how age and stage
influence experience, noting that notions of belonging and citizenship are connected to one’s ability to pass as a naturalized Canadian.

**Chief Fundraisers of Large Non-Profits (CFLNP):** I recruited ten professionals who lead the fundraising activities of their organizations. These organizations have an operating budget of at least $50 million in which philanthropy plays a major role in their accounted-for revenue. All of the participants are located in Toronto and have considerable experience and profile working with immigrant donors. Seven of the ten professionals have given conference workshops within the last five years, which they shared their expertise in the area of diversity and inclusion. Two of the CFLNPs are owners of fundraising consultancies based in Toronto, where they provide regular philanthropic counsel to large and small charities. Both of these participants publish widely on the subject of fundraising and are considered to be experts in the field. I decided to include their perspectives within the CFLNP group since their professional networks were closely tied to that network. In fact, I noted that they mostly referred to other CFLNPs in their examples, which makes sense given that larger charities can afford to retain philanthropic counsel as extensions of their fundraising teams. Interestingly, all of the CFLNPs are white Canadians. One is an immigrant from the United Kingdom, while the rest are either third or fourth generation Canadians. I explore this issue of white immigrant philanthropic relations in Chapter 4. Another interesting point is that all of these organizations fall under the categories of “publicly oriented non-profits” (Quarter et al., 2001), meaning that their funding comes from a number of sources, including government operating grants, fee for service programs and services, and private investment through charitable giving. This phenomenon is further probed in Chapter 5.

**Settlement Agency Executive Directors (SAED):** As part of this study, I also interviewed ten executive directors of immigrant-focused charitable organizations. The majority
of these organizations provide immigrant and settlement services (e.g., language skills
development, employment and housing services, and tutoring and mentoring opportunities) in
the Greater Toronto Area. A couple of these organizations provide health services to mostly
immigrant and refugee populations. All of these organizations have a ‘community building’
component to them, meaning that they also organize recreational and social activities for their
clients. The annual budgets of these organizations are anywhere from $150,000 to $1,000,000,
but no more than $10,000,000 (and that is only in one case where the organization has multiple
sites). Each organization is a CRA-registered charity with an explicit fundraising mandate. Most
of these organizations receive core funding from at least one level of government. Except for one
SAED, all of the participants happened to be immigrants or members of a racialized community.
Seven are women and all of them have been employed by (or previously volunteered at) their
organization for at least six years.

**Immigrant Fundraising Volunteers (IFV):** In my thesis proposal, I had yet to identify
this cluster of interview subjects; however, as I began to interview IPHILs and CFLNPs, I
observed that unpaid “influencers” in immigrant communities played a vital bridging role
between philanthropists and the charitable sector. Since many large charities have formal
volunteer structures (as discussed in Chapter 3), I wanted to capture the perspectives of the
immigrant fundraising volunteers as they wield considerable power in terms of class, status, and
party (Weber, 1978) inside and outside of their ethnicized/racialized community. These
interview subjects are well-known figures in the charitable sector, and seven of the ten have
participated in political activities, either having previously stood as candidates for election or as
overt supporters of elected officials either locally, provincially, or nationally. One IFV is a
racialized third generation immigrant, who provided a different perspective about the confluence
of (or confusion between) between race and citizenship. This idea is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 4.

Data collection and analysis

I used different strategies to recruit the participants of each cluster, as noted below. All of the interviews were conducted between October 2013 and August 2015, and the majority of them took place in private settings, including enclosed offices, low traffic areas of member-only clubs, living rooms, and my office at Ryerson University. In one case, the interview was conducted by phone. Thirty of the interviews were between 60 minutes and 75 minutes in length; in seven cases, the interviews were 90 to 100 minutes; and in three cases the interviews were between 45 and 55 minutes. The latter series of interviews were more structured than the others, where the participants answered the question directly and waited for another question from me. All of the other interviews were true conversational, semi-structured in-depth interviews (DiCicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006; Whiting, 2008).

All of the interviews, except one, were digitally recorded and 70% were personally transcribed. For the remaining interviews I used a transcription service. I did not have my digital recorder for one of the interviews, so I took copious notes, repeating key phrases and quotes with the participants to ensure accuracy. Immediately after each interview, I uploaded the recording and electronically scanned and saved my handwritten notes onto my personal password-protected laptop. I also saved the audio recordings on an encrypted USB stick as a back-up file. The transcripts were recorded in Microsoft Word. Once all the transcriptions were completed, I transferred the content of each interview onto a separate Microsoft Excel sheet in order to categorize the quotes based on the three body chapters that I wanted to explore. After reading and categorizing the data three times over the course of two months, I sorted the data based on
three key terms: “hospitality/gift,” “translocal,” and “financialization,” which helped determined where the data best fit (i.e. in Chapter 3, 4, or 5).

I conducted member checks within 5 to 10 weeks after I completed each transcript. In all cases, I did not receive any further feedback. One of the participants requested a copy of the audio recording, which I provided. All identifying features of places, names, and titles were removed, as I had promised each participant I would do. I also deleted any content that the interviewees asked I omit from the study.

In terms of confidentiality and privacy issues, I assured all participants that they would not be personally identified in this study. I also told them that they could opt out at any time prior to my final committee meeting. Finally, I had promised that I would give each participant a pseudonym, however, with the sheer size of the data, I found it impossible to keep all of the names in order as I began to pull out and compare quotes from the interviews. Instead, I ascribed a number based on their cluster assignment. For example, I used IPHIL X, IFV X, SAED X, and CFLNP X, where “X” could be any number from 1 to 10. This coding process allowed me to see where some voices were perhaps over- or under-represented, giving me a chance to go back to the original transcripts to find data that I may not have considered during the first three rounds of coding.

Recruitment of IPHILs and IFVs: As I noted earlier, some of the participants were known to me through my professional work in fundraising. In other cases, I asked an interviewee if he/she would be willing to make an introduction to an IPHIL or IFV who fit the study parameters. A couple of times, I secured the email addresses of an interview subject from public sources (primarily online searching) and used the content of the invitation letter (see Appendix A) to formally seek his or her permission to participate. Shortly after the invitation was sent, I contacted each participant by phone and/or email to determine his or her interest and availability.
In all but one case, the interview appointment was set-up through these follow-up activities. One of the interview subjects, wanted see a sample of the questions I was going to ask before agreeing to participate, which I immediately provided by email.

Recruitment of CFLNPs: Since I have work experience within large fundraising shops I was able to determine which organizations’ chief fundraisers who would be ideal interview participants. In many cases, I was able to phone these individuals directly to set-up appointments. In one case, I asked a CFLNP if he would introduce me to someone whom I believed he knew, since they once worked together. In that case, I followed-up by phone after an introduction was made by email.

Recruitment of SAEDs: Six of the SAEDs were identified through an online review of a settlement agency directory. Four of the SAEDs are known to me through my own volunteer work in the sector, so I found contacting them to be relatively easy; however, the other six were approached more formally, four by email and two by phone. Three of the SAEDs were referred to me by other interview participants. At the end of the SAED interviews, I often asked, “Who else from this sector should I be speaking with?” This question always yielded a number of new potential leads, which I used on two occasions.

Terminology

The nomenclature and phraseology of this study can be very confusing, given the interchangeability of the terminology used in the field. The problem of language is particularly rampant in the non-profit sector mostly because there are so many organizational types, funding models, governance structures, and policies that differentiate one organization from another. In this section, I provide some of the distinguishing features for the most elusive words and phrases in an effort to give clarity to meaning and use.
Philanthropy and Donation: As noted in Chapter 1, philanthropy is a very fuzzy concept that seems to connote a combination of giving “time, talent, and treasure” (McCuddy, 2012; Ott & Dicke, 2011; Bothwell, 2003) all in the name of “love for humankind” (Qiyong & Tao, 2012; Miller, 2006; Soon, 2002; McChesney, 1995). However, most fundraisers would agree that philanthropy is connected to the overall bottom line financial resources required by a charity. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, I understand “philanthropy” to mean a financial pledge to a formal charitable organization, usually amounting to a six-, seven-, or even eight-digit figure. For most fundraisers, a gift of $25,000 or $25,000,000 would be considered a philanthropic gift. In this case, philanthropy is considered to be an extraordinary benefaction that often begets media and political attention. This term is usually associated with high net worth individual donors. On the other hand, “donations” are commonly defined as a one-time gratuitous gift to a charity, often requiring little cultivation on the part of the organization.

Donations can be officially recognized through a formal acknowledgment from the charity along with a charitable tax receipt. In order for a donation to be a gift, it must be made “voluntarily” by the donor. These benefactions give donors a number of “rights” that are outlined in the Donor Bill of Rights (see Appendix G), a widely accepted series of principles that formally registered charities across North America have adopted as a form of best practice.

Charities and non-profits: Throughout this dissertation, I have used a number of terms as alternatives to “non-profits” and “charities.” Non-profits can also be referred to third sector organizations, shadow state entities, voluntary organizations, social profit bodies, not-for-profits, non-governmental organizations, social economy groups, and para-government organizations. While the vast nomenclature illustrates the complex layering of the sector, there are a few important elements that distinguish “charities” from “non-profits” Charities are organizations that are registered with the CRA and report annually on fundraising revenue and expenses.
Charities also provide official receipts that donors use for income tax purposes. Non-profit is a broad term that describes other charitable or not-for-profit bodies. These organizations can be formally incorporated and are often organized as associations, societies, clubs, co-operatives or volunteer groups. Some advocacy groups, like Amnesty International, have a charitable mandate (in other words, it solicits funds to carry out its mission); however, they are not sanctioned by CRA because the federal government considers its work more activist-oriented over charitable. This issue is very important to my analysis in Chapter 5.

*The “old” and “new” Canadian establishments:* In some ways, this dissertation aims to define these terms more clearly. However, the notion of an “establishment” speaks to a pioneering, industrialist, and affluent class of citizens who are owners of the means of production and finance. In the US, the old establishment commonly refers to the leading capitalist families—namely the Fords, Rockefellers, Vanderbilts, and Carnegies; and in Canada, the old establishment includes the Eatons, Westons, and Thomsons. They are typically white, have Christian roots and live in affluent neighborhoods. More recently, however, some Jewish philanthropists have joined the ranks of the old establishment. During the 2015 federal election campaign, former prime minister Stephen Harper used the term “old stock Canadians” to identify white citizens from all others. Borrowing from this problematic phrase, the “old establishment,” refers to the dominant culture where affluence and political power are defining traits. The “new establishment,” then, refers to an emerging group of immigrants who possess comparable levels of capital and influence as the “old” establishment.

*Immigrant, transnational, translocal, and diaspora:* While I have articulated some of these terms in Chapter 1, since I use them throughout this study, I would like to clarify what they mean to me on a practical level. Foundationally, I define immigrant as someone who was born outside of Canada, but now resides in Canada. This definition is sometimes articulated by the
state as a citizen or permanent resident, however, for me, “immigrant” connotes a particular settling into a new environment at the nation-state level. I define “diaspora” as a group of people who live in Canada but trace and refer to their history to another nation-state, often in the Global South, as is the case with the majority of the participants in this study. “Diaspora” may include immigrants, but the term also suggests successive generations of people who claim their roots to another place. Translocal and transnational are complex terms that prioritize the connections and networks that define relationships at home, back home, and all of the places in between. For me, translocal more accurately describes some of these relationships, particularly since some diasporas are connected to more than one location, nation-state, or region. I would like to note here that these are my own definitions, and many scholars have addressed these nuances in greater detail. I will refer to some of these works in Chapter 4.

**Ethical considerations**

In their article “Confronting the ethics of qualitative research,” Brinkmann and Kvale (2005) asked researchers to consider the power dynamics of the interview-subject relationship based on five dimensions: a) the asymmetrical power relation of the interview, b) the interview as a one-way dialogue, c) the interview as an instrumental dialogue, d) the interview as a manipulative dialogue, and e) the interviewer’s monopoly of interpretation (pp. 484-485). Each of these dimensions are considered to be elements of what Kvale (2004) called an “unreflective qualitative ethicism” (p. 165).

For this study, I was particularly concerned about the ways in which these issues of power might have played themselves out, not necessarily in the process of interviewing, but during the participant invitation phase. In essence, I was acutely aware that as a fundraiser in the field, I already had previous relationships with many of the participants, and that there could have been some ethical considerations in terms of trying to keep my ‘day job’ at arm’s length
from this study. I wanted to make sure that the interviews were not seen as a cultivation tool for fundraising, and that the IPHILs and IFVs, in particular, regarded me primarily as a doctoral student, not a professional fundraiser. To support these efforts, I did not reveal to my colleagues who I was meeting or the results of the conversation. When talking about my research, particularly, at the office, I would often speak in generalities – “My impression is that donors are...” or “I’m hearing that the fundraising sector could use more....” I also, somewhat deliberately, chose to appear in more casual clothing for my interviews, leaving my suit and tie at home.

In some cases, I was also aware that the CFLNPs and SAEDs would likely talk about their experiences with the IFVs or IPHILs that I interviewed, or vice versa. Indeed, in many of the interviews, I wound up learning about the two sides of the relationship – from the soliciting and giving perspectives. In an effort to treat these conversations with respect and confidentiality, I removed all references to names, organizations, and locations early on in the transcription and coding processes. This allowed me to treat the interviews “as is” and connect broader issues together, not as “so-and-so’s experience with so-and-so.”

I encountered three other ethical dilemmas during the fieldwork phase. First, one of the IPHILs suddenly passed away shortly after I completed my interview with him. I debated whether or not I should include his “voice” in this study as I did not have a chance to seek his input from my proposed member check. However, I consulted another doctoral student who had experienced the same situation with one of his participants only a few months before. Based on our discussion, I decided that this IPHIL’s perspective was too important to leave out. Second, one of the IPHILs I had planned to interview passed away shortly before our scheduled meeting. Several months after his death, I interviewed his wife, since it is well-known that their philanthropic decisions were often made as a couple. Third, during the research period, two of
the CFLNPs changed jobs, one moving from a large arts organization to a major healthcare institution, and the other moving for a national research institution to a major cultural organization. I debated whether or not I should use the data from their interviews since they no longer formally represent the organizations about which I wanted to learn more. However, in the end, I decided to include the data because their perspectives were, in effect, a snapshot of a particular time and their experiences were still valid.

Overall, the ethical review process at the University went quite smoothly, and I only had to revise one area due to some repetitive language in my sample invitation letter. I owe credit to my thesis committee for making this phase uneventful, with a special acknowledgement to Professor Alissa Trotz, who reviewed my submission with great precision and speed.

Study limitations

I have identified two limitations to this study. First, despite what some of my fundraising colleagues had recommended, I purposely chose not to focus on how philanthropy is understood and performed by a distinct racialized/cultural group. I was vehemently aware of the potential problem of creating a “profile” about one group and essentializing their interests through the lens of a relatively small sample size. Furthermore, I believed that interviewing one ‘group’ contained an undercurrent of insiderness-outsiderness, where the “observer went into a foreign setting to study the culture, customs, and habits of another human group. Often this was a group that stood in the way of white settlers. Ethnographic reports of these groups where [sic] incorporated into colonizing strategies, ways of controlling the foreign, deviant, or troublesome Other” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008, p. 2).

I also wanted to use this study as a way to understand the “lay of the land,” since there are no other qualitative studies to my knowledge that bring together the voices of various stakeholders on the topic of high net worth immigrants and philanthropy in Canada except for a
recent book by Chuck English and Mo Lidsky (2015) called *The Philanthropic Mind*, which draws on interviews with well-known philanthropists in Canada (including a small number of immigrant donors) in an effort to help fundraisers understand their motivations for giving. While there are a plethora of anthropological and sociological case studies on the giving behaviours of a variety of groups exist (see Licuanan, et al., 2015; Pollard et al., 2015; Brinkerhoff, 2014; Walton-Roberts, 2014; Baker et al., 2007; Merz et al., 2007; Copeland-Carson, 2005; Geithner et al., 2004), very few are based on immigrants in Canada (see Mehta & Johnston, 2011; Bloemraad, 2006; Mitchell, 2001; Mata & McRae, 2000). I preferred to keep the study parameters more broad than other philanthropy projects, because I believed that it was vital to establish a baseline on philanthropic and fundraising experiences in Toronto before delving into community-specific case studies.

Another limitation is that I did not seek the participation of relevant government representatives, who are, of course implicated in the development of policies and practices that surveil, coordinate, and manage the non-profit sector. I have incorporated studies and works by authors who have carefully tracked the role of the Canadian government in the charitable sector (see Phillips, 2013; Phillips, 2012; Finkel, 2006), particularly in Chapter 5; however, adding interview data from policy makers and elected officials would provide another perspective and help round out this study. While three interviews were with former public servants or figureheads (for example, campaign canvassers or senators) who are now IPHILs or IFVs or CFLNPs, an opportunity exists to extend the scope of this project to include current government-based decision makers on charitable giving and non-profit regulation.

**Reflexive statement**

Recently, I received an email from a colleague who was selling Girl Guide cookies on his daughter’s behalf, a text message from a friend asking me to sponsor her as she trained for a
charity run, and when I went to buy my morning coffee, I faced the coin drop box at the cash register. All of these “asks” occurred before 9 am! This is the world of fundraising we inhabit, where we have become somewhat accustomed to the constant stream of appeals – all for a good cause, of course. I am acutely aware of the ubiquity of charity, not only because of my “day job” in fundraising, but also because of the ways in which giving is embedded in our everyday interactions – as we engage with media and advertising, during our conversations at the workplace, and as we celebrate milestones with our families and friends. Even upon death, we are encouraged to donate to a charity in lieu of sending flowers.

Suffice it to say, nowadays there appears to be a charitable purpose for almost everything. Politicians ‘need’ money to support their campaigns, corporations ‘need’ their employees to support the United Way and other worthy charities, and post-secondary institutions ‘need’ funds to ensure that students have access to a top-notch education. In fact, I was the beneficiary of someone’s gift when I was an undergraduate student at the University of Toronto, almost twenty years ago. I was raised in a working class, immigrant family where the idea of going to university was the crowning symbol of success for my parents and community. But to make it happen, I had to take out loans and hold down three part-time jobs. Then, one day, someone from the registrar’s office called me to say that I had received a bursary and that I needed to come to an event to pick-up the cheque.

So there I was, surrounded all of these ‘society people’ who were sipping wine and chatting about the university’s incredible art collection. I was then introduced to the donors who funded my bursary. I had no idea that there was actually a person behind this gift! Why did they do this? Why was I chosen out of all the other students in my year? Who made this happen? Pan to the next scene, I was hauled into a photo op with the donor of my/his bursary, followed by a dinner where I was asked to describe my plans after graduation to ‘friends’ of the University. To
be honest, at that time I did not think too much about the behind-the-scenes events that led to that moment – I was simply delighted by the prospect that I could quit one of my jobs.

That summer, I secured a work placement in the advancement office at University College, where I helped organize alumni events, write articles for the donor magazine, and input donor information into a database. As I performed all of these functions, I observed the inner workings of a sophisticated fundraising machine. The University was in the midst of raising $1 billion, and there were so many huddles about who was going to be at the meeting with this donor, who needed to be briefed about that alumnus, and who needed to sit close to the dean at the reunion dinner.

Fast forward a couple of years, I graduated with a BA and BEd, and secured my first ‘real’ job in advancement, which was to help coordinate events and communications for anyone who had given $1 million or more to the University. (Yes, there was an entire team focused on this!) At these events, I noticed that I was often the only person of colour. During this time, I started my MA at OISE and began working at New College, which at that time was home to many of the diaspora and equity-oriented academic programs of the University. There, I noticed that there was an unique opportunity to engage people who cared about Women and Gender Studies, Equity Studies, and what was then called “area studies” (Caribbean, South Asian, and African Studies). I often said that New College represented the “social conscience of the university” and “if you’ve been infected or affected by colonialism, come on our way!” During my time at New College, I had the chance to meet a number of immigrant and diaspora movers and shakers who were giving money away in no insignificant sums, but they weren’t necessarily giving to equity and diaspora programs. I wanted to know why.

This project finds its roots in this early curiosity. However, as I began to think through this topic with other students, I began to question how these “realities” are created, the power
dynamics that inform the everyday, and who really benefits from diversity and inclusion. I also began to think about philanthropy in terms of the growing privatization of public goods and social welfare. How could something widely regarded as “selfless” have larger implications on the economy and politics locally, regionally, and even overseas?

As I pursued this question, I was often reminded about the conditionality of my own citizenship, despite the fact that I was born and raised in Canada. I will never forget an interaction I had with a well-known philanthropist at a fundraising gala. We talked for a little while and at the end of the conversation he said: “Christian, I want to say one thing to you: Welcome to Canada! Christian, where are you from?” I was taken aback and responded, “Well, I was born in North York, grew up in Ajax, and now live at Bay and Bloor. Where are YOU from?” It was a little awkward as he told me the story of his ancestors’ pilgrimage from the UK to Toronto, but we hugged and made up. For me, though, this was a valuable lesson: people see me as “ethnic” and “diverse.” Will this project of belonging ever end?

This study was also informed (and, frankly, slowed down) by a number of life experiences over the past nine years. My father was diagnosed with cancer and passed away, I came out to my entire family, I met my partner Michael and we bought a house together, and, more recently, my mother was also diagnosed with cancer (she is cancer-free now). I also changed jobs twice, taking up a serious fundraising and marketing role at Seneca College, and more recently, a position to raise funds at Ryerson University. Throughout this time, I had a chance to work on this project in different ways and reflect on my own role in this entire game: I remember my mom and dad driving me all over Ajax in the dead of winter so that I could go door-to-door selling wrapping paper for the Grade 8 school trip. I remember, during my pre-service practicum, how teachers reacted when the Ministry of Education enforced mandatory
volunteer service for Ontario students. And every day, in my job, I am reminded about the woeful underrepresentation of racialized people in privileged fundraising positions.

In June 2016, I will start my term as the board president of the AFP Greater Toronto Chapter, which is the largest network of fundraisers in the world. Over the last four years, I have been the co-chair of two AFP initiatives that have deep connections to this doctoral research. Together these projects received over $700,000 in government funding. The first initiative involved engaging donors and volunteers from twelve “diverse” communities in discussions about the role of philanthropy and fundraising within and outside their own community. The second initiative, which began in 2015, is a fellowship program to encourage people from Indigenous, racialized, and other minoritized backgrounds to pursue fundraising careers. This latter project is not about coopting people to become “expert fundraisers;” rather, its aim is to build a network of professionals who see fundraising from different angles and can help uncover the power and politics of giving.

This thesis is both the beginning and culmination of a journey to understand (and sometimes reconcile) my own role in this highly charged, dynamic, and elusive field. As I make a commitment to exploring this topic further and engaging more actors in this field, I am acutely aware that new issues and concerns are challenging the non-profit sector – the use of technology, heighten concerns about privacy, the growth of ‘activist’ donors, a competitive funding environment, the need for more experienced fundraisers, the integration of new revenue development models, concerns about the cost of fundraising, government surveillance activities on charities, and the unpredictability of the media in its reporting of fundraising. While I have tried to touch on all of these issues in this thesis, I acknowledge that each could (and should) be treated as separate studies. For now, however, I remain excited about the possibilities of drawing
on this piece of research to help articulate how these complexities are redefining the field of charitable giving in Canada and beyond.
Chapter 3: The Gift Reconsidered: Negotiating Between Hospitality, Philanthropy, and Citizenship

Chapter overview

“People give to people” and “fundraising is all about relationships” are but two clichés that many fundraisers rely on when speaking about the essence of charitable giving. While there rests some truth in these axioms, what becomes abundantly clear – from a sociological perspective – is that fundraising success depends on social relations that are characterized and governed by solidarizing binaries. To put it simply, the performance of giving distinguishes benefactors from beneficiaries, rich from poor, and the old establishment from the new. What role, then, does charitable giving play in reimagining the figure of the foreigner or immigrant? How is elite diaspora philanthropy influencing and reorganizing these power dynamics? Drawing on forty interviews with immigrant philanthropists, immigrant fundraising volunteers, chief fundraisers of large non-profits, and settlement agency executive directors, all based in Toronto, Canada, this chapter aims to articulate the complexity of giving relative to ideological expectations of belonging and citizenship. In the following pages, I rely on Jacques Derrida’s extensive writings on hospitality and the gift to explore how immigrant philanthropy is turning the tables on what it means to be a generous Canadian and the limits contained within this problematic. The data suggests that new forms and dimensions of othering become more pronounced as affluent immigrants adopt these monikers, giving way to a number of new questions about the efficacy of charitable giving as a force for social good. At the end of this chapter, I will highlight the implications of these findings on the broader study of philanthropy and modern practices of fundraising.
Introduction

As discussed in Chapter 1, giving is popularly characterized as an altruistic and voluntary expression of benevolence that has little to do with the strategic advancement of neoliberalism or consumer-based citizenship. The public rollout of patriotic celebrations of philanthropy alongside a steady stream of donation requests suggest that giving is unlike other forms of economic exchange, appealing to the moral and civic inclinations of individuals who simply want to “give back, “pay it forward,” “do good,” or “make a difference.” Arguably, these turn of phrases serve as pacifying and distracting agents that give anonymity to the structures behind the root causes of the environmental, social, and political injustices that dot the globe today. In effect, I propose that this study serves as an unveiling and interpretation of the politics that underpin these acts of kindness.

Against this backdrop, how can we insert the relatively new issue of charitable giving in already advanced discussions about race, class, gender, marketplace development, and identity politics? What role can philanthropy studies play in the broader mapping of citizenship, migration, and colonialism? While several early studies have exposed the ways in which giving has served as a strategic tool for white settler colonization (see Hewa, 1995; Rainger, 1980; Van Horne, 1985) and gender inequity (see McCarthy, 1990; Galaskiewicz & Burt, 1991; Lal, 1994; McCarthy, 1996; Tananbaum, 1997), the emergence of major fundraising campaigns, particularly in North America and Europe, over the past twenty years has generated an explosion of case studies that have uncovered the growing collusion between governments, corporations, and elite actors – all in the name of charity. *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded* (Incite! Women of Color Against Violence, 2007) is a foundational text in this regard, detailing the curious and damaging impact of private/corporate giving for public benefit. Subsequently, a burgeoning group of activists and scholars have turned their attention to the problem of the charitable
industrial complex relative to global economic uncertainties, foreign threats to national security, forced migration, extreme climate change, and racialized and indigenous death at the hands of authorities. In reading many of these works, I am reminded of Stuart Hall’s (2011) statement about injustices created by capitalism: “State-led social engineering must never prevail over corporate and private interests. It must not intervene in the natural mechanisms of the free market or take as its objective the amelioration of capitalism’s propensity to create inequality” (p. 706). Indeed, it is at this very intersection – between profit and inequality, between public and private, between belonging and othering – that this project finds its place.

Over the last decade, a new strand of charitable interest has preoccupied the imaginations of corporate, non-profit, and government agencies: the giving capacity of “diverse” bodies, most notably racialized immigrants and white queer men and women. As mentioned elsewhere in this dissertation, much of this attention stems from a growing realization that a different flavour of middle class and affluent citizenry has emerged, one with tremendous buying power and political influence (Witeck & Combs, 2006; Pires & Stanton, 2014; Rao & Kurtz, 2015). Often referred to as the “new establishment,” these consumer communities pose both a challenge and an opportunity for governments and corporations as they determine how best to harness the potential of these groups without compromising the expansionist logic of neoliberalism. Within major immigrant receiving metropoles, this move is often coded within the language of diversity and inclusion, which tends to appeal to cosmopolitan sensibilities around community building, civic action, and citizenship rights. Those who supposedly deviate from these norms, then, are subject to social abjection, incarceration, or even unceremonious deportation. As Barry Vaughan (2000) surmised: “The development of the prison, as an alternative to capital punishment, is the story of how a burgeoning middle class tried to impose their own standards of behavior on those
who were thought to be worthy of inclusion in society but not yet able to take their place voluntarily” (p. 28).

In Canada, the notion of conditional citizenship is particularly palpable in this contemporary moment. Recently, the federal government passed Bill C-24 whereby dual citizenship holders could be stripped of their Canadian citizenship based on insinuations of what may be deemed unsavory or threatening behaviour. This bill recalls Himani Bannerji’s (2000) observations about the fragility and tentative nature of citizenship:

Living in a nation does not, by definition, provide one with prerogative to “imagine it.”

From the very inception of democracy, Athenian and after, the making of a national imagination, the construction of its ideological political form and content, has been conditional….Being working class, “raced” or of a particular gender all restrict access to citizenship in the here and now by modifying the conditions of freedom, property and literacy. (Bannerji, 2000, pp. 66-67)

However, do the rules of citizenship change when it comes to immigrant elites or “transnationals from above” (Portes, Guarnizo & Landolt, 1999; Vertovec, 1999)? How do model minorities feed into the stratification of citizenship? In an effort to begin grappling with these questions, I would like briefly focus on several recent policy decisions that have been developed with the ultra-high net worth in mind. In January 2015, the Canadian government quietly announced the launch of the Immigrant Investor Venture Capital (IIVC) program under which sixty migrants each with a net worth of at least $10 million would be granted permanent residency if they would commit to making $2 million investment into an IIVC fund. In a written statement, then-immigration minister Chris Alexander noted, “This pilot program is designed to attract immigrant investors who will significantly benefit the Canadian economy and better integrate into our society, which will contribute to our long-term prosperity and economic growth” (Mas,
In May 2015, Citizenship and Immigration Canada announced an extension to the program, allowing another 120 millionaire migrants to apply for what I call “express lane citizenship.” In the US, a similar initiative, the EB-5 Immigrant Investor program, provides front-of-the-line green card access for those who can invest a minimum of $1 million in ventures or businesses. Finally, in the UK, the Tier 1 (Investor) Visa program is designed for migrants who can invest a minimum of £2 million. These pull factors have given rise to a new class of immigrants who clearly do not share the same rags-to-riches narratives as many of the economic immigrants who arrived thirty and forty years ago. More symbolic, however, is the renewed hope a burgeoning resource-rich establishment can offer nation-states on the perpetual brink of financial collapse. And as this promise permeates across the entire economic base, charities are taking a serious look at how this untapped potential can impact fundraising success.

Needless to say, various biases and false assumptions have informed the field of charitable giving as well. For example, in some of the fundraising circles I travel in, I have repeatedly heard that “X community isn’t charitable” or “Y community doesn’t believe in giving.” These perceptions are simply untrue and, for me, contain undercurrents of racism and xenophobia. In fact, giving traditions and expressions of voluntary action are found in every culture (Merz et al., 2007). Modern institutionalized philanthropy in the Global North finds its roots in Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian values of fraternity, asceticism, and salvation that have, over time, mingled with advanced capitalism and governments to produce the non-profit sector as we know it today. Gift exchange and charitable giving are central features of all organized cultural practices, and gift giving has deep anthropological roots based on local norms of giving and reciprocity (see Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011; Brooks, 2003). To say that the practice of giving is more pronounced in one community over another undermines the value of other charitable acts, namely, volunteering and anonymous philanthropy. As I mentioned in
Chapter 1, Marcel Mauss’ (2011) celebrated study (first published in 1954) of gift giving in what he called “archaic societies” has served as an important primer for many scholars who have paid close attention to the implications and variations of these exchanges on media simulacra, commodity fetishism, financialized aid, and race relations (Baudrillard, 2007; Granovetter & Swedberg, 2001; Wolfe, 1989; De Fina et al., 2006). Speaking to this point, Ilana Silber (2009) rightfully asserted that, “The gift, in brief, is a fundamental cornerstone in a rich and complex theoretical edifice” (p. 187).

Even though Mauss is credited for initiating a serious debate on gift exchange within a number of disciplines, Dana Freibach-Heifetz, (2008) pointed out that nearly forty years earlier, Friedrich Nietzsche had begun to unravel these topics in Thus Spoke Zarathustra (Nietzsche & Kaufmann, 1995), in which she observed that, “Generosity, for Nietzsche, is a Dionysian self-waste without calculation without purpose other than the very spending of itself. It flows freely from a beneficent individual regardless of the beneficiary, in an impersonal way” (p. 398). For most well-known writers of gift exchange – from Nietzsche and Mauss to Bourdieu and Derrida – an element of “preserving solidarity” (Flynn, 2005, p. 367) pervades; a solidarity that pays distinct attention to the economics of binary class consciousness within a wide variety of historical and contemporary contexts.

Since this study centres on elite diaspora mobility and philanthropy, the subject of giving is not so much about the benign nature of exchange as it is about the problem of host-foreigner dynamics, shadow state development, cross-border cooperation efforts, and the cooption of racialized and ethnicized bodies to advance white supremacy. This is particularly salient in the location from which I am writing, Toronto, Ontario, which is the financial capital of Canada and longstanding destination for migrants from all over the world. Toronto is also a charitable powerhouse and home to many of the country’s mega-fundraising campaigns, not to mention the
largest professional association of fundraisers in the world. It is indeed the confluence of these elements (and others described more fully in Chapter 2) that not only bring to life Mauss’ belief that “gift giving is a culturally embedded phenomenon” (Larsen & Watson, 2001, p. 898), but also makes room for greater critical analysis and dialogue.

For me, this milieu begets a number of practical questions: How does this new philanthropic community influence the capacity of charities and shadow state organizations? What is the role of the government, corporations, and the non-profit sector in regulating these institutions and the actors within them? How are these exchanges tested and resisted? And how do these forces reify philanthropy as an elite activity that crosses regional and international borders? In an effort of explore these questions further, I rely on Derrida’s writings on hospitality and gift exchange, not only because they have the potential to aid in naming the power structures within a modern charitable context, but also because I believe that they can provide a refreshing take on how diaspora philanthropy is researched and understood within non-profit studies. Moreover, a focus on hospitality and gift exchange makes way for deeper understandings of how charities themselves are reinforcing agents of prescribed stratified relations, primarily between benefactors and beneficiaries, old and new guards, insiders and outsiders, and other binary groupings found within the sector. This is particularly instructive within the broader spectrum of migration and settlement studies where “new global population flows brought about by neoliberalism” (Hogeveen & Freistadt, 2013, p. 39) call on us to revisit the norms of philanthropic social relations within the context of economic globalization.

Power and hospitality

Several scholars have drawn connections between Derrida’s upbringing and his enduring commitment to deconstruction and semiotics (see Peeters & Brown, 2013; Malabou & Derrida, 2004; Todd, 1990). On one level, it would make sense that the Algerian-born philosopher would
have been deeply influenced by witnessing the undoing of France’s colonizing exploits at the turn of the century or by his early readings of Sartre. However, Derrida himself questioned the relevance of such biographical comparisons, even though one of the goals of deconstruction is to draw on anthropo-biographical approaches to understand various phenomenological issues. As Simon Glendinning (2011) pointed out,

Any effort to engage with the biography of Jacques Derrida would have to take into account that the person whose life is the object of its study had a lot to say about the biographical genre, and, in fact, regularly insisted that, especially with respect to the lives of philosophers, there is very little value in the idea of seeking an accounting of ‘so-and-so’s text’ by thinking one can simply refer to what went on in the ‘real life’ of the existences of flesh and bone. (Glendinning, 2011, p. 3)

Correspondingly, I believe that deconstruction is not so much a “preferred weapon of attack” (Drolet, 2007, p. 236) as it is an offering that speaks to Derrida’s commitment to uncovering the processes that produce and sustain social relations. How could anyone resist from seeing this as a product of maneuvering through our modern world? Followers of Derrida continue to believe that deconstruction is an effective method for exposing how actors interpret and interpellate the roles they play. Pronounced throughout his oeuvre is a longing to secure a voice for the subaltern or what Andrew Shepherd (2014) called a “transcendence of the other” (p. 13). In this pursuit, Derrida found that social solidarity also produced social isolation, an extricable aporia that cuts across all interactions, rendering this notion of transcendence impossible. However, Derrida did not call for wide-sweeping anarchy, as some may be inclined to believe. As Michael Naas (2005) put it,

Often mischaracterized as a philosophy of negation or even destruction, deconstruction can perhaps best be described as a philosophy of affirmation, an affirmation of what is
best in the tradition and of what is most living in life. A philosophy, therefore, of thoughtful and responsible reflection and reception a thinking par excellence of hospitality. (Naas, 2005, p. 11)

Hospitality sets Derrida apart from other critical theorists of his time and, for this study, makes way for new critiques of modern charitable giving. For Mark Westmoreland (2008), “Throughout most of Derrida’s work, there lurks an oasis of hospitality, sometimes on the verge of the horizon” (p. 1). While true, what often surfaces to the top is Derrida’s position on the nature of language. According to Michael Tratner (2003),

In *Of Grammatology*, Derrida credits numerous fields, including philosophy (Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Husserl), linguistics (Saussure), ethnography (Levi-Strauss), and psychology (Freud). To this list, let’s add economics, citing Keynes, who marks the end of production as the basis of economics, but who maintains the belief that individuals in powerful enough positions can still act to counter the effects of the system, and Friedman, who brings in the notion that the sign system operates separate from any individual agency. (Tratner, 2003, p. 804)

For Derrida, language was not only an expression of power, but was power in and of itself. Serge Margel (2014) explained this further in his insightful discussion about the power of vocabulary: “...In the construction of a lexicon is the power it gives to the word... the recognition of the power of words: the power to say, obviously, the power to do, as well as the power to undo, to counter, to contradict, and especially this quasiphantasmatic power to bring about [de faire venir]” (p. 254). Along these lines, Nick Peim (2013) stated that “deconstruction is a revolutionary way of thinking... [It] means being open to rupture in the name of both critique and creativity” (p. 181). I propose that Derrida’s ideas about hospitality, when applied to philanthropy studies, begs us to politicize what is commonly observed as a simple act of
benevolence, to *de faire venir* a new understanding of gift exchange. Derrida believed that this collusion of hospitality and power was “in its finitude, which is to say the necessity, for the host, for the one who receives, of choosing, electing, filtering, selecting their invitees, visitors, or guests, those to whom they decide to grant asylum, the right of visiting, or hospitality” (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, p. 55).

George Pavlich (2005) pointed out that, “‘Hospitality’ is rooted in the Latin word *hospitale* connoting ‘of a guest’ and from *hospitare*, ‘to receive as a guest’” (p. 104). While Derrida’s interest in hospitality stemmed from this etymological stream, he was also influenced by Émile Benveniste’s (1969) claim that “hospitality” derived from two Indo-European words that refer to “stranger” and “power.” According to John Caputo (2002), “an essential ‘self-limitation’ [is] built right into the idea of hospitality, which preserves the distance between one’s own and the ‘stranger,’ between owning one’s own property and inviting the ‘other’ into one’s home” (p. 110). For Derrida this meant that hospitality inherently elicits some hostility, constituting what he called “hostipitality.” He described this phenomenon in the following way: “If I say ‘Welcome,’ I am not renouncing my mastery, something that becomes transparent in people whose hospitality is a way of showing off how much they own or who make their guests uncomfortable and afraid to touch a thing” (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, p. 13).

In *Of Hospitality* (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000), Derrida argued that all social interactions have at least one actor who plays the role of host while the other adopts the role of the foreigner who is always subject to the welcoming acts and gestures of the host. This “différance” is at the heart of all exchanges and, as I will later explain, informs the culture of gift exchange and charitable giving. Marilyn Low and Pat Palulis (2006) underlined an important connection between différance and othering within the context of semiotics. They stated: “Signs circulating, signaling from the inside out and outside in cross borders in the language of home
and the language of learning (English) – where the \( a \) of a différance puts into play the foreignness of the other, inciting multiple and complex movements of signification – languages-in-translation – yet desiring his own language instead of allowing his language affected by the foreign tongue” (p. 55).

Derrida noted that the host has preconceived expectations that inform how the both parties perform their respective roles:

That is where the question of hospitality begins: we must ask the foreigner to understand us, to speak our language, in all senses of this term, in all its possible extensions, before being able and so as to be able to welcome him into our country? If he was already speaking our language, with all that that implies, if we already shared everything that is shared with a language, would the foreigner still be a foreigner and could we speak of asylum or hospitality in regard to him? (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, pp. 16-17)

The deconstruction of “hospitality” fueled Derrida’s ideas about the “intentional experience” (Derrida, 2000, p. 8) of its etymology, and its impact on everything from mundane micro-level binary engagements all the way up to government policies and practices. For this reason, “hostipitality” better describes the impact of hospitality.

Given that there is an intergenerational or genealogical element to this particular study of immigrant charitable giving, Derrida’s ideas behind the creation of a pact through hospitality are particularly relevant to us for a couple of reasons. First, pacts lead to the development of rules, which in turn create the institutions that regulate host-foreigner relations. In an interview with Dominique Dhombres (2005), Derrida articulated the connections between the pact to gift exchange and immigration laws:

Whence the ‘conditions’ which transform the gift into a contract, the opening into a policed pact; whence the rights and the duties, the borders, passports and doors, whence
the immigration laws, since immigration must, it is said, be ‘controlled’. It must be remembered that the stakes of ‘immigration’ do not in all rigour coincide with those of hospitality which reach beyond the civic or properly political space. (Dhombres, 2005, p. 6)

Second, Derrida pointed out that the foreigner moniker travels along genealogies and lineages. Accordingly, race, gender, and language bind (or create a pact) across generations, keeping foreigners as guests and others as outsiders, no matter how long one has lived in the host’s home. He stated:

> It is not here, although the things are connected, a question of the classical problem of the rights to nationality or citizenship as a birthright – in some places linked to the land and in others to blood. It is not only a question of the citizenship offered to someone who had none previously, but of the right granted to the foreigner as such, to the foreigner remaining a foreigner, and to his or her relatives, to the family, to descendants. (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, pp. 22-23)

It is important to clarify Derrida’s intentions and personal orientation on this topic. For him, hospitality had nothing to do with privileging or valorizing the nation-state and its hosts; after all, he was not a “playful nihilist” (Stoll, 1999, p. 344). In fact, the converse is true. Naas (2005) pointed out that Derrida wanted to ensure “one must extend the rights and protections of citizenship to as many as possible at the same time as one submits these notions to critique” (pp. 30-31). It is also important to point out that the project of hospitality does not only concern nation-states, but also corporate entities, which hold great control in establishing and maintaining host-foreigner relations. These are carried out by schemes like the temporary foreign worker and live-in caregiver programs, which serve as a kind of antidote to waning economic and capitalist production. I will expand on this proposition in another section of this chapter.
Derrida’s explanation of conditional and absolute hospitality offers additional clarity to the inherent structuration of power between hosts and guests, and makes way for a few new observations about how elite mobility and philanthropy blur the lines between these groupings. He made a definitive distinction between the two regimes of hospitality:

...Absolute hospitality requires that I open up my home and that I give not only to the foreigner (provided with a family name, with the social status of being a foreigner, etc.), but to the absolute, unknown, anonymous other, and that I give place to them, that I let them come, that I let them arrive, and take place in the place I offer them, without asking of either their reciprocity (entering into a pact) or even their names. The law of absolute hospitality commands a break with hospitality by right, with law or justice as rights. Just hospitality breaks with hospitality by right, not that it condemns or is opposed to it, and it can on the contrary set and maintain it in a perpetual progressive movement; but it is as strangely heterogeneous to it as justice is heterogeneous to the law to which it is yet so close, from which truth it is indissociable. (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, pp. 26-27)

Conversely, unconditional hospitality gives way to an interaction without expectations of conformity or reciprocity, giving little or no credence to the issue of power:

The unconditional or hyperbolical on the one hand, and the conditional and juridico-political, even the ethical, on the other: ethics in fact straddling the two, depending on whether the living environment is governed by fixed principles of respect or donation, or by exchange, proportion, a norm, etc. (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, pp. 136-137)

Can unconditional hospitality, then, really be a form of hospitality at all? In search for an alternative, an aporia or philosophical deadlock came into play for Derrida, where unconditional hospitality simply cannot exist because of the impossibility to free oneself from host-foreigner relations. Bryan Hogeveen and Joshua Freistadt (2013) pointed out that the binary, symbiotic
nature of hospitality writ-large renders absolute hospitality a redundant proposition: “Hospitality, whether conditional or absolute, originates in encounters with an Other who appears at our threshold” (p. 43). Richard Kearney (2004) highlighted how this aporia is further manifested in reconciliation efforts: “When I am for any kind of negotiating between these unconditional and absolute thoughts and the conditional, then I become juridical and political – then I am of course with the side of the best possible reconciliation – which is, nevertheless, always very difficult” (p. 5). Derrida admitted that this is an ethical dilemma where hospitality takes precedence over (and therefore informs and governs) morality. He stated, “So we should now examine the situations where not only is hospitality coextensive with ethics itself, but where it can seem that some people, as it has been said, place the law of hospitality above a ‘morality’ or a certain ‘ethics’” (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, p. 151).

Derrida’s concept of aporia does not go uncontested. Camil Ungureanu (2013), for example, took up his all-or-nothing perspective on hospitality, particularly as it relates to gratuities, charitable giving, and other forms of voluntary acts:

Derrida’s understanding of gratuity as unconditionality is premised on his injection of a Kant-like metaphysical purism into the heart of common practice. By regarding gratuity as a negative absolute, Derrida “purifies” it of any content, determination, or representation whatsoever. This view of gratuity as a sort of Kantian “noumenon” mirrors the category mistakes at the root of the notion of conditionality. If conditionality is a catch-all concept, unconditionality is a reject-all one. (Ungureanu, 2013, pp. 403-404)

This idea is important because it evokes the issue of agency into the discussion about host-foreigner relations, a topic that is glaringly absent throughout Derrida’s oeuvre. Does the outsider possess any free will? Can he or she express self-determination independent of his or her relationship to the host? For Derrida, there was no escaping the prescribed roles of the
foreigner because of consanguinity: “Usually, the foreigner, the foreign citizen, the foreigner to
the family or the nation, is defined on the basis of birth; whether citizenship is given or refused
on the basis of territorial law or the law of blood relationship, the foreigner is a foreigner by
birth, is a born foreigner” (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, p. 87).

Despite these questions, Derridean hospitality theory remains a useful framework for
identifying power hierarchies between donors and beneficiaries, fundraisers and volunteers, and
corporations and non-profits. A focus on hospitality also helps us problematize and debunk any
notions of corporatized private charitable giving as a social leveler. While Derrida’s ideas on
hospitality have primarily been used to analyze historical and contemporary government policies
(see Haque, 2012; de Ville, 2010; Carroll, 2007; Wise, 2002), Andrew Kaufmann (2014) rightly
pointed out that “it could also refer to an order that is specifically non-political: family life, non-
governmental organizations, and transnational institutions all of which are committed to an ethic
our thinking about the other through the lens of absolute hospitality might encourage more
ethical and just ways of being with and relating to strangers who approach our thresholds” (p.
44). These endorsements are particularly relevant to this study as they call on us to unearth the
influence of social relations based on philanthrocapitalism.

**Politcizing the gift**

Derrida’s take on hospitality is particularly instructive for this study when brought into
conversation with another theoretical preoccupation of his: the nature and aporia of gift giving.
In *Given Time: I. Counterfeit Money* (1992), he deconstructed and critiqued the gift-focused
writings of Heidegger, Mauss, and Baudelaire to show that the gift creates an inextricable circle
of exchange and obligation, making true giving impossible. He also drew on various narratives to
highlight the primacy of finance in modern gift exchange. Simply put, all gifts require money
and all money is traded for goods, commodities, and other forms of capital. These interactions create a sociality bound by capitalism and consumption. Just as a focus on hospitality makes way for critical discussions about social stratification and stimulates resistance to the status quo, the same could be said about the gift as well. As Claudia Ruitenbergh (2014) pointed out, “...Hospitality for Derrida is an event and a gift that ruptures such an economy of exchange. It is a principle of radical openness to the other, and to otherness more generally, with the understanding that this principle can never be fulfilled” (p. 150). For this very reason, this section pays substantive attention to Derrida’s ideas on the gift.

I would like to begin with an overview of Baudelaire’s story, *Counterfeit Money* (1992), which Derrida used as a primer for his ideas on giving. The story – only a page in length – resembles a short scene of a play that describes a brief exchange followed by the narrator’s soliloquy. The story is as follows: Upon leaving a tobacco shop, two men stumble upon a beggar on the street. The first man (the narrator) gives a small coin to the beggar while the other tosses a larger amount. As the men walk away, the latter admits, with bravado, that his coin was counterfeit. The story ends with the narrator’s commentary on the unconscionable and unforgiveable actions of his companion:

I looked him squarely in the eyes and I was appalled to see that his eyes shone with unquestionable candor. I then saw clearly that his aim had been to do a good deed while at the same time making a good deal; to earn forty cents and the heart of God; to win paradise economically; in short, to pick up gratis the certificate of a charitable man. I could have almost forgiven him the desire for the criminal enjoyment of which a moment before I assumed him capable; I would have found something bizarre, singular in his amusing himself by compromising the poor; but I will never forgive him the ineptitude of his calculation. To be mean is never excusable, but there is some merit in knowing that
For Derrida, this story not only highlighted the immorality of the so-called charitable man, but also pointed to a specific othering process that was initiated by the tossing of a fake coin. It would, of course, be impossible for the beggar to benefit from the supposed generosity of the donor. Here, the two men adopted the virtuous saviour-like role of benefactor/donor, while the beggar became subject not only to them but perhaps to the law as well, especially if he attempted to purchase something with his newly found fortune. Eventually, another level of othering or distancing occurred as well – between the two friends. However, the narrator expressed some ambiguity and empathy for the actions of his companion. Derrida (1992) explained that, “The narrator seeks first of all to make excusable that which his friend has just confessed to him, perhaps triumphantly” (p. 157). This moment of solidarity recalls an earlier point about the development of the pact between hosts. Here, we are shown the resilience of pacts between benefactors as well. There remains some tension within this pact; the narrator’s desire to create and uphold a certain class solidary temporarily suspends his morality. However, this is a fleeting sentiment for the narrator, who ends his sermon with didactic purpose. For Niva Arav (2015), the friend “betrays the essence of friendship which is the guarantee for the existence of any society, because a sort of friendship precedes every law or agreement, and sets the condition for moral and political relationships” (p. 2). Friendship and forgiveness were, of course, aporias for Derrida too (see Derrida, 2005; Derrida, 2001). In the end, Baudelaire left us imagining “ad infinitum” (Derrida, 1992, p. 157) what may happen next in his unfinished tale. Did the narrator call out his friend? Did he replace the counterfeit coin with a real one? Or did he ignore the situation entirely? This kind of cliffhanger is a hallmark of Derrida’s analyses, which is sometimes referred to as “destinerrance.” For Hillis Miller (2006), “destinerrance is like a loose
thread in a tangled skein that turns out to lead to the whole ball of yarn. It could therefore generate a potentially endless commentary” (pp. 893-894). Indeed, any discussion about the “impossible possibility” (Ungureanu, 2013, p. 393) would lead to this philosophical deadlock, an existential aporia that renders all social relations as vulnerable and problematic.

Derrida’s analysis of Counterfeit Money followed a lengthy critique of Mauss’s work on the gift or the “impossibility of the gift” (Derrida, 1992, p. 12). How did Derrida define the gift relative to Mauss? What are the conditions behind gift giving? Are there exceptions to this inextricable circle of obligation? To explore these questions, I would like to turn our attention to the opening pages of Given Time where Derrida called on his readers to critique the very essence of giving:

For there to be a gift, it is necessary [il faut] that the donee not give back, amortize, reimburse, acquit himself, enter into a contract, and that he never have contracted a debt. (This “it is necessary” is already the mark of a duty, a debt owed, of the duty-not-to [le devoir de-ne-pas]: The donee owes it to himself even not to give back, he ought not owe [il a le devoir de ne pas devoir] and the donor ought not count on restitution.) It is thus necessary, at the limit, that he not recognize the gift as gift. If he recognizes it as a gift, if the gift appears to him as such, if the present is present to him as present, this simple recognition suffices to annul the gift. Why? Because it gives back, in the place, let us say that the symbolic re-constitute an exchange and annuls the gift in the debt. It does not re-constitute an exchange, which, because it no longer takes place as exchange of things or goods, would be transfigured into a symbolic exchange. (Derrida, 1992, p. 13)

It should come as no surprise that a committed deconstructionist would criticize Mauss for ignoring the impact and value of etymologizing the gift: “[Mauss’] essay... begins more and more to look like an essay not on the gift but on the word ‘gift’” (Derrida, 1992, p. 55).
Of the major critical theorists, it appears as though Derrida and Bourdieu were the most preoccupied with Mauss’s writings on the gift (Ungureanu, 2013; Berking, 1999); however, each casted a considerably different light on the topic. Bourdieu called gift exchange “a collective hypocrisy in and through which society pays homage to its dream of virtues and disinterestedness...” (2001, p. 152). Bourdieu came to this conclusion through an analysis of the gift in creating and substantiating group solidarity. For him, giving was a form of capital that defined or characterized class consciousness. From his *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1977) to *Logic of Practice* (1990) and *Pascalian Mediations* (2001), Bourdieu seemed to move from a critical, social justice orientation to a broader economic analysis on social relations – a “twofold truth” (Bourdieu, 2000) driven by context and local norms. As Terry Evens (1999) explained, “The truth that structural objectivism excludes the ‘full truth’ is the temporal ‘structure’ of gift exchange. It is this structure, argues Bourdieu, that allows a pattern of exchange ever open to definition as reversible to be experienced and presented as irreversible, that is, as a gift” (p. 22). Ilana Silber (2009) also observed a definite shift in Bourdieu’s treatment of the gift, stating that his last writings on the topic displayed a “richer understanding” and deeper consideration for the “more subtleties and ambiguities in the subjective experience itself” (p. 183). Ultimately, both Bourdieu’s and Derrida’s notions of the gift have a counter-establishment appeal, exposing the false consciousness of those who reify benevolence and those who interpellate need. In reviewing Bourdieu’s work on the gift, Ungureanu (2013) showed that, “The neoliberal worship of egoistic profit should be counterbalanced by civic virtues and solidarity understood as members’ collective disposition to offer ‘disinterested’ gifts to the group” (p. 396). The same could be said of Derrida’s take on the gift; in fact, he rightfully critiqued Mauss’ discourse as “valoriz(ing) the generosity of the giving-being” (Derrida, 1992, p. 44).
Unlike Bourdieu, however, Derrida remained resolute about the “impossibility of the gift” from the first publication of *Given Time* to his final writings. For him, giving was a tool that created solidarity through the process of othering. Drawing on Jacques Baudrillard (1994), Derrida stated that, “Even if the gift were never anything but a simulacrum, one must still *render an account* (his emphasis) of the possibility of this simulacrum and of the desire that impels toward this simulacrum” (Derrida, 1992, p. 31). Indeed, Baudrillard and Derrida seemed to share a similar existential platform, what has also been described as a “singular politics” (Evans, 2014). However, unlike Baudrillard, Derrida gave great credence to the very palpable and questionable effects of stratified social relations. In fact, his aporia is rooted in a frustration about the inescapability of class, race, and production based on the conditionality of gift exchange – not just the dizzying “odyssey of the circle” (Derrida, 1999, p. 24) of giving, giving back, and counter-gifting.

According to Derrida, there were two ways in which the problem of the “annulled” gift could be settled: the act of forgetting about giving and anonymous gifting. Regarding the latter, when the beneficiary is oblivious to the gift giver and when the donor does not know to whom the gift is directed, then and only then may the odyssey be broken. Following, Derrida admitted that in anonymity there is always the gift because of the selfish intentionality of giving and receiving. In his reading of Derrida, Jeffrey Kosky (1997) noted that “the gift is this phenomenological impossibility and thus confirms that the field of possibility measured by intentionality is not unconditional” (p 189). Similarly, when it comes to the issue of forgetting the gift, Derrida again grounded his discourse in the primacy and omniscience of the gift as a force: “For there to be forgetting in this sense, there must be the gift. The gift would also be the condition of forgetting” (Derrida, 1992, p. 17).
Since Derrida’s ideas about the gift had (all at once) everything and nothing to do with the binary positioning of the benefactor and beneficiary, students of his have had ample opportunity to air their grievances and suggest alternatives. One of my own criticisms of Derrida is that he seemed to confuse the gift as a donation of cash or monetized assets with alms. While all forms of exchange could easily find a suitable place under the larger rubric of giving, donations are managed, packaged, and regulated very differently than sacrificial gifts or remittances. The dowry system is another form of economic exchange that is considered more problematically than simple gift giving. In essence, fundraising and modern gift exchange is deeply embedded in monetary systems, state funding mechanisms, and bureaucratized institutional development that inform and bind social relations.

Derrida also had a vague notion of what constitutes the “gift economy.” Tratner (2003) surmised that Derrida’s critics tended to centre their arguments on his simple and guileless sense of the economy, which was grounded in an early-industrial period of economic production. At the same time, Derrida’s thin take on the relationship between the gift and capitalism underscored a deep philosophical tension amongst pro-Keynesian and neoclassical economists from this period: “So one might think that Derrida... is returning to the 1860s, not joining in the developments of the 1970s. Actually, the two possibilities can coexist, because the economists who challenged Keynes in the 1970s claimed to be returning to the economic theories of the latter half of the nineteenth century” (Tratner, 2003, pp. 797-798). Derrida (1992) criticized Mauss for casting the exchanged gift as only a “tit for tat” (p. 37) and for ignoring the annulment of the gift, the ultimate paradox of the gift economy; but what he missed was the historical context Mauss was writing about, a “primitive” economy where finance and capital appeared much later, as banking systems were just emerging as formal entities. Mauss, in fact, surmised that finance was not central to the gift within the societies he was studying, and that giving writ-
large was steeped in obligation, celebration, and ritual – not in the “economy” as we define it today. Derrida’s overall understanding of the economy also falls short of providing anything more than an etymology of the word itself:

What is economy? Among its irreducible predicates or semantic values, economy no doubt includes the values of law (nemos) and of home (oikos, home, property, family, the hearth, the fire indoors). Nomos does not only signify the law in general, but also the law of distribution (nemein), the law of sharing or partition [partage], the law as partition (moira), the given or assigned part, participation. Another sort of tautology already implies the economic within the nomic as such. As soon as there is law, there is partition: as soon as there in nomy, there is economy. Besides the values of law and home, of distribution and participation, economy implies the idea of exchange, of circulation, of return. (Derrida, 1992, p. 6)

Even though Derrida may have left his readers questioning the actual role of the economy on the gift, he made certain that we saw connections between gift exchange and laws – formal rules and customs – that regulate and institutionalize the gift. He surmised, “As donee or donor, the Other would keep, bind himself, obligate himself, indebt himself according to the law and the order of the symbolic, according to the figure of circulation, even as the conditions of the gift... would have been fulfilled” (Derrida, 1992, p. 15). This is an important statement filled with analytical complexity, especially as we consider the role of modern philanthropy in the valorization of elite subjects. For this study, the norms of gift exchange, along with the very act of gift giving, creates holes in his pat sense of host- and guest-making. And, as I explain in the second half of this chapter, the entire of subject of hospitality is complicated by the gift.
A brief note on Derridean-oriented research methods

While Chapter 2 offers a detailed overview of the research methodology employed in this study, throughout my readings of Derrida and his proponents/critics, I have come to appreciate the nuances of qualitative analysis using a Derridean lens. Before I layout and interpret the interview data, I would like to highlight a couple of unique Derrida-inspired takes on human research in an effort to unearth the inherent political themes contained within the study of philanthropy, hospitality, and the gift.

Even though Derrida did not explicitly identify with many of the poststructuralist and postmodern labels that characterized the Western philosophical cannon of the second half of the 20th century, his focus on the institutionalization and economic underpinnings of the human condition aligned with other important figures of his time, namely Foucault, Bourdieu, Althusser, and Baudrillard. In their oft-cited guide on conducting interviews, Steinar Kvale and Svend Brinkmann (2009) rightfully asserted that a “postmodern approach to interviewing focuses on the interview as a production site of knowledge, on its linguistic and interactional aspects, including the differences between oral discourse and written text, and emphasizes the narratives constructed in the interview” (p. 53). This statement is very encouraging, particularly since my understanding of hospitality and the gift is informed by the voices of key stakeholders in the production of the philanthropic experience.

In 2005, Deborah Dixon and Jean Paul Jones wrote a brief yet informative article called Derridean Geographies in which they pointed out how deeply concerned Derrida was by the notion of context “[that] meant to signal the inter-referential character of meaning” (p. 243). As outlined in the previous chapter, the context – or situational analysis – of this study informs how movement, thought, and production are deeply intertwined with space, time, financial circulation, and social interactions. Accordingly, my analysis places a premium on uncovering
the nature (tensions, opportunities, and impossibilities) of social relations based on the institutionalization of hospitality and the gift. This chapter, therefore, intentionally critiques Derrida’s deconstruction methodology to open up a conversation about how concepts, signs, and ideas are translated and amended within the context of race relations, economic cooperation, class structuration, and local perceptions about generosity. Ultimately, Derrida’s ideas contain greater meaning and resilience when all of these contextual nuances are considered. As Kanakis Leledakis (2000) rightly asserted, “The subject does not produce meaning; it is part of the broader networks/structures of signification” (p. 188).

Similarly, my study is based on historical narratives and personal accounts that link the then and now. For Geoffrey Bennington (2014), the inescapable domino-effect informs one’s present and future. In other words, perspectives are informed by one’s past, which inevitably evolve, but help form a sequence of experiences. He wrote, “The moment of signature is always affirmative, but it cannot ever quite affirm as triumphantly as it might wish: I may write in order to monumentalize or even immortalize my signature, but my signature haunts everything I write as the weight of a past I would like to escape” (Bennington, 2014, p. 3). Consequently, poststructuralist research often proves “rhizomatic validity” (Lather, 1993, p. 681), meaning that context, perspective, and experience create new realities that are inherently determined to shift, evolve, and (re)produce new meanings. This concept serves as an important warning sign, especially since my study has the dangerous potential of allowing for essentialist and grand theories to be made about how immigrants participate (or do not participate) in the charitable economy. Accordingly, I deliberately chose to interview individuals who hold a distinct role in the production or deliverance of philanthropy, not members of one particular racialized or cultural group. This is not to say that a focus on a distinct group always produces a questionable “profile;” in fact, there are several recent studies that draw on Derrida’s theories of hospitality
and the gift (see Brooks, 2015; Jelnikar, 2015; Hagerman, 2013) to express “moments of normative self-assertion [that] are... sites of mourning for/anticipation of a world hospitable to collective praxis, a world I can perhaps call my own” (Rosen-Carole, 2010, p. 278). However, in engaging immigrant donors, fundraisers, and volunteers in a conversation about philanthropy, we have a new opportunity to explore various concerns about this new frontier in fundraising.

Given this aside, I would now like to test Derrida’s ideas on hospitality and the gift (and the tensions inherent within them) against the interview data in an effort to identify the subtleties, specificities, and implications of mega gift-giving on socio-economic relations, cultural production, and citizenship matters. In particular, there are three issues and themes that have permeated the discussion of immigrant philanthropy within this contemporary moment: the ‘doubleness’ of inclusion and exclusion in the charitable sector; the politics of joining and breaking away from a ‘pact;’ and the structure and aporia of the modern gift. At the end of this chapter, I will return to how these perspectives – when considered together – provide additional ‘impossibilities’ and produce new questions for further deliberation and discussion.

The doubleness of inclusion and exclusion

While Derrida was firm about the division between hosts and guests, he also believed that these binaries created coalescing opportunities that widen the chasm between both. For him, the act of exclusion (orchestrated and managed by hosts) created a certain level of inclusion (amongst the subaltern, foreigner, or Other). To put it plainly, an outsider can build solidarity amongst other outsiders. The converse is also true; insiders are bound by their ‘insider-ness.’ He wrote, “Because exclusion and inclusion are inseparable in the same moment, whenever you would like to say ‘at this very moment,’ there is antimony” (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, p. 81). This phenomenon is observable in everyday situations – for example, between managers and workers, parents and children, and retailers and consumers – where in-group interests and
experiences lead to the formation of organizing bodies, such as unions, associations, and clubs. In their extensive comparative study on labour union formation and solidarity, Gabriela Alberti et al. (2014) asked a critical question that we must apply to this study as well: “Does strategic coherence facilitate organizing efforts and innovation” (p. 109)? In our case, this question makes way for a new opportunity to evaluate the resilience of these affiliations amongst philanthropists and fundraisers, to determine if there is indeed strength in weak ties (Granovetter, 1973).

Before I delve into this question, it is important to first acknowledge the inherent diversity within these broad categories and groups – something to which Derrida gave little credence. In Of Hospitality, Derrida took his cues from the context of refugee and “from below” (Smith & Guarnizo, 1998) movements to foreign territories. However, as we know, the intersectionality of race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and other markers of space and place (Agnew, 2011) play a foundational role in reconfiguring the host-foreigner dynamic, or at the very least, the perceptions and gestures of the host relative to the other. For example, while the philanthropists I interviewed did not necessarily see themselves as outcasts or others, their perspectives are coloured by their own subjective experiences of hospitality. When asked about their sense of belonging to/in Canada, they all admitted (albeit with varied directness) that they believed themselves to be fully-fledged Canadians and no different than white Canadians. For the majority of them, Canada is will always be a ‘land of immigrants’ and in so, they possess the determination to imagine it: One of the philanthropists I interviewed summed up this refrain:

I feel so much more at home in this country than I felt back home in [name of country]. [I serve] on boards with pan-Canadians and these are not ordinary people. These are the who’s who types – brilliant administrators, politicians....These are serious interactions, where they’re not bullshitting. They’re not trying to be politically correct. But I feel more [that] I belong here in that my presence is not foreign. I feel like there is always a ground
for me to grow. So it’s like the seed has come from somewhere else, but this ground is very fertile for me to grow. (IPHIL 1)

The seed analogy used here exemplifies how elites consider Canada as a land of untapped potential where anyone can succeed. In fact, all of the philanthropists I interviewed spoke with great passion about a distinctly Canadian warmth and openness that helped create the conditions for them to make it. According to Naas (2007), Derrida would have regarded this sort of sentiment as an “unavowed influence of a theologico-political notion of sovereignty” (p. 23). In other words, the promise of democratic capitalism (Streeck, 2014) offers elites a sense of confidence and pride in their new environs. Another IPHIL added to this perspective as he reflected about his own experiences with discrimination in Canada:

Both from my personal experience, my wife’s experience, and my children’s experience: no discrimination. Sometimes I felt I’m doing far better than most white people are doing. But I realized that, to be honest with you, when I became the director of information technology at [name of company], I said to myself that this field is going to help me move forward. No blame of the systems, no blame on society because I thought people [Canadians] don’t have those experiences – which are required here. So far I had technology skills, I had managerial skills. In order to get to the top, you need a lot of different skills – wonderful speaking skills, you ought to have good writing skills, you should be part of Canadian culture to understand people. (IPHIL 2)

The notion of having the requisite skills for success underscores the value of economic security and professional development in the everyday world; that to obtain a job, one must arrive with in-demand talents. This was true of all the philanthropists I interviewed; they either arrived with a university degree or pursued higher education in Canada, all of them possess advanced English proficiency (in fact, over half of them speak ‘perfect’ English using the ‘right’ colloquialisms),
and each had sufficient access to cash and capital. A couple of the philanthropists I interviewed came to Canada as a child or adolescent, which meant that their experiences closely aligned with the “1.5 generation” (Fresnoza-Flot, 2015; Bartley, 2010; Yi, 2009) in which an overlay of ‘growing up’ issues (e.g., age, physical and emotional development, and schooling experiences) informed their placement within the family unit. Their observations of their parents and middle class-ness, however, suggest that they held enough privilege to become acquainted with giving early on:

Yeah my dad, although he was a huge and very well recognized, publicly recognized, activist, things were more sort of social as opposed to any kind of service-oriented. When I was growing up, [name of country] was a very divided and uneven country. My mom and my grandmother were very conscious about helping others because there was no major government infrastructure to help people. My grandmother – it’s a very interesting story – had a regular guy who came for lunch, a homeless guy once a week, we all knew, on Thursday. He didn’t eat inside the house, he ate on the step. He came every week and he actually dressed up for the occasion [in a] very old suit... My parents were not rich, neither were my grandparents. We’re middle class. We were not wealthy. My grandmother said, “We just do what we have to do and this man needs our help.” And we, as kids, just sort of accepted that. I didn’t even know his name. I never actually knew his name. (IPHIL 3)

Another IPHIL echoed this sentiment: “The first organization [my mother] joined was the [name of ethnic group] society, which is here and all through the world. So, when you’re 11 years old and she drags you along to the meetings with her because there’s no babysitter to leave you with, you get to see it [philanthropy] in action” (IPHIL 4).
As I mentioned in Chapter 2, one of the philanthropists I interviewed was born in Canada, but is often identified in the media as a child of an immigrant, which in and of itself is symbolic of how this individual is perceived in the public eye. For me, this recalled an informative study about relations between generations of immigrant families by Nancy Foner and Joanna Dreby (2011) that, in part, showed how social labels influence one’s appreciation and interpellation of what has been called an “immigrant aesthetic” (Fisek, 2012, p. 45). In this instance, the donor’s earliest recollection of her immigrant parents’ acts of kindness resembles those of the two donors noted above:

When my parents got married, [my father] certainly was not rich by any means but, you know he built up a company and so on but he was incredibly charitable and generous. I will say generous is the keyword. He started in the [name of sector] business and eventually built a plant and he was on the way from the airport in [name of Canadian city] and all, any [name of culture] who would arrive in [name of Canadian city] would have to go by this plant and they’d see the name [IPHIL last name], which is a [name of region in country] name, and a lot of them would stop there and ask him for a job.... I’m telling you, you have no idea how many... he would just give everybody a job. (IPHIL 5)

Returning to those philanthropists who arrived in Canada as adults, many of them were adamant that immigrants must endure some hardship as part of the settlement story. According to one IPHIL:

Look I mean I came in my early 20s and I didn’t speak English and I will always have an accent speaking English. That’s the beauty of this country: “Show me what you can do and go for it.” You have to fight your own way and it’s not easy and you can’t wait for someone to give it you. My expectation was not that Canada is just going to be bowing down, oh my God, [IPHIL name] chose us to come to this country! No. It’s my
responsibility to emerge into society and the rules that exist in this country. And sometimes I think that we forget that. I’m all for individual cultures, but I want Canadians to be Canadians first, not something else and then Canadian. They should be a melting pot and I don’t think it is all the time. It bothers me when I keep hearing people talk about their country, that it’s so much better. Then what are they doing in this country in anyway? If it is that much better, go back. (IPHIL 6)

When asked about what kinds of advice they would give new immigrants (or those considering coming to Canada), many of them talked about how important it was for new arrivals to be prepared to leave behind their middle-class lifestyles for blue collar work, even if one possesses unique and high-demand professional skills. According to one of the philanthropists, “Maybe you do have to work harder, I don’t know. You have to prove yourself little bit more, but it is as flat a country as you can possibly imagine, right? It’s not perfect, but I don’t know of any other place where there is that kind of opportunity” (IPHIL 3). One SAED, who came to Canada as a child, shared a similar reflection:

So the [name of culture] were not brought here because we have fine food which revolutionized the eating habits of Toronto and the world. We weren’t brought here because of the renaissance or the Roman Empire. I remember going to the immigration visa officer in [name of city] in 1955-1956 and they asked to see my father’s hands... a hard worker is going to have calluses on his hands. I’m not making this up, I’ve lived through this. I am both part of the parade and witness to the parade... So my father was an example of every other person, most every other person in those days did go to work in construction, dig ditches, lay pipes, built houses and pour concrete. My mother, like many, many other ladies, ended up... making clothing and purses and etcetera. So that was the entry key to my Canadian reality that allowed me to go to school, allowed me to
wear a white collar shirt and not a blue collar shirt. Again, I use myself as an example, not because this is about me. I’m simply a pretty good example of the hundreds of thousands of other people out there. (SAED 1)

The experience of “foreigner-ness” amongst the IFVs I interviewed is worth exploring as well. As immigrants and/or racialized people, their early memories greatly influenced their sense of belonging and, frankly, readiness to give back. Many of them actually lived out the hardships that the immigrant philanthropists said should be par for the course. For one very prominent IFV, this struggle began when he arrived and tried to find work in the accounting field, which he had tremendous training and experience in back home. He recounted an exchange he had with a hiring manager in great detail:

No matter how much you know, forget all of your qualifications and start at the bottom. “Get Canadian experience.” That’s what one person who interviewed me said. I knew I wouldn’t get the job. So I might as well say what’s on my mind and with respect I asked “Can you direct me to a store where I can go and get this package of Canadian experience?” He looked at me “No job for you.” I said, “I know that, but just remember when you say Canadian experience how are we going to acquire that? In a package I can buy from a store?” A banker in Edmonton, interviewed me and I said, “Look, I got 10 years but I’ll start from the bottom, I don’t mind, I’ll work my way up. He said “Mr. [last name] I can’t offer you the job.” I said, “Well can you give me a reason why?” So his office door was open he gets up closes the door, he said “I’m going to tell you something. If you repeat it outside it’s your word against mine and who is going to believe the word of a new immigrant?” So yeah, very candid and I said, “I appreciate it.” He was the controller of that bank. He said, “I’ve seen your resume, we have talked for an hour. The job is definitely yours. If I were to give you this job six months from now you will be
where I am and I’ll be without a job. So give me one good reason why I should offer you this particular job?” So we shook hands I said, “Yeah, who is going to believe this immigrant?” So even in 1982 those barriers were there... the lack of Canadian experience or being overqualified were the excuses not to give [me] that job. Partly I think it was the fear of the unknown. It wasn’t all racial. There was certainly an element of it, but it’s the fear of the unknown. When a new immigrant comes in, and appears to be as good as the next guy, the next white guy, there is a fear. What is it about him or her that I don’t know or I can’t see? (IFV 1)

This IFV’s experiences speak to two of Derrida’s major arguments. The first centres on the aporia or the ‘impossibility of possibility.’ The notion of being simultaneously overqualified and inexperienced creates an impenetrable deadlock, an against-all-odds scenario that the foreigner must contend with as part of the settlement phase of migration. The second speaks to an overt racism that the host expresses towards the foreigner – an action that, as mentioned earlier, propels solidarity amongst others. This symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Thompson, 1991) is enacted upon at a moment’s notice, when a host’s livelihood is threatened. Derrida did not view these confrontations as isolated incidents; in fact, he rightly regarded them as symbols of macro-level host-foreigner tensions, which are fueled and substantiated by the laws of the host society:

Whenever the “home” is violated, wherever at any rate a violation is felt as such, you can foresee a privatizing and event familialist reaction, by widening the ethnocentric and nationalist, and this xenophobic, circle: not directed against the foreigner as such, but paradoxically, against the anonymous technological power... which threatens the “home,” the traditional conditions of hospitality. The perversion and pervertability of this law (which is also a law of hospitality) is that at once can become virtually xenophobic in
order to protect or claim to protect one’s own hospitality. (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, p. 53)

In this case, conditional hospitality serves as an enforcement of restrictions on the foreigner and maintenance of an “out of place-ness” (Walcott, 2014, p. 97) that sustains white supremacy and coloniality. Here, race, racialization, and racism are central to the enactment of conditional hospitality. Sometimes this violence is not a physical act of violence; rather it is played out by institutional laws and rules that sustain inequality. These dynamics are what I call the “subtleties of unevenness” that appear smoothed over by generosity and benefaction.

In writing about his students’ reactions to neoslavery narratives, Rinaldo Walcott (2000) observed that “critical fictions are difficult to come to terms with, particularly if one is seeking a self-affirming story... These “fictions” allow for a certain transformative working through the trauma, as this is instantiated by the narratives of “becoming” through which their main characters often live through” (p. 140). This particular longing for redemption, deliverance, and being is also produced through the archetypal rags-to-riches immigrant narrative, which provides a sense of (im)possibility amongst economically poor and racialized (im)migrants, as well as affirmation for socially progressive Canadians who put great faith in diversity programs. This is a particularly palpable sentiment amongst the volunteers and executive directors of settlement charities. One of the IFVs I interviewed recounted a very emotional childhood story of her mother who was a housekeeper back home, which ends with a personal vow to change her life circumstances:

One night we are walking and it was raining, and [my mother’s] slippers got lost, so she was walking barefooted. And she said to me “You are never going to spend your life cleaning people’s houses.” I remember that. She didn’t eat the meal that she cooked. She brought home the meal that would have been hers for the people who she worked for,
and that was our dinner. And I was at boarding school and I said I’m going to take advantage of everything that comes my way. Her slippers fell off, she walked home barefooted and she said “You are never going to spend your life... Promise me you will never spend your life cleaning other people’s houses.” This happened over 60 years ago. I might have been about 12 and I’m now 72. So I worked hard and I studied and when I took the local exam... I came third in the island. So I knew that I had the ability. (IFV 2)

Through this impassioned retelling of her mother’s hardships, this IFV developed a clear resolve to “become” and overcome, recalling Walcott’s observations as noted a moment ago. Somehow over time, this determination morphed into a desire to become a model citizen through charitable volunteering. Similarly, another IFV talked about the “inquisitiveness” of people who identified him as the other:

I’ll give you a very good example, the first time we went to the Toronto Club, my wife was wearing a [name of ethnic dress] and I was wearing a tuxedo, we walk in and the gatekeeper suddenly came and asked for my invitation card and you could make out the tone. And then the way he would direct, there’s the men’s room, there’s the ladies’ room, you could just see it wasn’t the politeness you normally expect. It wasn’t the same politeness that I was seeing last month when I went in there. There’s a different etiquette, different approach. So about 15 years ago Toronto started to change. Even today if you go to the Rosedale Golf Club, they may not say it, but the receptionists and others, you can make out in their eyes that they are inquisitive. They won’t ask you to leave but they are inquisitive to know if this person is really a member here or are they just walking around here? So if they don’t see you settle down quickly, someone will come and approach you. That’s the kind of behaviour. (IFV 3)
After experiencing racism both “here and there” why would anyone want to give back? Is it a simple attitude of “if you can’t beat them, join them?” I proposed that the capacity to open doors into their racial or ethnic community is a form of symbolic and social capital that has reciprocal benefits by providing credibility and elite access through the giving of insider information about donors to mainstream charities. While I further explore this idea in the next section of this chapter, what is most pertinent at present is the notion of the ‘win-win’ ideology of diversity and volunteering. According to many of the charity leaders I interviewed, diversity in volunteer leadership is a moral imperative. Here are but two voices that support this idea:

I think we need to be engaging as volunteers, the people who can advise us. We need to pave the way within our organizations, we need to teach our organizations, you can picture that you have lots of time before you get to the stage of asking somebody. If you have volunteers engaged in your organization, to discuss, “What might you anticipate?” “Do you think this idea would work?” (CFLNP 1)

Another CFLNP shared a similar sentiment:

There are a lot of organizations that haven’t come to the understanding that you must start engaging diverse communities if you really want to grow your philanthropy and your engagement and awareness in the broader community. I think often times what happens is that you’ll set-up a volunteer committee, you’ll put a fundraiser or community outreach officer against it, but it hasn’t penetrated the consciousness of the entire organization. (CFLNP 2)

From a Derridean standpoint, the strategic cooption of immigrant volunteers to deliver diverse bodies for corporatized giving is an enactment of conditional hospitality. In fact, Derrida would have likely argued that this is an example of a “constant collusion between traditional hospitality, hospitality in the ordinary sense, and power” (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, p. 55). Power, in
this instance, is articulated as a vocation or a form of aproetic civic duty based on belonging and exclusion. Ungureanu (2013) explained it as a “‘duty beyond duty’ as it involves going through the ‘ordeal’ of an unsolvable paradox whose poles are the conditionality of existing rules and inherited duties in a specific context, on the one hand, and one’s giving herself to the others’ unconditional call of justice, on the other” (p. 401).

There, too, appears to be another layer of tension or dissonance when it comes to donor cultivation opportunities amongst the SAEDs. All of the settlement agencies have meagre fundraising budgets, even though major philanthropic support would certainly have a transformative impact on the organizations’ programs and services. In reality, all of these charities are experiencing financial precarity due to waning government support, competition within the non-profit sector, and limited fundraising capacity. A couple of the settlement agencies have developed new revenue generating models (for example, fees for translation, interpretation, and mediation services), but for the most part, the bulk of the pillar funding comes from tenuous and one-time-only sources. Furthermore, engaging affluent immigrant donors is an unfulfilling pursuit, since many of them are already ‘scooped up’ by slick and mighty fundraising machines. As one SAED put it:

SAED 2: So you’re thinking, “Why am I not tapping into those resources?” Just the small shops that we are all are engaged in. So, there’s money there. A lot of people in our community are making enormous amounts of money business-wise. Like, businessmen, doing business internationally and doing a lot of stuff back home. And so it’s really sitting down and working out, okay, who are the populations we are serving, what does it look like? Let me not just focus on the marginalized communities that I serve directly. I look at the Stats Canada information that looks at our incomes compared to Canadians,
It’s significantly lower. But what about that percentage of our population that is actually doing extremely well?

Krishan: Right, that 1%.

SAED 2: How do we tap into that? And I can’t say that they don’t want to help. They do. They just don’t know about me down here, at [charity street address] sort of thing, right?

Capturing the attention of donors has been an age-old issue, particularly for fundraisers in the arts, HIV/AIDS, and social services sectors (Nissan et al., 2012; Nunnenkamp & Öhler, 2012; Smith & Pekkanen, 2012). In addition, small settlement agencies simply cannot offer the same networking and status-building opportunities as large charities. In other words, giving to a university affords greater benefits to philanthropists than giving to a local AIDS service organization or immigrant employment agency. Some of the SAEDs I interviewed also reluctantly fundraise, not necessarily because they believe it takes up too much time or resources, but because of a strong-held belief that private donations serve as an affront to their organizational values. Here, private capital and corporate profit are deemed to be drivers of social inequality, making fundraising a ‘necessary evil.’ According to a SAED of an organization that provides community health services to uninsured immigrants and refugees:

I don’t know anything about fundraising. I don’t know anything about that kind of money. I don’t know anybody with that kind of money. I have this little program that’s generating the equivalent of what a small little fundraising program will be taking over. So why do I need to go into fundraising? So I even said, you know, there it is in the minutes at some place where I said, “The day the organization thinks it needs to go into fundraising, it’s fine. I’ll leave because I never want to do that. (SAED 3)

For me, this issue expresses the doubleness of inclusion and exclusion for a couple of reasons. First, the SAEDs expressed a kind of solidarity when it came to their experiences and frustrations
with fundraising and attracting philanthropic support from within their own cultural or racialized community; all of agencies have developed coalitions and meet regularly to discuss ‘like-minded’ matters, including funding, collaborations, and education. Second, the SAEDs’ commitment to the financial resiliency of their agencies forces them to be open (and exhibit absolute hospitality) to private capital, not for independence but for filling gaping economic holes left behind by governments. This aporia is passionately articulated by Hogeveen and Freistadt (2013) who believed that, “...Social service agencies and the wider public must adopt a new ethic of hospitality. Absolute hospitality would, as much as possible, unconditionally welcome the other and be less concerned with bureaucracy and accountability than with fashioning open spaces of welcome” (p. 58).

Before I explore the issue of pact-making within the gift-hospitality matrix, I would like to end this section by quoting Peim (2013), who succinctly described the doubleness of inclusion and exclusion as follows:

The structure of democracy, for Derrida, is essentially, and in a special and challenging sense, messianic. In The Politics of Friendship it is made apparent that a necessary condition of democracy is the promise, not the fact, of universal inclusiveness, of each singularity counting equally. But this inclusiveness must also be – within the organization of specific contexts – dependent on exclusions: on some definition of identity that declares a right to be included as well as a right to exclude. This doubleness of inclusion and exclusion determines an aporetic structure fundamentally at odds with itself. (Peim, 2013, p. 180)

Making and breaking a pact

In many ways, elite immigrant philanthropy breaks up the hard delineations between the foreigner and host. More specifically, I argue that transnationals from above oscillate between
both binaries, never as full members of each but needed by both. This is not to say that there is no home-base for this cluster of immigrants. In fact, mega philanthropy creates, what Homi Bhabha (1990) called, the “third space” or, more recently, what Ian Woodward et. al (2009) regarded as “uber citizenry,” where home is not so much about place as it is about placement. In essence, this traversing gives ruling classes the power to detach, attach, and re-attach within a variety of social and class settings. There are, of course, institutional, governmental, and economic levers that propel this phenomenon forward, which I will explore in this section. Since my discussion focuses on Derrida’s post-structural take on hospitality, it is important to first review what exactly he meant by the word “foreigner.”

What does “foreigner” mean? Who is foreign? Who is the foreign man, who is the foreign woman? What is meant by “going abroad,” “coming from abroad”? We had merely stressed that, if at least we have to give it a determinate scope, a normal usage, as it is used most often, sensu stricto, when the context does not specify it more (the normal meaning is almost always the most “narrow” meaning, obviously), estranger is understood on the basis of the circumscribed field of ethos or ethics, of habitat or times spent as ethos, of Sittlichkeit, of objective morality, especially in the three instances determined by law and Hegel’s philosophy of law: the family, bourgeois or civil society, and the State (or the nation-state). (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, p. 45)

Hegel’s categories – what could also be called “spheres of belonging” (Aziz, 2002) – provide a useful starting point for this discussion because it evokes a certain layering process that begins on the individual level and progresses up to the macro, and vice versa. This vertical movement corresponds to our earlier discussion about the development of pacts through conditional hospitality. For the philanthropists I interviewed, this idea was often articulated as obtaining entrance into a private “club:”
Krishan: Can I ask you a question about that, around networks? Sometimes they say that philanthropy buys you membership into a club, to a certain group, a line of very distinguished leaders, civic leaders. Is there any truth to that?

IPHIL 3: Yeah, but it has to be done right. The organization has to be prepared to receive people from other communities as well instead of just having them parachuted in for access. Look at my board – you want to sit at the table with [name of white establishment male philanthropist] and [name of white establishment female] and blah blah blah. They’ll be at the meeting, you know? You’ll see them all the time and you can engage in debates with them around the boardroom table. I don’t mean debate but in conversation about any issue to do with the [name of charity], and then we have more dinners where you can be social. So yes, of course, I think it does buy you access into a certain community of people.

IPHIL 3 makes an important point about the role of governance boards in accepting someone from outside of the traditional club. Since all volunteer fundraising boards of large charities serve as inner sanctums for philanthropists, most have established a formal vetting process to ensure that new members maintain the reputation and integrity of the group. One CFLNP called this a “society:” “It’s sort of getting into the society you want to be in. This is where society is” (CFLNP 8). To this end, these bodies – sometimes referred to as “campaign cabinets” – expect that their members have the capacity and intention to make a significant donation to the charity. In addition, members are often asked to identify and solicit others within their own sphere to strengthen the group. This is a philosophy that the CFLNPs have embraced. Another CFLNP reflected on how her board’s desire to seek diversity has become a major organizational preoccupation: “So, yeah, it’s a great question because I could go speak to my board of directors that truly are not necessarily representative of the community, unless the whole community lived
in Rosedale. [Laughter] And say that and they might go “Yeah, but you should add some diversity in, just so we represent” (CFLNP 9). Since the establishment of a campaign cabinet is a hallmark of most major gift fundraising environments, finding suitable candidates who fit the bill is always a tricky task (Edles, 2005; Lysakowski, 2005; Panas, 2005). As one of the CFLNPs poignantly put it:

You know I used to say the difference between Americans and Canadians is that Americans like to talk about money Canadians don’t. Americans define their social circles largely by denominations... starting with faith and then schools, which are faith-like. The whole American college experience seems to me to be more of a religious experience than an educational one. And then you’ve got the local hospitals and all that stuff. But in New York (which if we consider New York to be a very mature model) there is no question that social status is closely associated with which club you belong to, right? And those are philanthropic clubs. It’s very hard to have status in that city and not be philanthropic. So the thing that I find amusing about [Canada]... let’s take [our] boards of directors. Everyone complains about their board of directors, but they actually do nothing to make it a privileged group to belong to. In fact they are so desperate to put people on it and they don’t ever have a frank conversation about philanthropy. They wonder why they don’t have a philanthropic board. So I mean, I always say, if you truly want to have a powerful board it all starts with governance, right? So get the power...

Now if people are looking for social status they generally find it within their own community first and then they seek opportunities in other ways whether that’s universities, hospitals, or other mainstream institutions. Carnegie Hall says you have to be giving half a million dollars a year to be eligible for the board. Now that’s a club you want to aspire to, right? (CFLNP 3)
While this desire for elitism is well-understood by the CFLNPs, there is also a sense of denial (or modesty) about the nature of hospitality within this group. One of the CFLNPs expressed this humility as a kind of aporic conundrum where cabinet membership overshadows the very charitable purpose of the organization:

We don’t have place or space and we don’t have that kind of... There’s no elitism about us. There’s an everyday man [feeling] about us. And that was also, it was a barrier because even when we had our [name of cultural group] Leadership Council, they said, “Oh, we’d like to be on your cabinet.” But they were not that interested in our case for giving. They were interested in being on the cabinet when the bank CEO was the Chair. (CFLNP 4)

Another CFLNP made a similar remark: “But to be fair you know the same principle would apply to trying to get a bank president on the board. We believe that if we had that, we would bring a community along with it, by the very nature of their stature and clout” (CFLNP 10). One IPHIL pointed out that as much as he appreciates all of the public acknowledgment for volunteering/giving, charities rely on his presence to maintain their reputation – it is a way to show that the organization is addressing gaps in diversity and inclusion. To this end, an ‘invitation’ to join the club is strategically given out to some immigrant donors. One of the IPHILs referred to this as a “Beam me up, Scotty” moment:

IPHIL 1: I’ve been seen in the crowd. I haven’t given the most money [in the room], but when we talk, we discuss good things. So philanthropy is not a club. I have not joined a club, but…it transports you. It sends us up. “Beam me up, Scotty.” That is Scotty, right?

Krishan: Beam me up, Scotty.

IPHIL 1: Beam me up, Scotty. Scotty brings you to that group. We don’t belong to the club but you are there, you just suddenly you get beamed in.
Krishan: Have you ever found yourself surprised, astonished, that you were beamed up and there you are...with them?

IPHIL 1: I was. One day I got a call from the Prime Minister’s office... three years ago. “The president of the Canadian Jewish Association wants to talk to you....” I’m saying with that kind of money I think I am on a first name basis at least 20 to 40 [college and university] presidents, 150 deans, and 200, 300, 400 CEOs. And we have kind of a national movement.

Somewhat ironically, this interview was conducted in a private club in downtown Toronto, where we appeared to be the only to racialized people in the building. Going back to the notion of the philanthropists’ club, however, a similar sentiment was observed by another IPHIL:

When you give you become part of the whole movement that’s around that giving. And you get yourself so involved in it. When I look at [name of healthcare charity], I love the entire hospital but my focus is [name of disease] and so I can’t say I’ve become a member of [name of healthcare charity]. I have become part of the [name of disease] movement and the docs and everyone else that supports it. (IPHIL 6)

In both of these examples, the elite stratum extends beyond affluence to include sector influencers and captains of industry. For these donors, and all of the other IPHILs I interviewed, their social spheres include the intelligentsia, medical professionals, artists, politicians, and other professionals who help round out the figure of the model minority. This collection of people is far from the foreigner that Derrida described in Of Hospitality. In fact, I propose that an absence of networks could be a defining feature of the foreigner/outsider/other. Early social network theorists and scholars (see Erickson, 1996; Putnam, 1995; Wellman & Wortley, 1990) contended that one’s connections have profound implications on the development of class consciousness and habitus, supporting the upward mobility of well-networked individuals. In the case of
charities, this phenomenon is informed by an organization’s structures (whether or not there is a fundraising board, formal giving society, governance body, and exclusive networking events) and localized norms of charitable giving from within the pact. This “uneven distribution of symbolic capital” (Peim, 2013, p. 178) creates a varied and dynamic comparative field within the charitable sector. In other words, since all charities are not made equal, each is subject to varying levels of the philanthropists’ gaze. To create a unifying understanding about “philanthropic impact” (Frumkin, 1999), then, requires a deeper dive into the experiences of the ‘have not’ side of the equation.

In this spirit, the SAEDs view the IPHILs as a far-from-grasp group. In fact, the settlement agency world could be described as a type of organizational ‘foreigner’ within the broader charitable sector, making larger charities and their immigrant donors ‘hosts.’ Moreover, if we consider the host as a citizen and the foreigner as the non-citizen or outsider (as Derrida intended for us to do), then we can more clearly see how settlement agencies experience conditional hospitality, in part because of their “boundedness” to the community they serve. This is often articulated in each organization’s mission statement, which identifies a target group (i.e., women fleeing domestic abuse, migrants from a particular part of the world, people living with HIV/AIDS, and the under- and un-employed). From a monetary perspective, this conditionality is managed by government agencies that dictate how much and how often grants are made to settlement charities. Conditionality, in this regard, leads to precarity and fragility, making fundraising the inevitable but uncertain antidote. An SAED of a multi-site charity expressed this shift from a governance board to fundraising board as part of his charity’s survival:

And so given the crisis we have been experiencing in funding from government, our board decided that we really needed to take a look at this fundamentally. The issue for us, Krishan, has been that it’s very difficult to do fundraising if the organization isn’t fully
aligned in terms of you know fundraising culture. By that I mean that to do it well you need a fundraising board. And we did raise this issue with our board in a very formal way a number of years ago, our development manager did a presentation to the board explaining this is what we really need to do if we’re going to be effective at this... A number of very effective board members in terms of their contribution to the board said, “Well, if you’re going to be requiring of me, you know, going out and soliciting and all of that... it’s not really my skill set and my discomfort with that is such that I would have to consider resigning” (SAED 4).

This reflection contributes to a larger refrain about the desperate need for fundraising volunteers in the settlement sector. All of the IFVs I interviewed are well respected in both the large mainstream charities and within their own ethno-cultural community. With regards to the former, this embrace (or hospitality/welcome) is conditional and based on how many philanthropists they can deliver to the organization. However, to attract IFVs and IPHILs, large charities need to first prove that they want more than money. How has the organization expressed its concern and relevance for that particular community? What tangible evidence do they have to support their interests? This is a rare opportunity for the IFVs to display some power and agency in their role as adjudicators of the worthiness of large charities. According to one IFV,

Organizations will come to me and they will say, “Can you help us reach the [name of racial group] community?” First thing I will say is, “Show me right now what you have done for the [name of racial group] community.” I say 80% of the time they have done nothing and I would then say, “Why in the world would the [name of racial group] community then give you money?” Any community... if you haven’t done something for them, why would they give money? And I hear that all the time and it’s all about relevance and some organizations do it very well. Like some health charities do it very
well. They will say we actually funded research that specifically can demonstrate numerically which communities are affected by this…and that’s great. Some organizations have done nothing. (IFV 4)

Here we can also observe how the IFVs perceive and experience the complexity of the pact. Indeed, they live in this interstitial space where they are facilitators, mediators, and interpreters between mainstream, white-led charities and the racialized and ethnicized communities from which they emerged. Accordingly, there is an acute awareness of creating a level of cultural relevance amongst CFLNPs. As one chief fundraiser pointed out,

There is a phrase that resonates with me and I heard it from someone a long time ago. I can’t tell you who I heard it from, but it has always stuck with me, and I’ve repeated it constantly….And that is every time you approach someone – and I do think this is common from individual to individual and community to community – the question is, “How can my gift to your institution help me help my community?” It forces you to confront the fact it isn’t just about you. (CFLNP 5)

This new power of the foreigner places conditions on charities, making them prove their worthiness to IPHILs. What IFV 4 pointed out is that money serves as a bargaining chip; in order to receive gifts, a charity must first court the diaspora (Panossian, 2003). Through these acts of cultivation, the host-foreigner dynamic is no longer about frivolous welcoming gestures as much as it is about opening the door, making someone feel ‘at home,’ and then asking them to invest in making that home available to more people. For me, this gets to the heart of my concern for immigrant philanthropy: Can the charitable sector genuinely commit to fundamental change by converting once-foreigners into bona fide hosts? What happens to the pact between foreigners? Is this pact actually a myth?
These questions point to the potential potency of flexible citizenship for the transnational philanthropic subject. Peim (2013) agreed by noting, “The proliferation of hybrid identities accompanies flexible hierarchies and plural exchanges: the economic, the political, and the cultural overlap and meld into one another. Empire works against old order boundaries” (p. 184). In this regard, Aihwa Ong (1999) considered flexible citizenship “not in terms of unstructured flows but in terms of tensions between movements and social orders” (p. 6). Here, conditionality and its limitations are up for grabs, so to speak. Serge Margel (2014) surmised that Derrida’s focus on conditionality gives us a rare view into how “these limits have no borders. These boundaries are not linear, they are not marked by a discernible, visible, well-defined line... These limits are but ruptured, interrupted lines, whose moment of rupture indefinitely produces other ruptures” (p. 255). Ong’s ‘movements,’ then, could have the power to disrupt social order by creating a ripple effect on an entire community. Therefore, an individual act of hospitality can bring the foreigner “pact” into the host’s domain. As Derrida (2000) explained,

This familial or genealogical right applying to more than one generation enables us to think about how this is not, basically, a question of the extension of the right or the “pact”; it is not a question of a straightforward extension of an individual right, of opening out to the family and subsequent generations a right in the first place granted to the individual. No, that reflects, that lets us reflect upon the fact that, from the outset, the right to hospitality commits a household, a line of descent, a family, a familial or ethnic group. (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, p. 23)

Here, I would like to further explore the solidarizing impact of fundraising, which has the dual effect of blurring the lines between the host and foreigner, and inciting a rallying cry for giving within IPHIL and IFV networks. One IFV interviewee described how the charity she volunteered for took a “risk” when she instituted a new solicitation methodology with donors
from her own community: This risk resulted in a double-benefit for the charity: first, it had opened up access to a new crop of donors; second, it helped build the charity’s reputation as hospitable environment for “diverse” donors:

Well it seems to me that things are changing a bit, although very slowly. Because when we asked for representation of individuals on boards and in the boardrooms and in the decision-making places of organizations, what the individual from a diverse background brings to the table are rolodexes as it were, I mean a list of names that they would not otherwise have. And I can give you an example. You know the Chair that I have at [name of charity] that we are working to ensure that it is fully funded, one of the things that, that I recognized early on is that there is a different way in which the big foundations work and I’m sure you are going into that work, so you will know. They say, ‘Okay, we need two million dollars: we look for two people who would give us a million each or we look at four people who would give us five hundred thousand each, or we look at eight people would give us two hundred and fifty...’ You know and that’s the way it goes. But there are a lot of people who can’t give [that much] and when we first started talking I thought, ‘Oh my God, this will never happen because I don’t know anybody who would throw away a million dollars or five hundred thousand dollars.’ They said the initiative won’t happen until we have the first five, you know, we were half-way there, which meant that we needed five hundred thousand dollars. And I didn’t know anybody who would give five thousand dollars, or two people or four people would give five hundred thousand. And it wasn’t until I was bemoaning that with someone and she said, “You have a hundred friends, if you can get each one of those friends to pledge five thousand dollars, you have your five hundred thousand.” So what I did, I sent a note out to a hundred and twenty people that I know. (IFV 5)
For Ungureanu (2013), “Donating in such cases communicates indirectly an act of solidarity between donors and those who are in need” (p. 407). In fact, as mentioned earlier, professional fundraisers often rely on the unifying axiom of “people give to people” in an effort to draw on the civic sensibilities of donors and volunteers. Solicitations for gifts are often, therefore, described as having a macro-level impact, drawing on nationalistic, cosmopolitan values of community building, fraternal trust, and social impact. For example, a charity walk is positioned to have a greater purpose than just providing funds for after-school programs; it helps keep children away from violence, therefore making communities and nations safer (see Saul, 2011; Sargeant & Woodliffe, 2007; Burnett, 1992). This sort of narrative is used as a didactic tool by CFLNPs to create an emotive rationale for donor giving:

All gifts fundamentally have a narrative to them. It’s a story the donor wants to tell and it’s the change, as I said earlier, that the donor wants to enact. If you don’t know if the donor is connected to a community, or there is something that the donor wishes to say with his or her philanthropy about that community, you’ve got to know that, you’ve got to hear it, you’ve got to understand it. (CFLNP 5)

These narratives are, of course, embellished through the lens of our popular media, in which large charities will sometimes purchase advertising space in national newspapers to recognize a particular donor or fundraising board. However, amongst all of the CFLNPs, there is sense of curiosity and passion for creating fundamental change within the charitable sector – and to open up and rethink fundraising best practices. Even amongst donors there is a sense that change, while needed, will likely come in successive waves – and emerging donor communities will force a retooling of the field. One IPHIL observed that the Jewish community in Toronto went through this metamorphosis in the 1990s:
All the groups wanted to play in the middle of the field and you’ve got to be part of that. The most damaging thing is when someone says, “Yeah, he’s never done anything for the community.” That’s an easy word that just gets around. You can never nail it down by saying it, but that gets around. Well, if you are trying, look into the Jewish community.
The Jewish community never gave to the University of Toronto. How did they get in? They appointed Rose Wolfe as its Chancellor. [There was] no better chancellor. Then the Jews came. Now the Jewish community never gave any money like that. All went to Israel somehow. So they wanted to be part of it. They had to be part of it. The Italian community is a few years behind them. They’ve given enormous money to York University to be part of it. So I’m sure others will be among them in no time. (IPHIL 7)
This solidarizing movement contains a patriotic tone where giving becomes a marker of belonging. In this regard, major philanthropy acts as a foil to Derrida’s notion of citizenship:
“Usually, the foreigner, the foreign citizen, the foreigner to the family or the nation, is defined on the basis of birth; whether citizenship is given or refused on the basis of territorial law or the law of blood relationship, the foreigner is a foreigner by birth, is a born foreigner” (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, p. 87). For one of the CFLNPs, giving is an expression of Canadian values:
I really want there to be a sense that we are all in this together. To be Canadians and to give, particularly wealth, to the non-profit sector. Give in other ways, too, to our churches and you know all of those kinds of things. But typically to understand that it’s our responsibility as Canadians to create a vibrant and caring nation, which means that our broader social sector will thrive in its programs and activities that support us all. So that’s my real long-term dream. That’s why I really continue to do [name of the quarterly newsletter her company produces]... to be seen to be thought leaders in the communities
that we serve because I do believe that there is huge potential. But there’s also a lot at
risk here if we don’t do it. (CFLNP 6)

Similarly, another CFLNP recounted to me a story when the Governor General of Canada came
to visit his charity and he introduced two immigrant philanthropists to him:

I said, “Your Excellency, Mr. and Mrs. So and So, are the absolute shining examples of
the richness of this country and our cultural diversity. The fact that we are (and I actually
use the quote that Margaret Atwood said in the Journals of Susanna Moody) ‘we are
immigrants to this place, one way or another’.” And so Mr. [last name of donor] spoke
and he said, to paraphrase, “Your Excellency, Mrs. [last name of donor] and I are so
deeply privileged to be part of this great nation that we every day we express our
gratitude to great organizations like [name of charity] that accepted our modest gifts.”
How is it for a start? ...And they are not modest at all. We owe the offering of our modest
gifts to this great country that has allowed us, that has welcomed us and has allowed us to
build our business, by the sweat of our brows or hands or whatever the metaphor was.
And we just are simply [and] deeply grateful that we are able to give back. (CFLNP 7)

The other side of the charity world shares a different story, where issues of class and race (or
classism and racism) are palpable and harmful. For a SAED who runs a South Asian-focused
settlement charity, the role of the fundraiser shows how philanthropy and white privilege are
intertwined in the solicitation process:

SAED 5: But again I think if you were South Asian, that could work as well, so long as
you came from a certain class, and spoke a certain manner, and were educated in a certain
way, and roamed in the same circle as they did. So if I was going to hire a fundraiser to
work with affluent fundraisers to try and build those donor relations, I would hire
somebody who would identify with that community but not identify with just any South Asian community.

Krishan: It is easier to say “no” to your own kind?

SAED 5: It is. It is, absolutely. And so I think that is part of it. But then again if it was that other group of people I would never send a person of a particular class to you.

Some of the settlement agencies are located in new enclaves where “the establishment” has expressed concern about the presence of immigrants. In effect, racism within the community speaks to the relevance to Derrida’s claims about conditional hospitality. In turn, this has a detrimental impact on the popular notion that giving is local (Gillmor & Bremer, 1999).

According to one Scarborough-based SAED:

The people who have lived here for generations and are like middle class West Hill people, a bunch of them are saying, “Alright, how do we embrace this new reality and you know, work together, and you know, they are here and they are doing it....” But there is that undercurrent of, “This would be a good neighborhood without all these immigrants.” (SAED 6)

This undercurrent by the “old stock” recalls a point that Leledakis (2000) made about how systems of difference inform a community’s identity: “The social – society in general, language, a small community, etc. – is, like the text, a system of differences, a ‘system of referral’ and thus a domain of play of difference” (p. 178). Here, Leledakis was asking us to recast hospitality as privilege. Needless to say, Derrida’s foreigner is subject to the host’s privilege, and in terms of our study, those who give also possess a certain level of privilege over their beneficiaries.

Bringing this issue closer to the gift, the question then becomes: Is conditional hospitality hiding behind absolute benevolence? As discussed in an earlier section of this chapter, the recent enactment of Bill C-51 makes it clear that Canadian citizenship is a privilege (or gift) – not a
right – based on the conditions enforced by the host. These conditions of privilege are articulated and bound by the governmentalized nation-state. For Dhombres (2005),

Whence the ‘conditions’ which transform the gift into a contract, the opening into a policed pact; whence the rights and the duties, the borders, passports and doors, whence the immigration laws, since immigration must, it is said, be ‘controlled’. It must be remembered that the stakes of ‘immigration’ do not in all rigour coincide with those of hospitality which reach beyond the civic or properly political space. (Dhombres, 2005, p. 6)

While Derrida’s oeuvre exposed the omnipotence of the nation-state when it comes to citizenship rights, he did not call for a complete dismantlement of the systems that create and sustain (conditional) citizenship. Naaz (2007) pointed out that, “Derrida’s response to those in need of rights and citizenship would surely not be to proclaim the sovereignty of the nation-state to be a phantasm to be dispelled....On the contrary, one must extend the rights and protections of citizenship to as many as possible at the same time as one submits these notions to critique” (pp. 30-31). In terms of philanthropy, Derrida’s sense of conditional hospitality is, in effect, bound by the conditionality of the gift, making charitable giving a tool for centralizing privilege and power – just as Canada’s conditional citizenship laws legitimate “unbelonging” (Edgeworth & Santoro, 2015; Christensen, 2009).

Giving to the other as a gift to the self

In an effort to round out this investigation of immigrant philanthropy, I would like to return to idea of the gift is a self-fulfilling “communicative act” (Ungureanu, 2013, p. 394) or what David Borman (2005) termed the “gift without gift” (p. 145). As previously discussed, Derrida considered true gift giving impossible because the very intention of giving (followed by the literal giving of a gift) was rooted in a desire that privileges the donor’s ego and self-
interests. Here, a string of intentions and reactions, followed by an acknowledgement of the gift and returned gift, creates a conditionality that characterizes the host-foreigner, donor-benefactor, and insider-outsider binaries. Derrida saw this (as he did hospitality) as a kind of symbolic violence, using more extreme anarchist language to describe this impossibility:

For this is the impossible that seems to give itself to be thought here: These conditions of possibility of the gift (that some ‘one’ gives some ‘thing’ to some ‘one other’) designate simultaneously the conditions of the impossibility of the gift. And already we could translate this into other terms: these conditions of possibility define or produce the annulment, the annihilation, the destruction of the gift. (Derrida, 1992, p. 12)

To what extent can we apply Derrida’s sense of the gift to elite diaspora philanthropy? How do philanthropists articulate the gift as a reflection of themselves? Amongst the IPHILs I interviewed, there were a number of moments when giving was considered a self-gratifying, expressive act of personal values. One of the IPHILs articulated this as a distinguishing feature of philanthropy:

First of all – I have talked about it before – for me, philanthropy is not about helping others….That’s why I differentiate charity from philanthropy. Charity is like, “somebody is hungry and you give food and now his hunger has been met.” You feel good about it. “I have money, you have hunger, and here’s what I’m going to do to help you.”

Philanthropy is my extended thinking, my beliefs that are getting fulfilled and others [beneficiaries] are just byproducts. So, as I said, I want everybody to have access of education. That’s my wish. So to do that my wealth and my efforts can be used, so I’m giving to myself. To me philanthropy is giving to myself, but myself is way bigger.

(IPHIL 1)

Another IPHIL explained it the following way:
We all have to take opportunities and, you know, can work – whether it’s education or whether it’s physical activity or all kinds of stuff – we should recognize what is good for people. You cannot say, “This is no good for me so I don’t want this thing for other people.” You live in the community. You cannot be safe if there’s something around you that’s not safe. So it’s normal – what you need other people need also. You must keep that in mind. (IPHIL 10)

Other IPHILs expressed more of a saccharine attitude about charity. For example, one philanthropist noted that “charity” should be more broadly defined: “That to me is charity, real charity: the way you treat others. Because charity, the word, is not giving money. It has a lot other all other meanings” (IPHIL 8). At the same time, what seems to set the IPHILs apart from other Canadian philanthropists, is this sense of pressure to build and maintain the charitable reputation of their pack; that giving is not so much about self-gratification as much as it is an understanding that their gifts have an impact on how their ethnic/racial/cultural communities are viewed in the mainstream.

IPHIL 8: Why am I the first? The [name of racial group] have been here a long time. Why was I the first? But then, at the same time, you think it’s better late than never. I better do a good job, right? Because you bring the entire [name of racial group] community, never mind, the entire community down if you don’t do a good job.

Krishan: Is that pressure? Was that pressure?

IPHIL 8: Huge, huge. The first year, I was in the centre. I lost a huge amount of weight. I gradually sort of, once I got settled, I gradually gained it back. But it was huge pressure. Not something I want to face now, but at that time I was okay. I was quite a bit a younger.
Derrida’s contention about the “gift to self” is challenged by the IPHILs’ sense of public obligation and responsibility. Derrida would have argued that this irony is, in essence, a part of the annulment of the gift; however, two important questions emerge from this scenario: Does giving actually benefit the donor more than the beneficiary? How exactly does a donor’s “auto-recognition, self-approval, and narcissistic gratitude” (Derrida, 1992, p. 23) annul a gift?

According to another IPHIL, giving is a part of a larger interaction and engagement with one’s community, an observance of one’s civic duty (as is voting) made “possible” only after one’s personal needs are met:

Well, yeah, it’s very selfish. We like to satisfy our needs first before we can be charitable.

I often hear people say ‘I love charity, I support charity,’ but you have to look after your own first and then whatever is left over, you can leave to others. But, the future of [our] country is at stake and that’s important and that’s why I’m not only involved with charities, I kind of dabble a little bit with political things because whenever the election is, it’s our time to speak up. And, at the end of the day... first and foremost, I’m a Canadian, I’m with all my heart and soul Canadian. And I really believe we live in the best country in the world. Sometimes we do not realize that; sometimes we take a lot of things for granted when we shouldn’t. (IPHIL 6)

It seems as though Derrida expected that for a gift to be true it must reside outside of all social relations. However, since giving is inevitably bound by sociality, the (re)cognition of gift exchange is what makes the gift an aporetic phenomenon:

One must—*il faut*—opt for the gift, for generosity, for noble expenditure, for a practice and a morality of the gift (‘*il faut donner,*’ one must give). One cannot be content to speak of the gift and to describe the gift without giving and without saying *one must* give, without giving by saying one must give, without giving to think that one must give but a thinking
that would not consist merely in thinking but in doing what is called giving, a thinking that would call upon one to give in the proper sense, that is, to do more than call upon one to give in the proper sense of the word, but to give beyond the call, beyond the mere word. (Derrida, 1992, p. 62)

Charitable giving as an expression of the “expanded self” is a newly articulated outcome of cosmopolitan philanthropy. For one IPHIL, this notion is inspired by a Gandhian ethic where the gift (of passive resistance in Mahatma Gandhi’s case) benefits an oppressed or marginalized community of which the donor is a part. In other words, giving to one’s community is rooted in a need for self-preservation:

I have used this example many times. I don’t think that he said, “Oh, I want to give you freedom.” No. He said, “I believe in freedom of the common man and I’m going to fast for it, fight for it. I will die for it. That’s what I believe in and I want to get freedom.” It so happens that 450 million people benefitted from that, so should he feel I gave freedom to 450 million people? He said, “No, I got what I believe in. All this I did it for myself.” So philanthropy for me is doing for yourself....but ‘for yourself’ is more expanded and more enlightened. Not in a cocky way. I’m saying [so] you see things very differently. (IPHIL 1)

The idea of the expanded self is also presented by other philanthropists, particularly amongst racialized and “otherized” (Afshar, 2013) IPHILs, although each articulated this concept differently. For example, one IPHIL described her ‘dream’ to give back to her community back home:

One time our teacher – I went to school in England for three years – said, write an essay about a dream you’ve had. So I wrote this very lengthy five page essay about how I dreamt that I went back to [country of origin] and I opened a community and a school for
the poor. I set up a whole community where people worked within the community and
the babysitting services were provided by other people in the community and they were
paid for their services. So like I had this whole concept that I put down on paper and this
is what my dream is. And the teacher is like, “Very nice dream, but not quite what I had
in mind.” (IPHIL 9)

These perspectives on the ‘self-gift’ contradict the experiences of the SAEDs who argued
that they struggle to garner the philanthropic attention of high net worth immigrants from their
own communities. One of the IFVs expressed her disappointment in two well-known immigrant
philanthropists who didn’t come through with a donation for an immigrant-oriented charity:

Well I felt awful, I felt awful because I sent out a challenge.... I went to see [name of an
old establishment philanthropist] for [name of the campaign] and the first thing she says
“What’s [immigrant philanthropist name] and [immigrant philanthropist name] doing?”
Because she said they made their money here. What are they doing to support you? And
we said nothing. She says, “Fine, I’ll give you this much and I want you to write them
and challenge them to meet my gift.” I wrote the letter. Never even an acknowledgement
of the letter from either [immigrant philanthropist name] or [immigrant philanthropist
name]. (IFV 2)

If some immigrant philanthropists regard giving as an act for the expanded self, then why
do they privilege large, mainstream charities over organizations that serve their own? I propose
that the concept of the expanded self is not necessarily about coalescing around race, ethnicity,
or immigration status; rather, one’s sense of belonging is reified by economics and broader
social/civic values. Public acceptance and prestige, then, are rewards for those who direct their
expanded self-gifts to large, white-led, corporatized charities with regional or national scope.
One CFLNP described a situation where an IPHIL saw his giving as a national project: “I think

for [name of IPHIL], he saw in the [name of large charity] an entity that had firm roots in multiculturalism and with the country. And he saw his own gift as perhaps being a very important turning point for the country in terms of the traditional association of large scale philanthropy being with old established, you know, Anglo families” (CFLNP 5). In Of Hospitality, Derrida also acknowledged that there are moments when the other appears “less foreign,” particularly when it comes to class. This in turns bridges the gap between the host and the other:

Without speaking the same national language, someone can be less foreign to me if he shares a culture with me, for instance, a way of life linked to a degree of wealth, etc., than some fellow citizen or compatriot who belongs to what used to be called (but this language should be abandoned too quickly, even if it does demand critical vigilance) another “social class.” (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000, p. 133)

According to the SAEDs, there is an ideological mismatch between them and the IPHILs. Many of the SAEDs regard their work as “grassroots,” a term that the IPHILs simply do not relate to. According to one SAED, “Yeah, I think that’s where this grassroots notion comes into play. So, it’s trying to reach communities where they are and talk about building a relationship with the [name of charity] whether they are users of our services or supporters in principle, and then become supporters in reality, either through volunteering or donating” (SAED 7). In the end, the act of charitable giving has a distancing effect between the new establishment and poor and working class (im)migrants from within the same ethno-racial community. Borrowing from Bertolt Brecht’s concept of verfremdungseffekt (Willett, 1964) I argue that philanthropic exclusion creates and sustains alienation between two new binaries – non-donor to non-beneficiary. Here, the gift is truly impossible because its possibility remains uncertain and unfulfilled. The absence of immigrant mega-donors in small charities also leaves the settlement
sector in greater financial precarity and marginality, pointing to a kind of institutional othering that gives further credence to Derrida’s definition of the foreigner. Within this scenario there is an element of irony where the idea of democracy seems to work against transformative progress and justice. As Kearney (2004) surmised, “There is always a lot of hypocrisy: racism, for example, still exists. And yet, the idea of this progress cannot be denied” (p. 9).

A final point: there remains great currency in Derrida’s take on the possibilities of the unconditional gift, specifically the selflessness of anonymous giving. According to one IFV:

They want to be recognized in major ways that says that, you know, something like “If you’re not going to tell the world that I did this, I’m not doing it.” Okay? And I’ll be honest with you, I don’t have time for people like that. I just don’t because I think I’m giving it for the wrong reason. We know that the ultimate giving should be anonymous.

The ideal, you know that, right? If you think about it, the ideal giver gives without recognition, right? But our society has shifted. (IFV 6)

Here, the aporia of anonymity melds into the aporia of hospitality, due to the primacy and power of the structures that identify hosts as hosts and donors as donors. The notion that society has shifted serves as an alarm bell that exposes the agents who create and sustain these boundaries.

**Conclusion**

Derrida’s gift to non-profit studies has made way for a number of new concerns about the possibilities of charitable giving. However, the aproetic nature of the gift needs to be reexamined under the conditions brought about by hospitality. This chapter aimed to uncover the complex interplay between both concepts in light of a new elite class of donors who are blurring the lines between the host and the foreigner.

Derrida’s ideas on the hospitable gift (Newlands & Smith, 2010) expose the intimacy and tensions between the various actors within the charitable sector. This study suggests that
hospitality is not so much a fixed experience that inevitably pits hosts against others. Here, I have argued that philanthropy plays a critical role in recasting guests as hosts or, more aptly, foreigners as citizens. This phenomenon points to the power of economic capital and the making of the archetypal Canadian. The rags-to-riches narratives that characterize our popular imagination must then be understood in light of the conditions to which working class, poor, and racialized bodies are subjected. Here, Derrida’s ideas about the foreigner contain great relevance and strength. For him, the foreigner is defined by his or her assimilative capacity or how different “they” remain. Accordingly, “Encounters with strangers – the foreigner, the homeless, the refugee, the tourist – raise an important ethical question: How should we relate to the other” (Hogeveen & Freistadt, 2013, p. 41)? In essence, this study suggests that some in-group relations are purposefully intended to be unsettled in order for philanthropic capital to realize its valorizing potential. This tension is most palpable between IPHILs and SAEDs, where the latter have little capacity and symbolic capital to bring (back) the former into their imagined community.

Second, there exists great diversity within the broad categories of “host” and “foreigner.” particularly in terms of one’s access to resources and networks. This reality, of course, weakens the pact made between members within a group. Derrida believed that people were bound together by a common identity in relation (or opposition) to their binary. In this regard, foreigners share experiences that create solidarity. The same could be said of elites or hosts. However, the foreigner’s accumulation of capital and charitable investments redistribute these pacts. Diversity and inclusion practices in fundraising, then, offer new opportunities to expand an organization’s donor base, particularly if it can demonstrate cultural relevance to the new Canadian establishment.
Also, Derrida never contended with the ‘possibility’ of the foreigner’s agency; so when financial control, entrepreneurship, and the ownership of production change hands, so does the foreigner’s capacity to take on the moniker of the host. In this regard, the “possibility of hospitality” (Pantaloni, 2010, p. 236) is exacerbated by the benevolence of new hosts onto the other – but from within, of course, the host’s tent. On a related note, Ungureanu (2013) rightfully asserted that gifts have an “asymmetrical structure,” meaning that they are “shaped by ethical or political values and ideals” (p. 404). In effect, the giving of a donation is deeply entwined with nationhood, civility, and Canadian norms and morals. There is a curious presumption amongst all of the actors that philanthropy must be taught; that “our” way of giving is the right way. This is not to say that fundraisers are ignoring the cultural nuances behind the gift; in fact, most of the CFLNPs expressed a deep and “radical openness to the other” (Ruitenberg, 2014, p. 150).

However, the laws of charity (created by governments and maintained by non-profits) do not adequately accommodate different giving styles and methods. As a result, organizations face a “‘double bind’ of hospitality, expressed here as the paradox that hospitality is constituted both by property and by the openness or communication (the welcome of the stranger) that threatens or may even destroy it” (Baker, 2011, p. 1443).

For Isabel Pinto (2014), the question of hospitality addressed the organization of the self and society. Accordingly, the institution of philanthropy is informed by the economic needs of society and set-up to favour the making of elite subjects. As she explained:

In times like these, with too many different procedures for organizing and structuring people, and their goods, being it effective or potential, as I see it, the concept of hospitality lies its foundation everywhere, because if not really comprised to living together, we are stuck at organizing with one another. Social viability depends on being
capable of sharing ways of staying, restoring and making, more than just being. (Pinto, 2014, p. 146)

For me, the aporia of hospitality and the gift rests on an unspoken promise – or a promise yet to be – of transformative social change. Similarly, Kaufmann (2014) proposed that we shift our thinking about justice as a kind of gift:

Justice is widely understood as a giving of due: restitution, reparation, and a righting of wrongs in the negative sense; or reward for good behavior in the positive sense. Justice involves either a rendering of reward or punishment, depending on the behavior in question. By contrast, the gift is widely understood as that which is not deserved or required. (Kaufmann, 2014, p. 92)

While philanthropy has a long track record of funding research, discovery, access, and infrastructure, we have never before witnessed such a great (and unjust) chasm between benefactors and beneficiaries. In addition, the meteoric rise of diaspora elites comes up against startling levels of precarity amongst immigrant, refugee, and racialized bodies. In the end, this chapter argues that the role of philanthropy, with both of its emancipatory and controlling qualities, must be redefined if the possible has any chance to emerge from the impossible.
Chapter 4: Charitable Giving and the Making of Diaspora: Translocal Issues and Global Philanthropy in Question

Chapter overview

An upsurge of media announcements about immigrant mega gifts over the last decade has unearthed several questions about the role of local charities in both domestic and international affairs. How is Canada’s charitable sector bringing together local and foreign philanthropic issues? What does it mean to be a “Canadian” for those who maintain relations to back home? How does charitable giving support the development of a global citizenry? What is the role of the state in creating philanthropic dependencies locally and abroad? What kinds of organizations are losing out in this process?

Through an exploration of these and other related questions, this chapter suggests that a newer strand of translocalism is forming in which large publicly-oriented charities are simultaneously drawing on immigrant gifts for two distinct purposes: first, to fulfill the domestic interests of charities and social welfare and, second, to facilitate the development of “back home” through local philanthropy. In this regard, elite immigrant donors have become key actors in the internationalization of the charitable sector, even though their gifts are technically considered to be made locally. Through forty interviews with immigrant philanthropists, charity volunteers, fundraising executives of large non-profits, and executive directors of settlement agencies in Toronto, this study uncovers how the non-profit sector is reorganizing itself to appeal to the “here and there” interests of immigrants and diasporas. At the end of this chapter, I evaluate the opportunities and challenges that these shifts have created for both large non-profits and smaller immigrant settlement charities as each seeks the support of the diaspora.
Introduction

Where are you from? Behind this seemingly innocent question rests many connotations and speculations. On a superficial level, it refers to a benign curiosity about the place you reside – anywhere from the street you live on to the country you live in. On a deeper level, however, it also implies that you sojourned from elsewhere, that you once belonged to another place and are now “here.” For me, this question points to the complexity and inseparability of place and placement. In other words, one’s sense of belonging to a community is inevitably connected to one’s status in society. Indeed, belonging and citizenship are mainstay themes in immigration and diaspora studies. Throughout my readings, I was struck by the plethora of philosophical and practical questions that diaspora studies researchers have posed about the peculiarities of belonging – questions that have sparked debates about the extent to which the self and society are shaped by the global economy, technology, war and armed conflict, neoliberalism, conflicting political systems, and free trade.

Until recently, fundraising and philanthropy, as formal fields of inquiry, have played a relatively minor role in the transnationalism literature. Even though diaspora giving first appeared as a sidebar to studies on remittances and international aid (see Russell, 1986; Levitt, 1998; Stark et al., 1986; Ratha & Shaw, 2007), the emergence of a global or transnational capitalist class (Sklair, 2001) has inspired a number of new explorations about the circulation of ethnic surplus value (Walton-Roberts, 2011) and philanthropic capital (Bernholz, 2004) across the globe. Following the literature on remittances, earlier studies of immigrant philanthropy were primarily analyzed through the lens of giving back to an original motherland or as a culturally entrenched practice. While transnational philanthropy is most readily observed during times of crisis or natural calamities, researchers have become increasingly aware of how immigrant giving operates within domestic and regional contexts as well. This translocal expression of
benevolence suggests that there is much more behind these flows “from point A to point B” (Faist, 2012, p. 1). I argue that translocal philanthropy, particularly amongst diaspora elites, serves as a marker of model minority citizenship and belonging (Chou & Feagin, 2008). In this light, translocalism is configured as a process through which an archetypal diaspora (Armstrong, 1976) is made, celebrated, and reproduced.

For me, this idea stems from debates about the degrees to which translocalism is considered to be a theory, conceptual framework, movement, ideology, or process (see Gearhart & Palumbo-Liu, 2005; Itzigsohn & Giorguli-Saucedo, 2005; Smith, 2003). In reality, however, rarely is it an either/or choice; rather, translocalism, I argue, does not have a singular agenda and it often veers away from grand theory-making about immigrants and diasporas. If anything, the myriad of translocal-focused studies have shown how concepts and ideas are deeply rooted in the multiplicity of everyday experiences and processes. For me, the interplay between the subjective and objective, the then and now, and the here and there, are hallmarks of translocal studies.

Later on in this chapter, I make the claim that the earlier transnationalism literature tended to focus on how diaspora networks exemplified either the strength or weakness of the nation-state and large-scale institutions (e.g., corporations and banking systems) in establishing, maintaining, or diluting diaspora networks. Translocal studies, alternatively, have tended to focus on the value of the networks themselves (or an actor’s experience of networks), and how these circuits are built and deployed. Peter Dicken, Philip Kelly, Kris Olds, and Henry Yeung (2001) identified four major factors that researchers should consider when examining networks, particularly in the context of intensified global economic regimes:

(A) conceptual categories and labels carry with them the discursive power to shape material processes, (b) multiple scales of analysis must be incorporated in recognition of the contemporary ‘relativization of scale’; (c) no single institutional or organizational
locus of analysis should be privileged, and (d) extrapolations from specific case studies and instances must be treated with caution, but this should not preclude the option of discussing the global economy, and power relations within it, as a structural whole.

(Dicken et al., 2001, p. 89)

These factors support this present study for a couple of reasons. First, the issue of scalability serves as a reminder that the volume and velocity of networks vary from group to group, producing multiple interpretations of “diaspora.” To make comparisons between the philanthropy of the Jewish and Tamil diasporas, for example, speaks to the problem of size, compatibility, and relevance. Second, a focus on the unevenness of power allows researchers to analyze the everyday experiences of translocals in terms of patterns and disruptions by placing a premium on the nuances of class, race, gender, and location. These factors do not suggest that translocal studies are diffusive, chaotic, or disorganized; rather, the plethora of critical studies of translocalism both from “above” and “below” are vital to exposing the growing importance and primacy of global economic restructuring, neoliberalism, and white privilege and supremacy.

These claims correspond with Jonathan Murdoch’s (1998) ideas about actor-networks, which “seek to analyze how social and material processes (subjects, objects and relations) become seamlessly entwined within complex sets of associations” (p. 359). He believed that actor-networks could lead in the development of “network topologies” that consider how “spaces emerge as social-material relations that are arranged into orders and hierarchies” (p. 359). In the case of elite translocal philanthropy, then, actor-network topologies must be articulated as part of class consciousness and citizenship. I will delve into this further in a subsequent section of this chapter.

Even though the academic literature on affluent immigrant philanthropy in Canada is quite thin, many related case studies, position papers, and philosophical discussions have
encouraged me to revisit the issue of assimilation in immigration studies, evaluate the relevance of transnationalism and marketized philanthropy (Nickel & Eikenberry, 2009), and even begin contributing to a growing discussion on translocal relations, power elites and creation of the philanthropic state (McGoey, 2014). Accordingly, within the next pages, I explore the various interpretations and debates about this provocative and hotly contested field of study.

Transnational beginnings

Much of the literature from the 1970s and 1980s grappled with the push and pull factors of migration (see Cox, 1988; Greenwood & Bourgeault, 1973; Jenkins, 1977; Petersen, 1958). While the majority of these studies focused on poor and working class groups, more successive investigations of middle class and elite populations revealed a number of different motivations for migration, including higher education, investment, and corporate laddering opportunities. As a surprising foil within a Canadian context, David Ley and Audrey Kobayashi (2005) found that economic factors did not appear to be prominent among the list of reasons for migration “although many new arrivals landed in Canada as economic migrants, including the largest single national group of millionaire migrants granted admission as business investors and entrepreneurs” (p. 114). These claims, then, evoke an important question: why do those ‘from above’ make Canada their home?

A review of the overall characteristics of translocal elites helps shed light on this question. According to Jonathan Beaverstock, Philip Hubbard, and John Rennie Short (2004), “What is perhaps truly distinctive about the contemporary super-rich is not their involvement in national politics, but their role in a global neoliberalism that promotes low taxation, open markets, and the strategic withdrawal of state regulation. Perhaps more so than any other group, it is the super-rich that therefore lie at the heart of the global ‘space of flows’” (p. 406). The super-rich are also constantly between nation-states to the extent that they “dwell in global time-
space, not the space of the nation-state” (p. 405). In this way, translocal elites personify what Malcolm Waters (2001) called “distanciation,” a kind of “stretching of social relations across space and time” (Kivisto, 2003, p. 9).

Based on a similar line of thinking, David Featherstone, Richard Phillips, and Johanna Waters (2007) asked, “Is it meaningful to speak of the transnational where there are no conventional nation-states” (p. 388)? While they were referring to transnationalism within an “ungovernmentalized state” (Pogodda & Richmond, 2015) context, this question encourages researchers to consider the ‘location’ of the nation-state in society. To what extent does transnationalism threaten the power of the nation-state? Conversely, how are the laws of the nation-state strengthened through the regulation and surveillance of transnationalism? Exploring these questions through the lens of elite immigrant philanthropy unearths a provocative debate about the role of the nation-state in either enabling or restricting charitable giving amongst and between immigrants and diaspora groups. It also suggests that local-to-local or intrastate relations do, in fact, inform giving behaviours and patterns amongst affluent subjects. Many of these debates centre on the challenges posed by the issue of migration writ-large, including its origins and impact on sending/receiving states, and their historical underpinnings. Referring to the latter point, Ravindra Jain (1998) noted that migration is cyclical process that spurs a gravitational shift where local agendas become more salient and central than nation-state interests:

The civilizational technology of development and cultural evolution throughout 20\textsuperscript{th} century thought seems to have been a mirror-image of 19\textsuperscript{th} century social evolutionism. The dialectical relationship... between civilizations and settlement societies has the potential of reversing the hallowed centre-periphery relationship paradigm, in cultural terms, of the world-systems theorists. (Jain, 1998, p. 345)
According to Alan Green and David Green (2004), early immigration policies in Canada (up to WWI) met three objectives: “1) it was consistent with the aims of a national policy; 2) active recruitment accelerated the population growth rate; and 3) it appeased the nativist constituency in Canada” (p. 107). However, since then, labour needs for domestic production led to the opening of the floodgates from Europe, eventually creating “a large inflow of skilled labour who are picked specifically to be flexible: to work in the labour force in a way that means taking on a significant share of the risk of production” (p. 134). For Vic Satzewich (2007), “before [the multiculturalism policy of] 1971, real and imagined transnational activities had social and political consequences” (p. 51), which informed policy prescriptions for “temporary diasporas” (Akinrinade & Ogen, 2011; Trandafoiu, 2006). One can readily observe this phenomenon through the legislated and limited mobility of, for example, seasonal labourers in Canada and call centre workers in India (Mirchandani, 2002). I contend that these so-called movements are not only influenced by domestic economic needs, but by circulatory systems set-up through international trade deals. In this sense, diasporas play a vital role in global financial flows, both on the production and consumption sides of financialization.

Before I make the case for translocalism, a deeper analysis of the relevant transnationalism literature will help uncover the theoretical value of translocalism and its relationship to the process, or “making,” of diaspora. Almost twenty years ago, Nancy Foner (1997) argued that “modern technology, the new global economy and culture, and new laws and political arrangements have all combined to produce transnational connections that differ in fundamental ways from those maintained by immigrants a century ago” (p. 369). Several years later, Luis Eduardo Guarnizo, Alejandro Portes, and William Haller (2003) identified three influences within the field of immigrant transnationalism: “(a) classical theories of the role of individual factors in immigrant assimilation; (b) contemporary theories of contextual
embeddedness as determinant of immigrants’ incorporation to host societies; and (c) social network theory” (p. 1215). At about the same time, the idea of a “methodological nationalism” entered the discussion, in which “the nation-state and its boundaries are central to social analysis” (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004, p. 1007). Andreas Wimmer and Nina Glick Schiller (2003) identified three variants of methodological nationalism:

1) Ignoring or disregarding the fundamental importance of nationalism for modern societies. This tendency often goes hand and hand with 2) naturalization, or taking for granted that the boundaries of the nation-state delimit and define the unit of analysis. Finally, 3) territorial limitation confines the study of social processes to the political and geographic boundaries of a particular national-state. (As cited in Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004, p. 1007)

These factors still have their place in the most recent literature, but are now challenged by the engagement strategies of sending states that actively claim their diasporas; first, by way of influencing policy and facilitating bilateral agreements between sending and receiving states; and second, in terms of “imagining and materializing the idea of an object” (Ho, 2011, p. 761), such as the financing of infrastructure projects back home. These strategies are particularly important as elite immigrants are tapped as a “diaspora option” (Pellerin & Mullings, 2013; Trotz & Mullings, 2013).

As a brief aside, I would like to clarify that the term “transnational” is not synonymous with “international,” as the latter “pertains to activities and programs of nation-states, ‘multi-national’ to large-scale institutions, such as corporations or religions whose activities take place in multiple countries” (Vertovec, 2003, p. 643). Faith-based philanthropy, in this regard, often “bypasses the state and is considered to transfer resources to the people who really need it using traditional models of salvation” (Morvaridi, 2013, p. 309). In their study of black Christian
Africans living in the UK, Sonny Nwankwo, Ayantunji Gbadamosi, and Sanya Ojo (2012), observed that a diasporic “church economy” made way for a more pronounced religious entrepreneurialism that enabled back home politics to play themselves out locally, as well as unlocking informal giving back to the motherland. I will provide more details on the role of faith in translocal philanthropy in the discussion section of this chapter.

Alejandro Portes (2001a) traced the modern roots of the term “transnational” to the 1916 publication of *Transnational America*, in which the author, Randolph Bourne, claimed that “the country was doing a disservice to itself and its immigrants by pressuring them to conform to a homogenous world, losing in the process their distinct cultural heritage” (p. 185). Long after, and many studies later about the validity of centering the nation, a focus on transnational communities, particularly their development, practices, and behaviours, served as an “epistemic move away from methodological nationalism” (Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002, p. 301). For me, the idea of transnationalism is constantly challenged by iterative meanings of the nation and “undermines democratic standards of representation and accountability” (Bauböck, 2003, p. 701). The constant circulation of people, goods, and cash across different sites not only makes borders more porous, but forces nation-states to “re-invent themselves to actively encourage migrant activism from abroad” (Levitt & de la Dehesa, 2003, p. 588).

How exactly is this reinvention articulated and managed? Peggy Levitt and Rafael de la Dehesa (2003) suggested that there is a “shared repertoire of policies and expectations” (p. 601) that orchestrate these movements. The Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), an agreement between twelve Pacific Rim nation-states, including Canada, the US, and Mexico, is a recent example. In October 2015, the federal government announced that through a side deal, companies from TPP member countries can bring temporary foreign workers to run their operations in Canada. Employers from some of those countries would also be exempt from a “wage floor Ottawa
established in 2014 to ensure foreign workers on intracompany transfers are paid the prevailing wage for their occupation” (Curry, 2015). Under this arrangement – called the International Mobility Program – foreign workers could be paid the same wages as their sweat labour jobs back home. While the TPP has yet to contend with the question of cross-border charitable giving, then-Prime Minister Harper’s policy prescriptions were regarded quite favorably by conservative immigrant and diaspora groups. An apt example was when the sale of Canadian uranium to India was celebrated by the Indian diaspora during Prime Minister Narendra Modi’s visit to Canada in the summer of 2015 (see Chase & Mackreal, 2015). Perhaps the TPP deal will become the basis for bilateral income tax treaties to encourage philanthropic exchange, like the US-Mexico Border Philanthropy Partnership under NAFTA (Vogel, 2006). In effect, there remains great relevance in Levitt and de la Dehesa’s (2003) contention, made almost over ten years earlier, that “political parties’ role as privileged institutions for representing interests within the state realm makes them not only effective promoters of emigrant demands but also opens up possibilities for directly representing emigrant communities” (p. 605). In a similar vein, Rainer Bauböck (2003) noted that, “Calls for enlarging a well-established nation beyond a sending state’s territory through mobilizing its emigrants are in most cases empty nationalist rhetoric. The danger is that they provide fuel for nativist propaganda in the receiving state that portrays immigrant communities as a fifth column manipulated from abroad” (p. 718).

Given these contextual notes, what then is new about transnationalism? Through my readings, I observed four important developments in this field. First, renewed attention on police violence, surveillance, and racialized death has inspired questions about contemporary colonialisms, modern slave practices, and the intensification of precarious citizenship within the context of race, gender, and diaspora (see Sexton, 2015; Smith, 2015; Dellinger, 2014; Hudson & McKittrick, 2014; Jensen, 2014; Ralph & Chance, 2014; Trotz, 2014; Walcott, 2012;
Whembolu et al., 2014). Second, the financial crisis of 2008 has initiated a number of questions about primacy of financialization and monopoly capital in the development of diasporas and, perhaps more importantly, the role of immigrants in the realizing the potential of financialization (see Lainer-Vos, 2014; Yong et al., 2013; Hall, 2012; Harney, 2012). Third, I have become increasingly interested in how questions of indigeneity are inevitably complicated, informed, and understood by diasporas. These issues have been taken up most actively in South American case studies on indigenous land claims disputes, armed conflict, resource extraction and deforestation, and cultural sovereignty (see Goldstein, 2015; Alexiades, 2013; Funk, 2012). Finally, I have observed an upswing of scholarly interest in the “one percent” or global elites (Keister & Lee, 2014; Keister, 2014; Young et al. 2014; Martin, 2013) who have made enduring connections in Canada, back home, and many places in between. Here, David Ley’s (2011) foundational work on millionaire migrants has unearthed a number of important observations about the role of diasporas in global finance, international trade, and, of course, civic engagement in Canada. I argue that this critique of elite immigrants provides another perspective to studies of global neoliberalism by further contextualizing the intermingling of class, race, gender, and globalization, and by articulating how new wealth is organized, concentrated, and distributed. My study is but one contribution to this growing body of work on the expansion of global capitalism with a distinct focus on the privatization of social welfare. In pursuit of this aspect of fundraising, I am reminded of Mark Rupert’s (2005) assertion that “the ideology of globalization seeks through its representations to universalize and naturalize, and thus effectively depoliticize, the neoliberal regime of global capitalism” (p. 460).

Featherstone et al. (2007) also claimed that early research on transnationalism was “guilty of overplaying the immateriality of spatial distance for contemporary social life, particularly with respect to so-called global elites or to an emergent transnational capitalist class”
when the “geographies of the super-rich” (Hay, 2013, Pow, 2011; Beaverstock et al., 2004) do, indeed, lend themselves to an erasure of what Ley called “the tyranny of distance and the particularities of place” (2004, p. 157 as cited in Featherstone et al., 2007, p. 385). Katie Willis, Brenda Yeoh, and Abdul Fakhri (2002) agreed, noting that, “Elite groups still have to operate within the confines of state boundaries, whether that be in terms of legislation...or in less tangible terms in relation to local business practices and social norms” (p. 506). My interpretation of this claim extends beyond the physical or spatial distance of a “mythologized home” (Ramji, 2006, p. 647) to include the “symbolic violence” (Bourdieu, 1989) of psychological distancing. Simply put, the social and nostalgic connections to an original homeland do not interfere with an individual’s pursuit of success. Also, on an institutional level, this ‘tyranny’ is “regulated by... market pressures and the career aspirations of individuals...and the frequency of international mobility between cities feeds global corporate knowledge structures, cultural diversity, social practices, wealth, consumption, cultural capital, and agency in the global city” (Beaverstock, 2001, p. 8).

The early literature described the making of diaspora as a process of “heterolocalism,” a term coined by Wilbur Zelinsky and Barrett Lee (1998), who studied the settlement issues of different immigrant ethnic communities within various white settler colonies. For them, there were three determinants of heterolocal immigrants – features that deeply resonate with transnationalism:

1) There is immediate or prompt spatial dispersion of heterolocal immigrants within the host country. 2) Residence and workplace are usually widely separated, and there is also a frequent lack of spatial overlap between residence on the one hand and shopping districts and sites of social activity on the other. 3) Despite the absences of spatial propinquity, strong ethnic community ties are maintained via telecommunications, visits,
and other methods at the metropolitan, regional, national, and even international scale. 4) Heterolocalism is a time-dependent phenomenon. 5) As is the case with other models, heterolocalism can be observed in both metropolitan and non-metropolitan settings. (Zelinsky & Lee, 1998, p. 285)

In this present study, “spatial dispersion” influences the possibilities or thickness of the diaspora network. However, the fact that cross-border giving is a reality amongst many immigrants means that we should not completely do away with transnationalism. Particularly from a policy and regulatory perspective, the nation-state plays a vital role in either enabling or restricting cross-border communications and networks. In doing so, bureaucrats, politicians, and corporations remain deeply concerned about transnationalism’s growing capacity to test and reify the power of the state. Accordingly, transnationalism as a concept still holds great meaning and relevance.

I also believe that there is wider public understanding about what constitutes the “nation” over the “local.” Some of this recognition comes from the use of certain terms that have been popularized by free trade agreements and bilateral partnerships like NAFTA and GATT. In an effort to build momentum with other actors outside of academia, I argue that “transnational” has more cognitive resonance for most people than does the term “translocal.” In this regard, the transnational network is a kind of “superstructure that rests upon rather resilient national bases” (Carroll & Fennema, 2002, p. 414) and, in doing so, signifies “universalist or anti-nationalist processes and ideologies like the supersession of nationalism in legitimating universal rights of citizenship” (Fitzgerald, 2004, p. 229). In some ways, transnationalism, then, serves as an affront to the nation, supporting my argument that a translocal analysis makes room for domestic issues of the diaspora as well as intrastate connectivity. Even in Irene Bloemraad’s (2004) study of dual citizenship there was “little evidence for postnationalism [and limited but] growing support for transnationalism” (p. 389). In addition, Bauböck (2003) suggested that researchers consider the
intersecting boundaries of membership in political communities. Accordingly, he used the term “political transnationalism” to “answer critics who maintain that transnationalism is neither so new nor so significant that we need to invent a new term for those phenomena” (p. 703).

Returning to the primary topic of this study, remittances and philanthropy are also indicators of the efficacy and importance of transnationality. According to Behrooz Morvaridi (2013), over two thousand philanthropic hometown associations have been formed in the US that fund activities and services that are “selected through collective funding decisions” (p. 306). However, remittances and philanthropy are not the same. In fact, according to Gustavo Flores-Macías (2012) donors/philanthropists sometimes bring additional interests to the table, “including marketing and public affairs considerations” (p 425). In this sense, remittances have a tendency to go under the radar, while philanthropy has an overt public appeal – even though the number of studies on remittances eclipses that of transnational philanthropy.

As noted in Chapter 1, charitable giving is broadly defined as the “private, voluntary transfer of resources for the benefit of the public” (Johnson, 2007, p. 6). Transnational philanthropy, however, is considered to be “the process in which migrants or immigrants abroad, in forging and sustaining their social relations with their origin societies, allocate a certain portion of their remittances to fund development projects in the emigration country” (Opiniano, 2002, p. 3). While the problems of this terminology go well beyond the various takes on surplus value and the gravitational pull of the nation-state, several studies indicate that the confluence of multi-national or bi-lateral state relations have prompted a distinct focus on transnationalism. For example, Xiao-huang Yin and Zhiyong Lan (2003) observed that diaspora philanthropy to China was influenced by two developments: First, Washington and Beijing reset their relations by allowing the Chinese in the US to reunite with their families back home starting in 1979. Second,
there was a significant national conference on overseas giving, which called on the diaspora to play a greater role in international development through philanthropy.

Local ethnocultural and religious institutions are ideal environments to observe the power and politics of fundraising for back home activities. In her study of the Sikh diaspora, Christine Fair (2005) noted that while gurdwaras enable linkages between the diaspora and people in the state of Punjab through fundraising for humanitarian, political, and social causes, some have allegedly supported militancy: “Gurdwaras with Khalistani leadership and congregants could be counted on both to support pro-Khalistan personalities and institutions and to propagate this position in various public and private forums” (p. 132). Similarly, Erik Snel, Godfried Engbersen, and Arjen Leerkes (2006) argued that, “The terrorist attacks on New York and Washington (2001), Madrid (2003) and London (2005)...can be interpreted as incidents of transnational political activism” (p. 287). I remain unsettled by these sorts of claims because of the implicit permission it gives authorities to surveil minoritized places of gathering and worship. Rumors of these sorts of indoctrination and fundraising practices have given the Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS) license to spy on clerics, community leaders, and civilians, as was recently witnessed in Calgary’s mosques. Here, the supposed threat of terrorism, Islamophobia, and fundraising come together, making sites for translocal connectivity (e.g., cultural and religious centres) new surveilling targets for law enforcement officials. Paula Johnson (2007) noted that in the US, considerable efforts have been made to ensure that philanthropy does not fund extremism. As a result, “the US Patriot Act, issued anti-terrorist financing guidelines for US charities, and now exerts even more scrutiny on international charitable giving and money transfers” (p. 40). These sorts of measures have certainly impacted some diaspora populations more than others. For example (and speaking to an early point about the “push” factors for migration) war, terrorism, and civil unrest influence how migrants feel
about their new homes and, in turn, the expectation for them to give back. Simply put, refugees
and forced migrants tend to express a kind of infinite gratitude to their host for “saving” them,
making philanthropy an expressive act akin to Derrida’s (1992) concept of the returned gift. This
phenomenon can be (somewhat problematically) mapped by a “conflict level proxy”
(Gammeltoft, 2002, p. 186) in which flows of migrants are calculated by the locality of war and
claimed that donor advised funds and intermediary funds were established to protect citizens
against homeland security threats. In both of these cases, philanthropy is used as a strategic tool
to arm against foreign threats on domestic soil.

Revisiting assimilation

Many authors of transnationalism have questioned, critiqued, and validated the ways
social and cultural assimilation influence local diaspora interactions and sustain cross border
networks. In my study, I was surprised to hear how many IPHILs believed that they belonged to
Canada and, perhaps more telling, how Canada belonged to them. While the term “assimilation”
only appeared in a couple of interviews, what I observed was a strong assimilative and
integrative ethos permeating throughout the data. Accordingly, I would like to reconsider
assimilation here, and its impact on translocal philanthropic relations.

Richard Alba and Victor Nee (2003) defined “assimilation” as the “weakening role of
ethnicity in assimilated people’s life chances” (p. 1309). In social studies, the apparent precursor
to transnationalism studies was assimilation and multiculturalism studies in which local issues of
tolerance were connected to one’s overall sense of belonging. Thinking further about the impact
of assimilation, however, we must ask of ourselves, following Peggy Levitt (2001), “Is
assimilation incompatible with transnational membership” (p. 195)? Considering the sustained
relevance of assimilationist theory, particularly in fundraising, I remain critical of the propensity
to use it as a way to “hegemonize relationships” (Urry, 2003, p. 251), particularly within a North American setting:

[Today] migrants encounter a social context that is much more tolerant to ethnic diversity and long-term transnational connections compared to the past when assimilation was demanded more strenuously. Rather than feeling pressure to abandon their unique traits, some migrants feel encouraged to maintain, if not celebrate, their social and cultural differences that are sustained through ties back home. At the same time, the spread of a global culture is reducing some of the distinctions between home and host societies that migrants must bridge in order to live in more than one country. (Levitt et al., 2003, p. 569)

On a related note, Ley and Kobayashi (2005) introduced the idea that return migration has provided a “sidebar to the historic immigration narrative of departure, arrival, and assimilation. The weight of the assimilation narrative, especially in the United States, has tended to obscure the significance of the return trip home” (p. 112). Peter Kivisto (2003) also argued that it would be wrong to construe transnational immigrant communities with assimilation; rather he proposed “that a conceptual framework is needed to articulate the interconnectedness of transnationalism and assimilation – their both/and rather than either/or character” (p. 17). In reality, assimilation remains a foundational social process through which immigrants enter and make a sense of place within what has been called the “modified mainstream” (Alba & Nee, 2003, p. 1309). Alejandro Portes et. al, (2002) agreed that transnationalism and assimilation are not necessarily “at odds” (p. 294). According to them,

The concept of transnationalism was coined in the early 1990s by an enterprising group of social anthropologists to refer to the ‘multi-stranded’ activities created by immigrants across national borders... Instead of a gradual process of acculturation and integration into
the host society, as described by classical assimilation theory, transnationalism evoked the imagery of a permanent back-and-forth movement in which migrants lived simultaneously in two or more societies and cultures, tying them together into “deterritorialized” communities. (Portes et al., 2007, p. 251)

However, not everyone sees transnationalism as an extension of assimilation. David Fitzgerald (2004), for example, contended that the “opposition between ‘assimilation’ and ‘transnationalism’ has been over withdrawn…. Cultural pluralism seems especially compatible with dual nationalism given the former’s emphasis on legitimate diversity” (p. 244). Even for Gernot Grabher (2006), “This cross-disciplinary exchange had yielded, among others, the notion of the ‘temporary cluster’ and the ‘project ecology’ to capture the spatial and social logics of temporary organizational arrangements” (p. 169). This notion of temporariness has, of course, a tremendous influence on one’s motivations to assimilate, giving the term ‘translocal’ more credence, particularly within a domestic philanthropic context.

Given the obvious “entanglements of economy” (Sheppard, 2012, p. 47) within charitable giving, the institution of philanthropy itself has often been viewed as an assimilative force for immigrants. As Alba and Nee (2003) contended, “Whenever opportunities for ethnic-minority immigrants are greater in the mainstream than in the ethnic economy, there is a motive for assimilation” (p. 1310). And, in the case of elite immigrant philanthropy, I propose that what assimilation and transnationalism have in common are the ways in which they appeal to one’s sense of loyalty to the nation. In fact, loyalty was a recurring theme in my interviews with the IPHILs. In particular, their philanthropic loyalties seemed to reside with Canadian charities, and less so with causes back home. These expressions go against the claim that “ethnic elites are perceived to have dual loyalties at best, and questionable loyalties at worst, to Canada” (Satzewich, 2007, p. 44). Saskia Sassen (2002), too, believed, “flexible loyalties and identities
facilitate loyalties, and identities facilitate the formation of cross-border geographies for an increasing range of activities and communities of membership” (p. 227). I surmise that multiple loyalties are more visible from the transnationals from below, especially if we consider remittances as part of the giving spectrum. In addition, from a Canadian viewpoint, there are specific policy prescriptions that may yield a stratified sense of loyalty. As Claudia Paraschivescu (2011) noted, “In the Canadian case... since the state has a diversity-driven agenda, the interaction of the participants with native-born citizens and people of other nationalities is easier, which translates into the participants being and feeling part of Canada” (p. 33). Paraschivescu also surmised that the “definition of citizenship [is] where membership of a nation state and of a national political community are mutually exclusive due to the fact that one can only be a member of one state and a nation” (p. 32). Through her study of Romanian experiences of transnationalism in Canada, she observed that the dual citizenship category helps “ensure the preservation of the culture of the country of origin, on one hand, and assimilation into the receiving country, on the other. The participants... do not seem to experience a feeling of ‘between-ness.’ They are both citizens and members of Canada, as their relationship with Romania only takes place at a material level, and not at an emotional level” (Paraschivescu, 2011, p. 32). This claim helps explain why the IPHILs in my study give, materially, to Canadian institutions, but still have emotional ties to their countries of origin as well.

Making a case for translocalism

The problem with privileging the nation over the local is that we inadvertently overlook or minimize the power of networks and connections that sometimes have little to do with formal borders. In fact, several studies have suggested that some migrants prefer to completely “sever ties with the home country” (Al-Ali & Koser, 2003, p. 246) while others do not participate in transnationalism (see Faist, 2015; King, 2015; Carling & Pettersen, 2014; Fox, 2005). Global
diasporas must then “exist through the prism of the local” (Werbner, 2002, p. 129). Pnina Werbner (2002) called this duality “chaordic transnationalism” where diasporas have “the capacity to expand across boundaries while remaining local and even parochial, recognizing its extensions while practicing locally” (p. 124).

Another issue with “transnational” is that it offers little theoretical reference points for understanding local diaspora connections and sometimes overstates the need for relations “over there” to be maintained. Roger Waldinger and David Fitzgerald (2004) argued that, What immigration scholars describe as transnationalism is usually its opposite: highly particularistic attachments antithetical to those by-products of globalization denoted by the concept of “transnational civil society.” Moreover, migrants do not make their communities alone: states and state politics shape the options for migrant and ethnic trans-state social action. International migrants and their descendants do repeatedly engage in concerted action across state boundaries, but the use, form, and mobilization of the connections linking “here” and “there” are contingent outcomes subject to multiple political constraints. (Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004, p. 1177)

Nick Clarke (2005) also surmised that local-scale texts and narratives are “highly effective and constructive in at least two broad ways. First, they give us a methodological framework which combines transnational ethnography and historicized political economy...Second, they bring realism to the table of transnational mobility studies” (p. 308). Here, the translocal agenda vehemently opposes the development of a grand theory or production of abstractions based on the everyday experiences of diasporas. A qualitative study based on experience, then, supports this realism and, at the same time, gives a voice to immigrant actors.

Without using the word translocal, Stephen Vertovec (2001) surmised that diaspora identities are informed by experiences and connections here, there, in between, or on the way:
“Among certain sets of contemporary migrants, the identities of specific individuals and groups of people are negotiated within social worlds that span more than one place” (p. 573). Translocalism has also been referred to as “bilocalism,” which connotes “a stage in the development of a broader set of identities, but not necessarily; often it works in the opposite direction, as the hometown association competes with other forms of organization that emphasize politics or ideology over affective ties” (Waldinger & Fitzgerald, 2004, p. 1182). On a similar note, Kivisto (2003) surmised that, “the ‘production of space’ is integral to the politics of identity” (p. 7). Thinking about translocalism as a process also allows researchers to consider the impact of iterative movements after arrival. For example, Ley and Kobayashi (2005) found that in countries like China and India, “an emergent high-technology industry has led to return migration by citizens who had moved to western nations as students and young professionals, but who now see career and entrepreneurial opportunities in their countries of birth” (p. 112).

Indeed, some of the IPHILs and IFVs briefly resided in other counties for a period of time before settling in Canada. I call these intervening moments migratory “pit stops,” which could last anywhere from a few months to several decades.

In some respects, these pit stops create “multivocality” (Gardner & Grill, 2002), a term that “stimulates the desire to connect oneself with others, both ‘here’ and ‘there’ who share the same ‘routes’ and ‘roots’” (Vertovec, 1999, p. 450). Notice the glaring absence of nation-state boundaries in Vertovec’s description here. Under this new regime of the translocal, Kim Butler (2001) suggested a four dimensional study of diasporas: “(1) the reasons for and conditions of the relocation; (2) relationships with the homeland; (3) relationships with hostlands; and (4) interrelationships within the diasporan group” (p. 209). These dimensions provide a foundation upon which diaspora relations can be mapped and evaluated. The latter point, in particular, has
deep relevance to translocal relations because it privileges the experience of connectivity over the oft-paternalistic needs of the nation.

The translocal global city: gender and communications considered

As was mentioned in Chapter 1, I believe that global cities are important nodes for the activation of social processes or, in this case, the making of diaspora. Janet Abu-Lughod (1999) called these processes “works of art” (p 170) because they enable change and innovation on social, political, and economic levels. For Levitt (2001), “communities are one of several mechanisms mediating between ‘high’ and ‘low’ levels of transnationalism. When individual actors identify and organize themselves as transnational communities, a response from ‘above’, by the state or by an international religious group, is more likely” (p. 200). In this sense, I contend that cities are also ideals venues for potential interactions between the immigrants from above and below. The global city, in particular, is a fertile setting for these sorts of engagements. For example, since most settlement agencies in Toronto are located in “inner” cities, next to the towers of finance and business, the line of contact between the translocal philanthropic class and the transnationals from below (Smith & Guarnizo, 1998) should be, in theory, direct and accessible.

Furthermore, the relationship between finance and elite diasporas is best observed in cities that “control and orient foreign investments” (Schuerkens, 2005, p. 542). In this regard, Toronto – Canada’s main headquarters of the banking system, transnational corporations, and “businesses of influence” (Boehm, 2005, p. 153) – serves as a kind of actor in this study as well. As Beaverstock (2001) noted, “The demand for complex, diverse, and specialist services by the financial economy of the city has not only encouraged proximity and agglomeration economies, but has also spawned constellations of legal accounting, consultancy, tax, recruitment,
advertising, public relations, and design firms, who provide specialist services at the point of
demand” (p. 3). In addition, the territorialization of translocal practices are “intensely reproduced
in the financial district of the city through the agency of both local, national, and international
migrants as they participate in regular cross-border transnational corporate, social, and cultural
networks (with work colleagues, clients, friends and family who live overseas)” (Beaverstock,
2005, p. 249). This idea corresponds with Sassen’s (2002) assertion that, “It is not only the
transmigration of capital that takes place in this global grid but also that of people, both rich –
i.e., the transnational professional workforce – and poor – i.e., most migrant workers; and it is a
space for the transmigration of cultural forms, for the reterritorialization of ‘local’ subcultures”
(p. 218). Following Beaverstock and Sassen, I argue that the city is an important observation
deck to view how translocalism operates on the ground, especially in terms of the diaspora’s
civic inclinations and local philanthropic activities.

The stark reality, however, is that these connections within diasporas are fragile and
fragmented, particularly in the global city. To put it simply, the elites and the working poor are
not bound together by the fact that they may come from the same “elsewhere.” How do cities and
their institutions perpetuate this difference? Are they complicit in the weakness of these ties? As
an indirect response, Vertovec (2007) asked researchers to consider the relationships between
transnationalism and integration within the context of the global city: “Many policy-makers and
members of the public assume a zero-sum game: that is, it is presumed the ‘more transnational’
migrants are, the ‘less integrated’ they must be. Such an assumption is likely false” (p. 1046).
For me, the global city is also an important platform to showcase how elite immigrants are
contributing to the local, through volunteering, workforce participation, civic engagement, and
cultural development. In this way, Michael Peter Smith (1999) was correct to suggest that,
The ‘translocal’ is composed of ‘local to local’ relations, ties and networks that cross national boundaries, and where they intersect in the city are the ‘translocalities’ (i.e., the household, the firm, the community centre). The key to the sustainability of the translocal is social networks in migration and their attendant modes of social organization which cross national boundaries by both physical movement and technology. (As cited in Beaverstock, 2005, pp. 248-249).

Here, proximity makes way for prosperity, particularly for upwardly mobile and privileged subjects in the financial and commercial sectors. This closeness, in turn, begets philanthropy. In the discussion section of this chapter, I will return to the issue of location (Toronto as a venue, actor, and platform) in the making of philanthropic elites.

Underlying this entire field are racialized and gendered dimensions of philanthropy and civic participation. Many of these issues are palpable within ultra-rich, patriarchal, and heteronormative households where the man plays the role of the hyper-mobile business executive, while the woman act as a “lady who lunches” (Gottschalk, 1998) and volunteers at the local charity. When it comes to immigrants, hyper-mobile elites have also been referred to as “astronauts” as they have short, distanced stints elsewhere, but eventually come home. Johanna Waters (2003) noted how gender roles play themselves out, particularly within the context of a nuclear family:

A related circumstance, well known amongst these immigrant communities, is the ‘astronaut family’. In this situation, it is the man of the household (the ‘astronaut’) who returns shortly after immigration to Asia to work, leaving his spouse (the ‘astronaut wife’) and children to undergo the often-difficult process of settlement in Canada in his absence. He will spend up to six months at a time away from his family, returning periodically for rest and recuperation in Vancouver. (Waters, 2003, p. 220)
The astronaut family not only embodies “transnationalism par excellence” (Waters, 2003, p. 225), but also the “insurgent temporality of social life” (Morawska, 2003, p. 630) that, interestingly, characterizes the transnationals from below as well. In effect, the traditional expatriate is diminishing, “to be replaced by the ‘nomadic worker’ whose ultimate international mobility meets the challenges of international business in globalization” (Beaverstock, 2005, p. 246).

The family structure back home also plays a foundational role in the everyday lives of transnational migrants and the “ideologies of return” (Singh, 2001, p. 290). In their study of immigrants to Canada from Hong Kong, Audrey Kobayashi and Valerie Preston (2007), observed the “overwhelming primacy of the family and its interests for many Asian migrants. The feminization of Asian migration and the diverse family configurations that result often challenge the patriarchal nature of Asian familialism, in which fathers and husbands are the ultimate arbiters whose decisions sometimes favour sons over daughters” (p. 154). Within a South Asian diaspora context, Supriya Singh (2006) also claimed that “money plays a very important role in other settings (Indian weddings, funerals, for example)... [where] men have property rights and obligations to contribute to a family’s well-being” (p. 380). Within a Caribbean context, Alissa Trotz (2005) noted, “Men’s narratives were more likely to stress autonomy as a primary motivating factor behind their decision to move, whereas women’s discourses were frequently saturated with notions of familial responsibilities” (p. 53). These gendered relations are important and salient features of translocal production and reminds me of Margaret Walton-Roberts’ (2004) point about the endemic nature of patriarchy on a global scale: “A transnational gendered focus demands that rather than contain the issue of patriarchy on the south, we become more attuned to how its endemic and systemic nature and distribution permits
such spatial intersections and reinforcements to occur” (p. 370). I will return this observation in
the discussion section of this chapter.

Another case for prioritizing “translocal” over “transnational” draws on the ways in
which “diaspora communities are organized on the internet” (Brinkerhoff, 2004, p. 397). The
internet, in effect, advances “globalized diffusion and localized appropriation” (Dahan &
Sheffer, 2001, p. 88) and creates a deterritorialized environment where the nation plays are
tertiary role in diaspora communications. The ease of communications has also helped thicken
translocal relationships, particularly amongst those from below. For example, the use of mobile
applications – like Periscope, Skype, WhatsApp, Facebook Messenger, Facetime, and Viber –
makes the internet a “space for community dialogue” (Adams, 2004, p. 213). In some ways, the
use of digital communications for translocal connectivity, particularly in North-South and South-
South relations (see Tynes, 2007), represents the “expansion of a Western consumerist culture”
(Greig, 2002, p. 231) through paid advertising on social media and search engine optimization
tactics that promote North American and European goods and lifestyle. Martin Carnoy and
Manuel Castells (2001) contended that technology “was not the cause, only the medium. The
source of globalization was the process of capitalist restructuring that sought to overcome the
crisis of the mid-1970s” (p. 5). In this sense, globalization also gives researchers the opportunity
to see how international trade has fueled investor programs through the advent of technology and
communications. In an examination of Castells’ “space of flows,” Beaverstock (2001) noted that
these connections are “constituted not only by electronic exchange and the requirement of the
spatialization of command and control in nodes, but also by the importance of the spatial
organization of the dominant managerial elites (rather than classes)” (p. 2). Speaking of the
primacy of diaspora communications on a domestic level, Michael Greig (2002) argued, “For a
culture to be susceptible to outside influence, the capability for cross-cultural communication
must exist” (p. 228). Given that the internet is an everyday reality for the majority of growing middle classes in the Global South, Victoria Bernal (2006) called on her readers to consider transnationalism as a “reconfiguration or remapping of boundaries, so that, for example, what might have once been outside the margins (of the nation) is now more effectively included within a larger framework of imagined community” (p. 163). I believe that the imagined values of acceptance, multiculturalism, and tolerance have made way for curiosities about how others communicate and perform on a national level. This is an important point to our discussion on philanthropy, which I will return to in a later section of this chapter.

My views on elite translocal philanthropy are informed by the participants of this study who provided important information about how a model minority is made. In the following sections, I pay attention to their voices and perspectives based on the following issues and themes: notions of belonging, translocal politics at home and back home, the transference of class and gender issues, and the problematic role of the global city.

“Where do I belong?”

Who is the transnational capitalist class (Sklair, 2001)? Vertovec (1999) described this group as a mixture of transnational corporate executives, state politicians, bureaucrats, professionals, and media barons who make up “a new power elite whose interests are global, rather than exclusively local or national, and who thereby control most of the world economy” (p. 452). William Carroll and Meindert Fennema (2002), however, claimed that not all “corporate leaders really form a transnational community that operates in a way as to warrant the term ‘transnational class’ in the structural sense of the word” (p. 396). There is indeed a growing concern that an overplaying of transnationality has undermined the value of local allegiances and loyalties, particularly within diaspora philanthropy studies. But fundraisers know well that
loyalty and trust are indicators of philanthropic propensity, and that these values, in turn, lead to one’s sense of belonging to his or her local community. According to one IPHIL:

I’d say in the last 10 years I’ve settled on the fact that I belong here more than [place of birth]. It’s been a very interesting evolution, not that I ever aspire to go back to [place of birth]. I think the ties to [place of birth] have been disappearing with the death of my aunts and uncles, and my parents. Weirdly that was the generation....I went to [place of birth] every year to see my aunts, because I love them and they were getting older. I was sort of circling Europe I would always make a point of going to [place of birth] but now they are dead. I have cousins, but it’s not the same thing, right? So maybe that has something to do with it. Those ties dissipate and the ties that connect to Canada increase, if nothing else now because I’m going to probably have grandchildren. Everything grows here and diminishes on the other side. (IPHIL 3)

Many researchers have claimed that the family unit back home serves as the primary bonding agent for transnationals. However, as IPHIL 3 noted, this evolutionary process away from the motherland is propelled by changes in kinship alongside the formation of new roots here. Raising children in Canada and buying property, for example, are obvious symbols of “home making.” I observed this sentiment again when I asked IFV 3 about when he first realized he belonged in Canada:

Krishan: Home. You said, you will stay if you made $100,000 a year within five years? When did that change? When did you say, “You know, maybe this is home?” Or is it home yet?

IFV 3: I think when our son was born, then I started to get the sense that we’re here now. But if you really want to know, deep down, when I really felt that we were here for good, in that sense, I would say when we bought the house in 1984, so ten years ago. When we
first bought our house in Scarborough, it’s when it started to sink in and that’s when our son was also two years old at the time. Because when he was born, we were still in an apartment and we didn’t have this. Because living in an apartment always has a whole renting aspect and doesn’t have the sense of anchoring.

The question of loyalty is exacerbated by one’s longing for home – a kind of nostalgia that can create ambivalence towards naturalized citizenship. As one IPHIL put it:

Well I think I’m both. I don’t think of myself as a [country of origin] or Canadian. I don’t really have that thought. It’s almost like Canada is my home but [place of birth] is where I belong, right? So, in terms of my thought process...culturally, my thought process is [place of birth] but also Canadian. I’m a mixture of the two cultures. But I mean the first time I went to [place of birth] after about 20 years...Canada is my home but in [country of origin], when I went after 20 years, I felt at home. So...but I can’t see myself actually living in [country of origin] because I think of Canada as my home. So it’s kind of, I don’t know if that explains things. (IPHIL 9)

Symbols of “settling in” – marriage, buying property, and civic participation have – been described in terms of their capacity for “syncretism, creolization, bricolage, cultural translation, and hybridity” (Vertovec, 1999, p. 451). In other words, one’s values and traditions are reshaped by external forces and social norms that are carefully negotiated within a time-space continuum. Many recent immigrants, both from below and above, wrestle with this process, giving currency to Ley’s comments about the “tyranny of distance” where one inevitably must choose between home and back home. For the CFLNPs I interviewed, these ongoing struggles about belonging make it difficult to build relationships with astronaut-like immigrant philanthropists. As one participant noted,
And they’ve got... they got the flat in London or Paris, some place in Indonesia or Bali or somewhere like that and then they’ve got a residence in China or a residence in Hong Kong or Taiwan or India. You just...it is a strange and amorphous group of people, and I wonder sometimes if that’s a lonely existence being...being a global citizen means you’re...I think those people need to figure out where their roots are. It’s a particular problem in Vancouver. You know I do some work in Vancouver and we know that there are hundreds and hundreds of these ultra-high net worth individuals living there. The father is working in China, the wife and the children are in Vancouver. How do you effectively engage those people in the community, when you have very patriarchal family structures and the guy’s never...the guy is never around, right? (CFLNP 3)

Astronauts tend to be elites who frequently return to the places from which they came but maintain active relationships in their new homes (in this case, Canada). An acute understanding of what constitutes home is central to the effectiveness of CFLNPs who solicit internationally-based prospects. For example, alumni of a university in Canada who now live abroad will likely donate if the proposed initiative has a positive impact on their current “local” community.

According to another CFLNP,

So a real life story: [name of a university in Ontario], the year coming up to the handover in 1997, the Hong Kong handover. We built deep relationships, spent a lot of time there, became friends with a lot of people there. But we listened very carefully to what they were saying. The message came out loud and clear, a couple, as much as a couple of years before the handover: Those of us who are here in Hong Kong with significant resources are under subtle, but pretty clear pressure from the government or the PRC. Their expectation is that we will be giving back to the benefit of Hong Kong and China. That the idea of the old, rich Hong Kong Chinese giving huge benefactions to Princeton...
or Harvard or whatever – those days are going and they’re going fast. And that led to a whole retooling of our strategy, which involved the creation of a summer exchange program in Hong Kong, a scholarship program for Hong Kong students, an Asia-Pacific Studies Program, a chair in Hong Kong Studies. With all of these things we were then able to attract major benefactors who had Canadian connections, but were living kind of as “astronauts,” as they used to call themselves, flying back and forth between Hong Kong and China. How do you give them opportunities to do things which benefit the [name of a university in Ontario], but ultimately give them a big face in front of the Chinese government, right? So that was a very conscious and very specific change in strategy. (CFLNP 7)

A similar sentiment was expressed by a third CFLNP:

So we had broken through the campaign goal six times and reset it during the time I was there. That would never have happened if we were not able to create that sense of cause and caring about the place. So it mattered to the community and they helped us see where the community saw itself going. And by community, I mean the Toronto region, GTA. But there were people in other cities, in Hong Kong or in London, England, who had roots in our area, or connections to our area, and we thought that was important for them, from a national or international perspective. So the same thing for a university and I think we see this no matter whether in medicine or engineering or medical studies or humanities. It’s all about creating a better world we imagine for this and subsequent generations. That’s what philanthropy is about. What makes fundraising programs successful is when they are able to capture that piece of a person’s imagination. (CFLNP 5)
For those IPHILs firmly based in Canada, my study suggests that philanthropy gives them the flexibility of building new allegiances while maintaining old ones as well. In addition, there is an opportunity to blend individual interests here and there. For example, as one IPHIL noted:

IPHIL 9: Charitable wise... like I said, I am... I really would like to do my... my community project. So, if something comes along, and I mean, you know it can be in [place of birth].

Krishan: So it’s going to be international?

IPHIL 9: Yeah, I mean, it can be in Canada too. But I just... like I want to be careful, I want the right... I think it’s about identifying the right people to help. Like that’s actually been one of the challenges, when you’re looking, you’re trying to help children and, therefore, their parents. I find it very difficult to identify the right people here.

Another IPHIL regarded his philanthropy as a rare opportunity to make Canada a “global leader,” particularly in research and healthcare:

So here I’m trying to tie many, many things together. I’m trying to tie innovation, I want to tie universities, I want to tie research, I want to tie the quality of life. I want to talk about connecting global leadership, I want to talk about [country of origin] issues, and I want to talk about Canada. All these things factor in when I talk about charity. (IPHIL 2)

It is important to remember that giving does not begin in Canada. In fact, the vast majority of migrants come with varied experiences of donating money within their own local contexts. In this regard, charity can be considered an imported value which lives in an interstitial space upon arrival – somewhere between emigrant and immigrant, and between then and now. The crux of the literature on immigration is that it rarely takes into account that immigrants were once emigrants. Barry Kim (2006) believed that the absence of the emigrant experience muddles
debates on citizenship. I, too, argue that giving is part of a “translocal consciousness” (Anagnostou, 2010, p. 103) cemented long before one’s luggage is packed. This consciousness also suggests that there exists a global understanding that “charity” – in its broadest sense – is an expression of generosity, selflessness, and reciprocity. Most people – emigrants and immigrants alike – would likely agree that that involves some sort of financial transaction (Bonds et al., 2015; Smith, 2013).

Back home politics and the making of the translocal

In this present study, I found that the reputation of the nation-state back home has a tremendous impact on one’s inclination to participate in philanthropy. For one IPHIL, political corruption in his place of birth makes him a reluctant donor in Canada:

For example, there is one [charity] that I won’t name but it has to do with [place of birth] and it, you know, we raise the money in the diaspora and it... it gets invested or it builds schools and hospitals and so on, in [place of birth]. And it’s become a lot of... I don’t like the governance structure. You know the president in the country and the head of the church – they’re all advocacy board members and shit like that. I know that there’s theft happening and misconduct happening and yet here we are, still supporting it because even if fifty cents gets to the target that’s better than none. Although my heart tells me... my head tells me that that’s wrong. We should shut that place down if it’s not going to play by the rules but... so that’s a huge, huge disappointment that goes to the core of you – knowing one of [country of origin’s] weaknesses and lack of governance and lack of rule of law. It’s a tiny country of three million people, and yet it has a handful, you know, a dozen oligarchs who control the whole damn economy. (IPHIL 4)

Another IPHIL expressed a similar frustration about homeland bureaucracy:
IPHIL 2: But problem in [place of birth] is that there is tremendous bureaucracy. Like I remember, I said [to the charity], “You say put my name on a high school and I will give you a million dollars.” They said, “Yeah, fine give it all.” Then they had a problem: “No, no we don’t want to give it a name, we don’t want to do this thing at all.” So even though things changed, I desire to give it to [name of university] because of many reasons. Number one: I went to [name of university in country of origin] and it changed my whole perspective on life. Secondly, I really don’t think I would have gotten either a job, my first job at [name of company], or even immigration to this country, if I didn’t have a degree from [name of university]. So indirectly, it changed my life. So it’s not that I have any charitable interests in that organization, it’s more about my gratitude.

Krishan: Give back, give back....

IPHIL 2: Whatever little I can do. But if you ask me, if I have any interest in helping the poor in [place of birth] or doing hospital donations and everything – I don’t have those initiatives on my mind.

IPHIL 2’s frustrations are not only observable at a micro-level, but as another IPHIL described, at the level of the state as well. IPHIL 1 said that immigrants should appreciate Canada’s “social calmness:”

IPHIL 1: What I like about this thing is the social calm this country has. I have never experienced that, I don’t see it. I travel a lot, but the social calm, despite so much diversity. I’m not talking about a melting pot or mosaic or this and that. I’m talking about calmness.

Krishan: We are not fighting over differences?

IPHIL 1: No. We have calmness. Also, the state is not in our lives too much. The presence of the state in Canada is very invisible. If you go to a country like [place of
[167] birth], even the US, there are bodyguards, and this committee and that committee, and this lobbying group and that group. The state is very visible. Here the state is there, but if you have something major happen, you suddenly see all kinds of people show up. But they are invisible otherwise. Anyway this isn’t about Canada. Some other time you interview me about Canada.

What role, then, does the state actually play in immigrant or translocal philanthropy? In an effort to grapple with this question, I turn to the voices of the CFLNPs, who run what I call “para-state institutions,” particularly when it comes to service delivery (like healthcare, higher education, and social welfare) and funding coordination between the federal and provincial governments. I argue that the CFLNPs are interlocutors for the state insomuch that their charities are meant to serve the public good. In addition, local philanthropic diasporas are key actors in the internationalization of some para-state charities. As a result, high net worth immigrants are driving Canadian charities to reach beyond their own borders and plant flags, so to speak, globally. Many of the CFLNPs I interviewed talked about their internationalization successes through networking with the transnationals from above. For example, CFLNP 2 boasted about his track record with Toronto’s Caribbean and Chinese diaspora for his charity’s international initiatives:

I’ve been out to see every single media leader in the Caribbean press. I’ve been able to meet with all the consul generals of the Caribbean countries here in Canada. I’ve met with all the business associations that are representing each of the countries in the Caribbean countries here in the GTA. We’ve held events, and many of them were more awareness building than fundraising. But it’s through those events that we identified wonderful networks that we were able to then target for potential fundraising. So, this is again a great example of how we’re able to take an international need and use that as a
way of engaging local diaspora leaders and local citizens, who, quite frankly, really want to get involved. I have two other quick points here. We heard, for example, that in the Chinese community, that what was very important for us was to build credibility in the Chinese community here, to raise money, to demonstrate the kind of outreach were doing in China. So the Chinese community here wants to know, “How many trainees have come from China to do their education at [name of charity] and how many have gone back? Where are your research partnerships in China and what are they doing and what are they achieving?” So, we not only talk about the work that we are doing on the ground for the diaspora communities here in Canada and at [name of charity] specifically. They very much want to know what we are doing back home in their countries as well. I’ve found that this is certainly the case in the Caribbean community and the South Asian community. We have a lot of fellows who have come from India and this, you know, the various stakeholder groups and the Indian community, have really wanted to know how we are building capacity in India through the work that we are doing. Finally, I am going to tie this all together to say that, we are also creating an alumni program at [name of charity] in which we are going to then take all of these missionaries, if you will, people who have been trained at [name of charity] that are now all over the world, and try to keep them engaged through communications, lifelong learning, social events and the like. To keep them connected to us in a very formalized way, with the view that longer term, they may want to give money. Again, we are not looking to raise money right away. We understand we have to keep them engaged and connected to us, but we realize that we have this amazing network around the world that we really haven’t kept in touch with. And just as we try to engage diaspora communities here, we need to engage communities that have come through [name of charity] but have gone back to their home countries so
that they feel equally a part of our institution. And, at some future point, they will want to financially support us. (CFLNP 2)

Amongst those IPHILs that gave directly to charities back home, there appeared to be a sizable discrepancy in the amount they sent. In other words, several IPHILs give no less than seven digit donations to mainstream organization in Canada, while development projects in the motherland would receive anywhere from one hundred dollars to a few thousand dollars. One IPHIL recounted a story about how he “struck a deal” when he was solicited by an intermediary from back home:

[Name of solicitor] is my very good friend and so is his wife. One time they wanted to raise $500 for each child [in name of town where IPHIL grew up]. So I asked, “What do you want me to do?” He said, “This year, our target is 200 children.” At the end [of the solicitation letter] there was one line which said for $37,500 you can name the whole school and hostel. So I asked, “If I divide this money over five years is it okay?” I’ll tell you the psychology behind that. It’s like in [country of birth], that was a big number. So when I divided the whole problem into smaller problems our commitment was manageable from year to year. (IPHIL 2)

Notice here how this donation was articulated as a “problem,” whereas his gifts to large mainstream charities in Canada were described as “opportunities.” For me, these accounts point to a feeling of obligation, sometimes called “guilt philanthropy” (Elliott, 2006, p. 53), when back home calls on its diaspora to give. Related to “expanded transnationalism” (Levitt, 2001, p. 198), these sorts of occasional transnational practices are most visible prominent during political crises or natural disasters. On a practical level, elite immigrants see their meagre gifts back home as emotive, communicative acts. One SAED succinctly put it this way:
Most of the people I know who have done well economically love going back to [country of origin]. I love going back to [country of origin] to eat and drink and drive around and this and this and that. The question is if I had money, would I invest there? I don’t have money, so I can’t answer that. But I do know that many people who have money haven’t necessarily invested there. So they know and trust the North American way of doing things. When I say North American I include Canada and the USA. But there is less credibility and believability in [country of origin] or the ...yeah, let’s say the [country of origin] business world. That doesn’t mean that there aren’t people who don’t do business there, but most of the ones I know importing and exporting. I don’t know of too many people who go from here to build over there or do other things. (SAED 1)

While nostalgia certainly plays a role in giving (as Trotz (2006) observed in the fundraising activities amongst diaspora alumni of Guyanese schools), this present study suggests that emotional ties do not necessarily elicit mega gifts from affluent immigrants. Advanced communications technologies, arguably, have, in part, dissipated this sense of nostalgia within the field of diaspora charitable giving. As IPHIL 2 noted:

About 30 years ago, if you want to send a letter to your parents or to your family, it used to take one month to reach them. And then they will read it and call you. Nowadays you just write an email for free. You don’t pay anything at all. There, right away communication is established. So much so, that you don’t worry about going to the computer at night. It’s right there in your hand [points to mobile phone] wherever you are. (IPHIL 2)

Returning to the role of the state, I believe that fundraising volunteers are “unscrupulous intermediaries” (Barrientos, 2011, p. 2) in building para-state relations. Throughout this study, I observed that networks between mainstream charities and immigrant philanthropists are first
established by volunteers and then handed over to fundraisers who are expected to secure the gift. In an effort to better understand the motivations of these volunteers, I deliberately revised the parameters of my interview plan to ensure that their voices were added to the mix. When I asked the IFVs about their first memories of giving, many of them recalled sending money back home (e.g., remittances) and how those “gifts” morphed into an interest in fundraising. One very prominent Toronto-based IFV remarked,

IFV 2: That’s what I did. And in the meantime, I was sending money back home to [place of birth] to help my mother.

Krishan: Tell me a little bit about that. Was that something that was expected of you? Something you just did naturally something?

IFV 2: No, no my dad was off in the country and my mum had my two younger brothers and so the sense that my mother had worked hard for me and so if I could help...

Krishan: You would.

IFV 2: Then you send back to help her. Not a lot. Maybe $100 every 3 months but that was a lot of money from what I was earning when I had to save for 10 months to go to teacher’s college and buy my books and pay my room and board.

For me, the role of IFVs and IPHILs in large para-state charities exemplifies the relevance of a “public sphere theory” (Adams, 2004) in which transnational community research highlights the “linkages between individual participants, community forums, offline organizations and institutions” (p. 200). As Bernal (2006) noted,

Scholarship on the public sphere has tended to focus on the ideals laid out by Habermas – of open access, equal status of participants, and rational analysis of alternatives. Critics have pointed out that even in Western democracies existing public spheres actually fall short of the ideal in various ways. It is interesting to consider, however, how the
characteristics of the internet as a medium and the conditions of diaspora relate to Habermas’s ideals. (Bernal, 2006, p. 165)

This kind of theorization makes way for new investigations into how diaspora networks and intrastate relations help advance civil society organizations. Moreover, it supports the idea that publicly-oriented charities actually teeter between the public and the private spheres (Winston et al., 2002; Netting et al., 1990), especially as donor interests become central to an organization’s mission.

The dissonance within translocal relations was most readily observed during the SAED interviews, particularly as they described their underfunded international programs. To my surprise, many of the settlement agencies have robust and enduring international projects with other like-minded groups “back home.” However, according to the SAEDs, immigrant philanthropists want little to do with those initiatives. One SAED described the scope of his charity’s international work:

Part of the analysis around the increased difficulty of newcomers to integrate quickly in our society, tells us that if a skilled immigrant arriving here is going to get a job in any kind of timely way, you need to start the process before they actually leave their home country. And so the federal government has also realized that in this analysis and they have funded overseas programs in several different source countries, like China, India, Philippines, and the UK. And so what they’ve done, through a coordinating body, is contracted partners across the country to actually do the settlement work. So they have staff in those countries provide workshops to migrants who have been approved to immigrate to Canada. And then it takes several months before they do it because they need to get their medical papers and a lot of different things. (SAED 4)
Another IFV expressed her dismay that an IPHIL (who she claimed was a personal friend) ignored her requests about making a modest donation to support a settlement agency:

I kept calling and kept getting blocked. My messages wouldn’t get through to him. I don’t know if he heard it or what – but never a penny. Nothing. Nothing. They will give to the [name of large mainstream charity] $30 million, but never responded to the [name of settlement charity] that’s providing service to people. (IFV 2)

Returning to an earlier point that philanthropy buys admission into the establishment, Lloyd Wong (2008) contended that, “In the post-9/11 era, the notion of citizenship as constituting ‘social membership’ has been highlighted in public discourse, where citizenship is viewed as something that goes beyond formal, legally defined obligations. In this sense, citizenship is viewed as a form of ‘desirable activity’ with normative connotations” (p. 85). This configuration of citizenship asks researchers to consider all of the elements that transform an average citizen into a good Samaritan.

Throughout my interviews with the SAEDs, I was struck by their growing disillusionment with affluent immigrants from their own cultural group, even though many of these organizations have international fundraising mandates akin to those of the large mainstream charities that these same philanthropists support. One of the major differences between settlement agencies and large charities is the latter’s capacity to promote mega gifts locally and internationally. In fact, the CFLNPs have the distinct privilege of being able to amplify and celebritize immigrant philanthropic elites. As one CFLNP of an arts charity explained,

So we were able to show, give an outlet to people who had [name of culture] heritage who had deep involvement with the country, still had personal connections there and a desire to see that story being told in a way that would not just be told in Toronto but
around the world. So that the shows that we created actually toured or we were receiving touring shows – both happened. So that became both, you know, community-wide fundraising galas…those kind of events but also very, very large gifts from individuals.

(CFLNP 5)

In some ways, large charities act as intermediaries for the “diaspora option” (Pellerin & Mullings, 2013; Filipovic et al., 2012) to realize itself. So, for instance, when a Canadian hospital offers training to doctors from the same country where a philanthropist was raised, their gift to that hospital acts as an expression of giving to home and back home. In my interviews with the IPHILs and CFLNPs, these sorts of gift arrangements were regular occurrences, which, of course, would motivate any well-meaning fundraiser to closely study how best to identify and cultivate certain diasporas for their international projects.

Returning to the growing globalization of the non-profit sector, this study suggests that charities are arranged asymmetrically or hierarchically. In this sense, globalization is not “essentially economic or political or sociocultural or environmental. Rather, it is viewed as all of these, taking the form of multiple, complex, messy proximities and interconnections” (Urry, 2003, p. 250). In addition, globalization creates an intensified globally mobilized elite class and a “splitting off [of] those in the margins” (McCarthy, 2002, p. 353). This messiness, in part, led to the development of “ethnonational diasporas,” which are “dispersed [groups] in various states usually not contiguous to the borders of the homeland” (Dahan & Sheffer, 2001, p. 89). For example, many South Asian Ugandans in Canada have connections in the United Kingdom, since this was a major migratory route during Idi Amin’s reign (see Malik, 2014; Mamdani, 2011). The maintenance of these bonds are not necessarily connected to a single place, but are rooted in one’s sense of home to various elsewheres. There are many other examples of twice or
multiple landings, making it difficult to pinpoint what exactly is required to transform a homeland into a “home.”

Again, these pit stops are important in the making of the translocal. Moreover, these bonds are maintained and protected because neither party belongs “back there” anymore. For example, one of the IFVs explained how she developed a connection to New York even though she was not born or raised there:

I went up to New York with my aunt who would come down to [place of birth] for Independence Day celebrations. When I got there they said to me, “Why are you going across the country? It’s too cold and you have to stay in New York.” I had a student visa, so I had to go to school. So I went and I took a business course, around the corner, but I knew it wasn’t what I wanted to do. Well I tried getting into a school in New York but you had to write the SATs. I went and, again, I had nobody to tell me [how to take the test]. I saw people filling in things and I didn’t know what to do. We are talking 1963, when you had to use score cards. Well, I was marking up the book and I didn’t know what the card was all about because it had not been part of my experience in [place of birth]. I had nobody [back home]...and I decided I don’t want to go back....Well there are two places in the world I think I would like to go: Canada or Norway, okay? Canada or Norway. So in September, yeah, a year after I left [place of birth] I went down to the Canadian Consulate. I applied and he [immigration officer] asked me what I was going to do. I said I would do anything. I came here in November, two months later, as an immigrant. (IFV 2)

There is also a familial and intergenerational thrust in the making of a translocal community. For example, more immigrant adults are supporting charities that their children are
involved with and, in turn, many settlement agencies and large non-profits have recently launched fundraising strategies to attract the “next generation.” According to one SAED,

Right so, if you have that relationship with your family, where they’re like, “Oh, you know my son. He has this great job and he also supports his charity. We’re going to support him. That’s great.”...My family may know (what to support) but kind of don’t know. I have a core group of maybe six or seven people that are really close and really open. Obviously this organization is connected to my identity. Are you going to be that comfortable sending out an email to everybody on your friends and family list? Just be like, “Hey, I work or volunteer with this organization!” (SAED 5)

In his analysis of intergenerational diaspora issues, Portes (2003) asked, “Is transnationalism mostly or exclusively a first generation phenomenon, or can children of immigrants be expected to participate in large numbers” (p. 889)? I argue that as successive generations become entrenched in Canadian issues and problems, their philanthropic interests will stay close to home too. In the case of the Jewish diaspora, the number of second and third generation Jews supporting charities in Israel is shrinking (see Kasnitz et al., 2004), while there is greater interest in giving to maintain “Jew-ish” (Gilbert, 2014) networks locally. This is certainly a translocal expression where the gift does not need to cross a formal state border in order support distinct cultural activities. One of the IPHILs I interviewed talked about these generational flows as a kind of religious experience:

IPHIL 4: Yes, it is a cultural thing, you give because you must. It is...

Krishan: It’s a religious thing?

IPHIL 4: No, yeah I mean religion is smaller. Religion not necessarily to the church but the school, you give to the [country of birth] Relief Society. We’re now a bunch of us giving to the refugees out of Syria. It’s just you get hit up for these things and the causes
are all good. So, yes, there is a philanthropic bend to [name of culture] and I think it comes naturally because we’ve been displaced at least once, usually twice, sometimes three times and people started over again. Especially if they had a few breaks and if they were looked upon kindly, they reciprocate.

Krishan: It’s funny because the Jewish community is often cited as a very philanthropic community in Toronto, in building Canada and its establishments. Their experiences of genocide is actually the rallying cry, right? And similarly to the [place of IPHIL’s birth] communities. That horrific time shaped people’s charitable soul.

IPHIL 4: Yes, it’s galvanized the community. The charitable soul that, I would think, comes from elsewhere. Because if you look at the...I mean again, the Jewish community in Toronto, is remarkable. You look at some of the philanthropy....I mean it’s just not the Jewish causes. A lot of it is and I take my hat off for them for that. But not all of it. You have the Art Gallery of Ontario, the ROM, and U of T. Good on them! That’s what happens I think, you know, over the generations and so on.

As noted in Chapters 1 and 2, philanthropy is not only a central tenet of all organized religions, but it is deeply embedded in everyday faith practices (Brown, 2013; Wuthnow & Hodgkinson, 1990). When it comes to elite donors and faith, the IPHILs noted that their first few gifts went to building temples and churches. In a way, these donations expressed a certain commitment to ensuring adequate provisions were made for their own community. Over time, however, their priorities and interests pivoted – mainstream charities could offer a new promise of belonging within the old and exclusive establishment. As one IPHIL put it:

Oh yes, and my philanthropy really started with my community. The only thing I did for my community was build a church and that was really initiated by mother [who] passed away, but she felt that I was always doing things for other communities and not enough
for [name of ethnic group] communities. I had my reasons why I wasn’t doing it and it proved that I was right. Anyway, the church is still there and it’s standing and that’s good. (IPHIL 6)

Another IPHIL expressed a similar attitude:

IPHIL 2: But when you come to this country not all donations are related to people you feel an association with – your family, temples or community services...those kinds of things. Initially, I started giving to those places....

Krishan: Within the [name of ethnic group] community?

IPHIL 2: Mostly religious, okay?

Krishan: Temples?

IPHIL 2: Temples. But even then I used to go give...generously compared to other people, okay? One day my kids asked, “Daddy, you give money to community services? Why don’t you give it to hospitals?”

One IFV called these donations “first stage immigrant phase” gifts:

I think that by and large, people from the [region in the world] send money home and give to the church. That’s where they’re giving. They haven’t got to the next level. I think they’re still in that first stage immigrant phase. To many of them it’s still first generation and so in the first generation, it’s the church and back home. So I would tend to think that by the time we get to more second and third generation, who’ve grown up here, who’ve been the beneficiary of life in this country, who begin to see the range of opportunities for giving, then I think that the notion of giving won’t be just the church, but to the hospital, or to the university, or to the arts, or to other things like that. (IFV 6)

Following Jeffery Alexander (2000), I argue that through elite immigrant philanthropy, charities have the opportunity to “interpenetrate and restructure the more restrictive spheres of religion,
economy, state, ethnicity, family, and science” (p. 14). In this sense, immigrants are not only diversifying the tried and true composition of the charitable sector, but are also forcing new alliances between faith organizations, cultural groups, and mainstream non-profits. The question then becomes, to what extent are Canada’s social norms able to withstand these proposed alliances?

**Importing social relations: faith, gender, and class in question**

How are varying intracultural tensions from back home imported? How do these issues play themselves out within immigrant circles? Throughout my interviews, I was struck by the salience of “domestic rivalries” such as caste, regional differences, religion, and class. These problems were noted by many of the SAEDs, IPHILs, and IFVs I interviewed – ninety percent of who are immigrants. According to one SAED:

> There are people who are even more provincial than that because you know in [country of origin], as in other countries, there are regional rivalries. There’s north versus south, this versus that, so there are people who want you to support this town or this city or this region. As opposed to the one that comes from 50 miles away. I think I am beyond that and I think most of our community is beyond that. There hasn’t been too much recent immigration, so we are all multiple-layered; we all have different personalities, multiple personalities. We’re a little bit schizophrenic because, of course, as human beings we go out and fall in love or we meet a person who isn’t necessarily from the same town, or the same region, or the same religion. How do you accommodate all of these changes here? (SAED 1)

One of the IPHILs shared SAED 1’s perspective:

> The [name of ethnic group] are like that. From wherever or whatever village you come from, you have your own little group it doesn’t matter where you go. (IPHIL 8)
Similarly, for another IFV:

I met with [name of reporter] at the [name of national newspaper]. I looked around their newsroom and I said, “You know, there’s something about this. I just wasn’t comfortable.” But anyway, I got the job. The managing editor at the time said to me, “Look, I can’t promise I’ve got a job for you but we are going to send you to [place of birth] to go and do a story. They were writing a series of stories about going home and so they booked my airfare the whole bit. Gave me $200 of spending money, okay? And you can pay me to write this article. I hadn’t been back since 1964, so this was the first time I was going. And this was 1979, okay? And I’m seeing [place of birth] through different eyes now and places that I grew up almost didn’t exist anymore, okay? And I realized, my God, how poor we were. You don’t realize it until you go back. I met my grandmother; I spent time with her. It was great. Came back and wrote a story. About two or three months later, after the story was published, I got a lot of crap from the [name of cultural group] community for writing this story because they said I was putting my dirty laundry out. Our dirty laundry. (IFV 6)

These rivalries support the idea that even though philanthropy is rooted in notions of belonging within a local context, power struggles and inequality back home move along a time-space continuum. For me, these tensions “position individuals in the course of their everyday lives within and across each of their places of attachment or perceived belonging” (Vertovec, 2001, p. 578). Accordingly, the monikers of “insider” and “outsider” can be formed long before migration. For example, current domestic tensions between Tamil and Singhalese immigrants could be seen as vestiges of the war in Sri Lanka. Class and race are particularly palpable issues that play into social stratification here and help explain the fissures between “from below” and “from above.” In other words, poor immigrants and refugees are organized differently and are
less accepted into society than their middle- and upper-class compatriots who tend to have lighter skin, far reaching business networks, access to resources back home, and social agency. Referring to the latter point, strength in agency, translates into greater mobility on a local level (Maxwell et al., 2008). This observation further complicates Derrida’s claim that a migrant first becomes a foreigner when confronted by a host (Derrida & Dufourmantelle, 2000). In “contemporary modern or post-traditional societies, these categories have become distinct” (Rundell, 2004, p. 85), but are deeply rooted in power relations from elsewhere. On a related note, Silviu Totelecan and Stefan Mann (2012) suggested that we should look at the role of the insider and outsider through a transcultural lens, meaning that “we need to stay outside of a culture in order to understand the peculiarities of its identity” (p. 15).

In the end, people’s perspectives are perpetually sticky, requiring a renegotiation of past experiences or an erasure of history from one’s consciousness. Here, memory – not nostalgia – plays a vital role in charitable giving. For the CFLNPs, these memories are configured as morals and values. As one CFLNP described:

You know the same process that one would take for, you know, any individual making a decision, is trying to understand what values a person has, what do they want their philanthropy to accomplish? There is a story to be told and the story is a very personal thing. And it takes time to get to know that and for the person to trust you. (CFLNP 5)

Another CFLNP noted that:

With the Indian community, I’m not sure about the ingredient. I just don’t know, you know? We’re all working on it but if we created some Jewish related stuff, I think that could be very helpful in engaging. I am not sure whether the same issue would be the same for the Indian community that if we had a program in South Asian whatever, that it would have potentially the same meaning that it might to the Jewish community.
Similarly for the Italian community. So I don’t know what the answer is to engage in the community as such. My best guess right now is to do as much as you can to engage on a personal level, to create events that bring them into the tent, either as a community or as part of the overall stuff that you’re doing. (CFLNP 8)

Another CFLNP noted that the fundraiser’s task is to first determine what motivates an individual donor and then draw on this information to orchestrate a gift. This approach, known as “donor-centered fundraising” (Burk, 2003), has become the gold standard of fundraising practice, and is distinct from older techniques where a non-profit’s needs are first identified and then matched with a donor interests. According to CFLNP 2:

Your role as a fundraiser is to make sure that you understand what motivates people and to use those motivations in any possible way to secure a gift. So if a donor from a diaspora community wants to give and wants to be seen as a leader from a diaspora community, and it’s on that basis that they’re making their gift, fantastic! If there’s a donor that’s part of a diaspora community but wants to give a gift to you because they want to be viewed as being part of the mainstream, fantastic! I think the point is: Don’t generalize; you have to understand what the motivation of the donor is. Appeal to them on the basis of those motivations. If you’re a really good fundraiser you’ll have understood what motivates people and you will find a way to make the gift work.

(CFLNP 2)

Following Luis Eduardo Guarnizo’s and Luz Diaz’s (1999) investigation of transnational entrepreneurs, this study suggests that there is an inextricable link between entrepreneurship and elite philanthropy. After all, the majority of the philanthropists I interviewed were self-employed, of “a higher class origin and had higher status occupations before emigrating than their ‘not-so-successful’ counterparts” (p. 406). Moreover, these entrepreneurs “built their
business nexuses through their social networks, which in turn facilitated their social positioning and adaptation to a transnational setting” (Guarnizo & Diaz, 1999, pp. 405-406). One of the IPHILs described how entrepreneurship is the key ingredient to “making it:”

For me, entrepreneurship is about the pursuit of wealth creation. It begins with what I fancy, what I’m passionate about. It’s not all about logic. Logic is the process of refinement. Discipline and a professional approach come in eventually. And I think there’s kick to it. It’s like you are on a high. Also, for me, it is unusual for a [name of culture] guy, because I don’t have this money sense of business. For me, it’s more important that I create something and then move on. The more I do that, the more comfortable I am... But there’s one harmful trait – that is I always feel like, most things, I can do better than most people, especially in business. (IPHIL 1)

These trajectories come up against the “rags to riches” narratives that have often been ascribed to model minorities (Hsu, 2015). All of the IPHILs admitted to having “good” upbringings with few hardships. I surmised that the climb from below to above is more of a rarity than normal occurrence, and that immigrant bootstrap capitalism is part of the working class imaginary that creates what I call a “roll-up the sleeves work ethic.” In essence, many elite immigrants make their start well above ground level. This became apparent when I asked about their childhood upbringings. For example,

I mean let’s back up a bit, we came as immigrants in 1962 and within ten years my parents had built a business, still considered a small business by Canadian standards but they employed a 100 people. They literally gave my sister and me a very... they started not from nothing and they had they some small savings which they used to sneak out of [place of birth] on the black market at twenty cents on the dollar, right? So it wasn’t a lot
of money, but it was enough to get them going and...so they were very philanthropic.

(IPHIL 4)

Similarly, for another IPHIL,

Krishan: Can I ask you a little bit about that time what was life like growing up?

IPHIL 6: It wasn’t that hard. I didn’t have a bad childhood because when you are a child your immediate needs are met and it’s fine. When you are raised in a socialist country [like I was], equality of men and women exists from the start. I actually was shocked at how little it was present here. It took a long time for Canada to wake up to equality of women and men; it really was not present when I came – so that was a negative [about] North America. We are changing and things are getting better.

This point addresses the gendered dimensions of translocal philanthropy as well. Within the field of transnational philanthropy, Patricia Pessar and Sarah Mahler (2003) initiated an important conversation about the gendered geographies of power in which “multiple hierarchies of power [operate] within and across many terrains” (p. 818). Within this present study, each of the IPHIL women talked about how their roles as mothers, daughters, and wives were connected to their philanthropic values. Conversely, the IPHIL men never spoke about their giving relative to their roles as fathers, sons, and husbands. According to one IPHIL woman:

I am a mother of two kids – one is 30 and one is 28 – and it was really important for me that they become community-minded as well. When they are young it’s easy to tell them to do it like this but then they become adults. So our daughter lives in New York and works in New York and she’s the eldest. And she is actually having a meeting today with an organization that does some sort of big work with homelessness in New York that she wants to get involved with. She just did it out of the blue. She says now that they are in New York for six months and settled, [she’s] ready to get involved in the community.
And of all things – homelessness....There are lots of other cool things you can get involved in besides [homelessness]. And our son is a big leader at [name of charity in Toronto]. It’s great and he really wanted to get involved there. So I think I have kids right at that sweet spot. (IPHIL 3)

Another IPHIL woman noted how philanthropy (as a social value) has been passed down from generation to generation, and how she felt a need to continue this tradition:

We have a family tradition passed down to me and now it’s gone to my son. It’s in the DNA, if that makes any sense. I also see the good that my ancestors have done, not for one person, not for self-indulgence, but for everyone. For the good of the community. And then that is when money is worth having, okay? Because for people who have money and only indulge themselves, it’s not worth it. To me it’s not worth it. (IPHIL 8)

According to Floya Anthias (1998), even though diaspora has a “transnational referent” it also connotes that the forging of “solidary bonds with crosscutting groups, both from within the dominant category or with other groups also on the margins, is more difficult to sustain” (pp. 574-575). In other words, “diaspora” does not necessarily signify people from the same group; it could have a trans-ethnic quality. One IPHIL talked about how everybody can benefit from her philanthropy:

[My grandfather] was also very kind to people who are way below him. Now the difference is he’s from [country of origin], because it was a colony, a British colony. Now he helped everyone in [country of origin] no matter what their background was, but when it comes to actually giving money, he would focus that on [country of origin]. In my case, it’s for everybody. So that’s the difference, that’s the only difference. I don’t just give to the [country of origin] community. (IPHIL 8)
Similarly, another IPHIL noted that, “For me, my community is all inclusive. This is all Canada. I don’t see no colours, I don’t see no races, I don’t see no sex difference; male or female. I just look at people as energy. That’s why I’ve been blessed all my life” (IPHIL 10). This global orientation contains an undercurrent of an early 1980s Canadian aesthetic around multiculturalism. As one IPHIL asserted:

   By the way, I hate religions... I feel most wars and conflicts in the world are happening because of this religious problem. But in our system, in our religious books, there is something known as [term in another language], which means “the whole world is one family.” Therefore I choose my causes where it has a global impact, but the primary beneficiary always has to be Canada. (IPHIL 2)

For me, diaspora is “realized” when a “fiction of congregation takes hold” (Levitt, 2001, p. 203). As noted several times before, these assemblages are divided along a number of lines that are not necessarily centered on a country of origin, but also through social norms and expectations informed by faith, language, class, gender, and race. In the end, the fundamental problem with “transnational” is that it creates one category that merges “millionaire capitalists, highly-skilled middle-class professionals with impoverished labourers or refugees” (Li & Teixeira, 2007, p. 95) into one grouping.

**The place of the global city**

This final section addresses the importance of the global city. Each of the CFLNPs described the value of Toronto as a site for attracting diaspora investments. For example, according to CFLNP 8:

   The fact that [the name of the charity] is right in the heart of downtown Toronto, offers many things. It offers a sort of lifestyle of being in a busy, busy area of the urban centre but it also offers opportunities for jobs, which you wouldn’t get in lots of other places.
Now, it’s interesting: People say that you have lots of immigrants but it’s not a closed-in place. They’re integrated, enmeshed within the city. I think that’s a very significant part of our persona that is attractive to a lot of people. (CFLNP 8)

Another CFLNP talked about the growing value of urbanization and how cultural diversity and inclusion initiatives within cities are nudging charities to reconsider their “targets:”

People are moving from rural to urban everywhere...and the difference in terms of the high-rise condominiums is incredible. It’s people shifting away from the countryside too. But it’s not just China – it’s all kinds of places in Europe and in Africa and in other places as well. It’s creating some very real issues for how people are coping. And we know that when people come to Canada...they need to be in a metropolitan community, so Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver are the three places where you see the more diverse populaces, right? (CFLNP 6)

These examples, again, point to the currency of translocalism over transnationalism, since many of these relations require an urban centre for immigrants to “make their mark,” particularly within the job market. According to one IPHIL,

IPHIL 6: I’m involved with things that really matter to me. I’m involved with [name of large arts foundation in Toronto] which I think is so, so amazing and they do such amazing work with [name of large hospital in Toronto] and organ transplants. I’m involved with [a large healthcare association in Toronto], a phenomenal organization with reach to Canadian kids. All these things are important to me and could only happen in a place like here, Toronto.

Krishan: Anything back home?
IPHIL 6: Nothing, nothing. For me, that’s my past and I am not one of those people that left and always wanted to go back. No, there is nothing there for me. I matured, I developed as a person in this city, not over there. (IPHIL 6)

The global city serves, then, as a platform for elites to access networks, capital, and unique internationally-oriented charitable giving opportunities. Moreover, the “otherness” of high net worth immigrant appears to be minimized or, conversely, celebrated within urban environments where institutional diversity and inclusion programs are rampant. These assimilative initiatives suggest that the global city holds a certain promise – that everyone can be successful even though, in reality, as the SAEDs suggest, social, racial, and income disparity are also evident in these settings. Philanthropy, therefore, is a symbol of gratitude for these anomalies of success.

**Conclusion**

This study of philanthropy has taken it cues from the inherently “unruly and materially heterogeneous assemblages” (Featherstone et al., 2007, p. 386) that (un)define and (un)tangle relationships along nationalistic lines. In fact, the conundrum of transnational theorizing is that the connections of its actors are highly contextualized, making it impossible to develop solid conclusions about the nature of immigrant and diaspora networks. Following Vertovec’s (2001) claim that we “may do better to theorize typologies of transnationalisms and the conditions that affect them” (p. 576), this chapter has explored how translocal philanthropy is a process through with the archetypal diaspora is made and expressed.

However, there are many hidden problems and politics within this field. For example, class plays a salient role in widening the fault-lines within specific diaspora groupings. Simply put, through elite charitable giving, affluent immigrants are distancing themselves from poor and working class populations by aligning themselves with the old establishment. Philanthropy serves as a magnifying glass on these tensions, particularly as more elite immigrants give large
sums to publicly-oriented charities as smaller immigrant-focused charities remain subjected to precarious government funding schemes.

As noted in Chapter 1, philanthropy is sometimes considered to be a tool used by neoliberal actors as they redirect social welfare funding with applauding corporate elites for using their surpluses to fill these holes. For Morvaridi (2013), “Such a construction ostensibly depicts philanthropic actors as agents of social justice that, in contributing to poverty reduction, play a role in social transformation” (p. 305). This study suggests, however, that since translocal elites have benefitted from neoliberalism, their philanthropic interests are more closely aligned with para-state charities that have an international orientation. These investments are “win-wins” for immigrants who are looking to do good back home without directly investing there.

Within this context, it is clear that there are also groups that are left behind. Settlement charities, for example, run the risk of losing their core funding, possess few resources to do fundraising, and are continuously marred by a myriad of systemic barriers. Their commitment to providing services for “from below” immigrants is tested by shifting government priorities and stringent reporting that places a premium on quantifiable results and returns on investments. I argue that elite translocal immigrants can play an important role in advocating for policy and funding changes with bureaucrats and other elites. These propositions are particularly salient in this contemporary moment as immigration and settlement issues were recent election platforms for Canadian politicians.

In this regard, translocal connectivity is limited by the conditions of democracy. For David Held (2006), “Democracy is best located when it is closest to and involves those whose life expectancy and life chances are determined by powerful entities, bringing the circles of stakeholders and decision makers closer together” (p. 171). Accordingly, I suggest that the multiple localities of the diaspora, in aggregate, express a kind of democracy that, together,
“makes” the nation. Accordingly, translocalism can be viewed as a critical social field that stimulates diaspora or immigrant engagement beyond (or despite) national boundaries. Speaking to this very point, Levitt and Glick Schiller (2004) asserted that, “Studying migrant practices longitudinally reveals that in moments of crisis or opportunity, even those who have never identified or participated transnationally, but who are embedded in transnational social fields, may become mobilized into action” (p. 1013). My investigation not only supports this claim, but calls on non-profit leaders to think critically about their role in substantiating social stratification.

In the end, the “from above” and “from below” concepts of transnationalism need to be employed carefully “because it forces together under the same label very disparate sets of activities” (Portes, 2001a, p. 185). Since not all transnationals from above operate transnationally, this chapter suggests that there remains a heterogeneous assimilationist quality to charitable giving, particularly amongst elite immigrants. Ultimately, local and regional experiences of non-profit actors are shaping global priorities in distinct and important ways from those who engage in cross-border philanthropy.
Chapter 5: In a World of Debt and Benevolence: Affluent Immigrants, Financialization, and the Crisis of Philanthropy

Chapter overview

This chapter contributes to an emerging body of literature on the financialization of philanthropy by focusing on the role of affluent immigrants in charitable giving. Drawing on forty interviews with immigrant philanthropists, immigrant fundraising volunteers, chief fundraisers of large non-profits, and settlement agency executive directors, all based in Toronto, Canada, I analyze the interplay between public funding and private investing, especially as the latter begins to stand in for the former within a neoliberal context. I begin with a discussion about the various articulations of financialization as well as an overview of the salient symbols of the contemporary shadow state system. I then explore the inherent politics behind volunteering and diversity programs, and the everyday impact of philanthrocapitalism on social welfare restructuring. In the second half of this chapter, I incorporate the voices of the many actors who are simultaneously advancing and resisting financialization. Through their experiences and perspectives what becomes evident is that contemporary philanthropy is cautiously embracing financialization, not necessarily by choice, but out of survival.

Introduction

In March 2015, the Globe and Mail published a scathing feature article about the “philanthropic façade” of the Royal Ontario Museum’s Renaissance Campaign, one the largest fundraising efforts for the cultural sector in Canadian history (McArthur et al., 2015). The story described how the museum had taken out a multi-million dollar bank loan to supplement the $72 million it received from the province and Ottawa, and how it made a commitment to generate
private support from local philanthropists, many of whom were delighted to see a major infusion of cash for Toronto’s underfunded arts and culture scene. However, poor ticket and membership sales along with delayed donor payments over many years culminated in a serious cash flow problem: The museum needed to find a way to catch-up on its loan payments, which the province has underwritten in 2007. The only way to do this would be to convince donors to fulfill their philanthropic promises. However, this was easier said than done. The global financial crisis hit many donors hard, and some simply could not make their payments. Compounding this issue were changes in leadership and surrounding fundraising competition – almost every large non-profit in Toronto was in campaign mode at the same time. Fast forward to seven years later and the recovery efforts from the meltdown have finally given the museum’s donors a chance to resume their payments. But the question remaining is: What will be done if the economy collapses once again?

On the one hand, this article exposed a long-standing concern by charity leaders about the insurmountable debt loads non-profits have quietly shouldered for decades. In fact, many studies have shown that the entire social economy has been propped up by bank loans and unreliable government funding (see Anheier et al., 1997; Peters, 1993; Hassan et al., 2000; Mersland, 2011; Hall & Reed, 1998). Shortly after this story was published, organizations like Imagine Canada and AFP released statements showing solidarity with the ROM amidst growing speculation that the museum had conducted unethical fundraising practices. This was done, in part, to help curb mounting media stories portraying charities as financial wastelands. On the other hand, for a small group of fundraisers in Toronto, what was perhaps more unsettling about this article was how people reacted to the authors’ depiction of three major philanthropists – all of who are immigrants. I had learned, for example, these “profiles” raised a few eyebrows at the mostly-white Rosedale Tennis Club the weekend that the story broke. “Are ‘they’ really one of ‘us’?”
This chapter aims to shed light on the damaging impact of financialization on charities and how financial institutions, elite immigrant actors, and governments are working together to redefine social welfare. Let’s begin by reviewing the major and subtle influences that have given rise to the financialization of philanthropy.

The charitable sector under financialization

Financialization can be viewed as a product or consequence of iterative neoliberal moves that have shaped politics, society, and the economy over the last century. While a complete historical accounting of global markets has been taken up by many authors, what is particularly important to the field of fundraising and philanthropy is how economic restructuring, beginning with Regan, Thatcher, and Mulroney, has transformed the entire social welfare system into a financialized playground for corporate and elite capitalist actors. As Aaron Major (2013) rightly noted, “Privatization, deregulation, marketization – processes that scholars lump under the term neoliberalism – have unfolded at different rates, to different degrees, in different national contexts, but they have unfolded nonetheless across wide swaths of the globe” (p. 26). Indeed, financialization is now a global concern, especially as free trade agreements further deregulate labour standards, forcing working people to “scurry for security” (Woods, 2006, p. 149) in epic proportions. I argue that the early emergence of large, multi-million dollar fundraising campaigns in Canada and the US were established as a foil to several hasty bureaucratic decisions to cut funding to public services – namely, education, healthcare, and social services. On a local level, the Conservative government in Ontario from 1996 to 2002 instituted many economic reforms to support its ambitions to outsource social welfare, centralize government, and provide tax breaks for corporations and banks (see Ralph, 1997; Keil, 2002). These changes came without any warning and created a climate of desperation within the non-profit sector. In a study of social housing funding in Ontario, for example, Michael Shapcott (2002) recalled that,
[Then] newly-elected Premier Mike Harris, emerging from his first Cabinet meeting in June of 1995, cancelled 17,000 units of co-op and non-profit housing that had been approved for development. And he stopped all funding for new social housing. During its first three years in office, the Harris-Eves government cut more than $300 million in housing programs (one quarter of overall housing spending). In 1998, the province downloaded the entire cost of social housing to municipalities. In four short years, Ontario moved from spending more than $1.1 billion annually on housing to spending zero. (Shapcott, 2002, pp. 6-7)

Federally, in December 2010, the Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration cut $53 million from settlement programs across Canada. More than $43 million of those cuts affected Ontario settlement agencies, which saw its funding envelope shrink to an all-time low of $344 million in 2011 (Keung, 2010). Most affected were charities serving racialized immigrant women and youth, including Tropicana Community Services, the South Asian Women’s Centre, the Eritrean Canadian Community Centre of Toronto, the Ethiopian Association of Greater Toronto, and the Afghan Association of Ontario, most of which had solely relied on a federal funding for decades. A year earlier, then-Conservative head of the Canadian International Development Agency, Minister Bev Oda, suddenly cancelled base support to international relief agency KAIROS, causing such a media storm that she eventually resigned from government all together. To put it simply, provincial and federal governments have exercised their power to restructure social spending on many occasions and, in the cases just mentioned, this has been done with one signature on a funding allocation letter.

Legally, for non-profits to maintain their charitable status, they must keep their political or partisan activities to a minimum. In 2014, the CRA began a series of audits on environmental charities, targeting those that were most vocal about the development of crude oil pipelines.
Other charities came under the surveilling eye of the government at around the same time as well. For example, Oxfam Canada was on the edge of losing its charitable status over differences of opinion about how to support poverty alleviation efforts. As Gerald Caplan (2014) noted, there was tremendous irony underlying the Oxfam Canada case:

What about agency officials informing Oxfam Canada that “preventing poverty” was not an acceptable goal? “Relieving poverty is charitable,” they wrote, “but preventing it is not. Preventing poverty could mean providing for a class of beneficiaries that are not poor.” Oxfam’s executive director, Robert Fox, called it “absurd,” though insane seems closer to the mark. Maybe it’s another coincidence that Jason Kenney has criticized Oxfam for its opposition to Israeli settlements in the West Bank. (Caplan, 2014)

In this regard, charities are seen by the state as both rabble-rousers and caretakers of the social safety net. CRA audits have served as the primary surveilling mechanism for bureaucrats in these situations, pointing to the intimacy between governmentality and financialization.

Within this context, financialization has been articulated as “the increasing role of financial motives, financial markets, financial actors, and financial institutions in the operation of domestic and international economies” (Epstein, 2005, p. 3). In *Capitalizing on Crisis*, Greta Krippner (2012) described financialization as the “tendency for profit making in the economy to occur increasingly through financial channels rather than through productive activities” (p. 4). As a result, financialization is a “phenomenon approached from different angles, each of which leads to different rentiers; a component of the ‘neoliberal’ variant of capitalism; an expansion of the ‘coupon pool’ and a dis-intermediation of finance; a shift to accumulation via finance; and a culture of finance and financial risk. Instead of privileging any particular approach, we should understand financialization as the sum and interplay of these facets” (Mader, 2014, p. 606). I am not suggesting, however, that governments and governmentality are taking a backseat to
financialization. Arguably, the opposite is true; all levels of government have made the control and orchestration of finance central to their mandates.

Over the last decade, several economic precursors and issues have come together to advance the financialization of philanthropy. First, the growth and popularization of microfinance programs have somewhat unproblematically been deemed win-win partnerships between financial institutions and poor, mostly agrarian populations (Roodman, 2012). These lending schemes have led to the development of countless entrepreneurial outposts throughout the Global South. Within local fundraising circles, online microcredit intermediaries, like Kiva (www.kiva.org) and Zidisha (www.zidisha.org), have democratized microcredit insomuch that anyone with a credit card and internet access can become a sanctioned lender. Such platforms are supported by slick marketing campaigns, showing people how a ten dollar loan can supposedly lift a family up from squalor. Microcredit-style investing, however, comes with its critics some who have called this form of giving “intimate abstractions” (Elwood, 2015, p. 45). Pierre Ly and Geri Mason (2012) argued that Kiva provokes unscrupulous “competition for subsidized capital...similar to those faced when NGOs compete for donations” (p. 643). Similarly, Megan Moodie (2014) found that microlending programs create gendered conditions of vulnerability that “underwrite risk as ‘peril’” (p. 279). As Philip Mader (2014) noted, “For lenders and investors – from high net worth individuals to pension funds or ‘socially motivated’ investors – the system of microfinance offers a potentially high-return/low-risk opportunity for capital accumulation at the present frontier of the global financial market, but borrowers must perform their part by borrowing money and paying a more-than-cost-covering price for it” (p. 608). In essence, as microlending “makes everyone a capitalist” (Blunden, 2004, p. 30), it also creates what Shameem Black (2013) called “fictions of humanitarian responsibility” (p. 103) where the promise of social change is just one click away.
Second, the rise of the “innovation economy” (Janeway, 2012), where research and discovery are destined for commercialization, has pivoted institutions towards financialization. Start-up incubator spaces within universities and healthcare settings are the most obvious symbols of the innovation economy. These environments provide early stage companies with access to seed funding, angel investor networks, and financial ecosystems that propel entrepreneurship and stimulate job creation. No longer are universities, in particular, sites for advancing the “knowledge economy.” In fact, senior university administrators are now being tapped by the public sector to head up large-scale innovation strategies and build international technology-oriented start-up partnerships for development, patenting, and commercialization (see Siegel & Wright, 2015; Valdivia, 2013).

Third, new immigration categories appear to favour a financialized undercurrent. As noted in Chapter 3, in Canada, a special venture capital pilot program was recently established to encourage foreign investments. The precursor to this so-called express lane citizenship class was the immigrant investor category, designed to attract middle class migrants who do not necessarily see themselves as venture capitalists, but are still willing to invest the bulk of their capital in Canada. While the jury is still deliberating on the impact of this new category, if the results are as fruitful as they have been in the US and UK (see Torkian, 2015), I suspect that other policy prescriptions will soon follow to expand the financialization pipeline with elite migrants.

Fourth, the global financial meltdown of 2008 was a pivotal time for governments and corporations as they rushed to create austerity and stimulus measures to recover their losses and protect themselves from further economic volatility. Rock bottom lending rates and tax credit schemes reinvigorated capitalist consumption, while high yield investment options have nudged middle and working class people to save for an inevitable rainy day. In terms of charitable
giving, endowment funds were decimated during the downturn, and many non-profits had to dip into their reserves or ask donors for one-time expendable gifts to ensure continuity of programs and services that would have normally been funded by annual investment incomes. It comes as no surprise, then, that beginning in 2009, newer forms of charitable investing started to take their place within the sector. Venture/strategic philanthropy, social enterprises, public-private partnerships, and social impact bonds are but four models where donors expect specific returns on investments based on outcomes and performance (see Saltman, 2010). The focus on financialization through a philanthrocapitalist lens, then, is often regarded as “doing well by doing good” (Falck & Heblich, 2007, p. 247).

Within this fragile financial milieu, global unemployment and a precarious labour market have propelled the growth of the working poor, especially as contract positions and minimum wage jobs become the new norm. Simply put, one time only budget allocations and project-based grants have created an unprecedented financialized abyss, particularly for non-profit workers “from below.” On the other end of the spectrum, the concentration of wealth at the very top has reached an all-time high. In The Trouble With Billionaires, Linda McQuaig and Neil Brooks (2010), documented the rise of global super elites through the 1980s neoliberal agendas of Thatcher and Reagan, which created huge rifts between the rich and the poor. They contended that, “If you roll back state intervention aimed at protecting workers and at the same time dramatically reduce the taxes of the rich, it’s reasonable to expect that you’ll end up with a top-heavy society” (p. 12). In a similar vein, Patricia Cohen (2015) highlighted a startling conclusion made by Oxfam that the “one percent” is likely to control more than half of the globe’s total wealth in 2016. Currently, “the 80 wealthiest people in the world altogether own $1.9 trillion... nearly the same amount shared by the 3.5 billion people who occupy the bottom half of the world’s income scale” (p. 1). At the top are not just majority company shareholders, but also
hedge fund managers and venture capitalists who successfully placed their bets on monopoly capital schemes.

Finally, other government policy decisions have had a tremendous impact on the regulation of non-profits, particularly in North America. Within the US Treasury there are a number of third sector portfolios that monitor charity compliance and governance through charitable tax filings and expenditure submissions (see James & Rose-Ackerman, 2013). Within a Canadian context, Susan Phillips (2012) closely examined how federal government policies have instituted (and favoured) cost-to-revenue ratio measurement tools that regulate and standardize third sector activities. These movements are informed by two market failures:

The first relates to the dependence of charities on for-profit fundraising firms, and normally occurs when charities, desperate to raise some threshold amounts, agree to commission based or extraordinarily high fees. A charity cannot manage the fundraising on its own, and regards some funds as better than none, so it becomes dependent on the commercial firm – which may or may not lead to good practice. A second issue is that the return on fundraising investment is highly speculative, especially in contrast to the core programs and activities that charities are familiar with running. The speculative nature of these outcomes reinforces the case for sound strategy and prudence in fundraising, and intimately links decisions on fundraising to broader practices of good governance. (Phillips, 2012, p. 812)

There is, indeed, growing public concern around governance, which has tended to focus on cost of fundraising issues, ethical standards of practice, arm’s length donor involvement, and gift receipting/reporting processes. Phillips also pointed out that Canada has adopted a companion self-regulating system, through Imagine Canada, which has instituted a rigorous standards program to support and enhance a charity’s credibility. Many, if not all, of these issues have an
economic or financialized orientation. Moreover, the idea that Canada is leading in the co-regulation of the charitable sector on the world stage allows for other agendas to be taken up collaboratively through international government cooperation and transnational charities. Admittedly, this movement can only be realized if a common goal is articulated. In this regard, Phillips rightly surmised that, “There is no big vision of or overarching policy for government’s relationship with civil society. Rather, the legacy of many years of funding cuts and increased accountability requirements have strained relationships” (p. 818).

**Volunteering and the spectre of philanthrocapitalism**

Even though philanthropy is broadly defined as the voluntary giving of time, talent, and treasure (Hunt & Maurrasse, 2004), in an era where all parts of society and the environment are impacted by financial markets it should come as no surprise that fundraising results have become the primary basis for measuring charitable impact. In this regard, time and talent are configured as tools for revenue generation, and success within in the sector is first understood by how much money is raised, followed by how many people gave, and median gift size (Sargeant & Jay, 2014; Herman, 2011). There have been several important moves, however, to provide a more comprehensive accounting of the social economy, such as a unique methodology developed by Laurie Mook, Jack Quarter, and B.J. Richmond (2007) to measure the economic value of volunteering. There are, however, inherent politics behind this time-talent paradigm. For example, several studies have shown that the interchangeability of roles and responsibilities in paid and volunteer work (see Handy et al., 2007; Vézina & Crompton, 2012, Reed & Selbee, 2000) have led to organizational conflict, particularly in unionized environments, where volunteering is akin to outsourcing (Has, 2003; Salamon & Sokolowski, 2001; Robinson, 1994; Haiven, 2014). Simply put, why would an employer pay for work that someone would be more than happy to do for free?
Volunteering has become engrained into many social value systems, particularly in Canada where 12.7 million Canadians (44%) are reported to have volunteered, some on average of 154 hours per year or close to 2 billion hours in total (Sinha, 2015). In 2012, TD Bank reported that volunteers created $50 billion in annual economic value for Canadians (TD Economics). This report along with many other case studies and surveys have spurred public debate about the potential of mandatory community service, tax incentives for volunteering, and assigning an economic value for volunteering (Volunteer Canada, 2015). In all of these cases, financialization plays a central role, even though the term itself has yet to make it into any of the position papers and op-eds on volunteering.

I highlight this issue because fundraising volunteers are critical to opening doors to elite immigrants, particularly for large non-profits. In my experience in higher education advancement, I have witnessed first-hand how fundraisers have relied on volunteers to share their contacts, create awareness about a charitable issue, and galvanize support by drawing on various forms of capital (Bourdieu, 2002). In this regard, I surmise that fundraising volunteers are complicit in the financialization of philanthropy, especially since many of them are donors as well (Dove, 2000; Lysakowski, 2005). Consequently, fundraising volunteers tend to wield great power in their day jobs as corporate executives, elected officials, entrepreneurs, and financial investors. Many of these volunteer groups are organized as fundraising boards or campaign cabinets, and their members are often given honorific titles, particularly within charitable foundations. According to Darwin BondGraham (2011), “The history of foundations is rooted in elite attempts at charity reform, and, perhaps most importantly, social control.... Foundations create ideology and legitimate social practices that benefit the ruling classes. They are instruments of stabilization for an otherwise highly unstable economic and social order” (p. 283). This issue underscores the problem of charity governance in that models of non-profit leadership
and oversight are often borrowed from corporate and financial structures. Robert Monks (2011) noted,

As ownership of the great enterprises passed from the ‘robber barons’ to their heirs and the general public, Wall Street and financialization became the critical factors in corporate governance. Transactions affecting corporate capital and control generated fees, which became the informing energy of the American capitalist system, a situation that has prevailed into the twenty-first century. In the earliest days of financialization, control over corporations was largely exercised by the respected leaders of the banking houses, epitomized by J.P. Morgan, but this soon became ‘control’ only in the loosest sense of the word. (Monks, 2011, pp. 63-64)

I do not want to give the impression that fundraising volunteers are a sub-group of a self-indulgent elite class. In fact, all of the immigrant volunteers I interviewed are middle class and very aware of the power and politics of race, gender, and class relative to their volunteer efforts. Many of them believed that they have made great efforts to disrupt elitist sensibilities by sitting at the same decision-making tables as their philanthropist counterparts. In addition, all of them expressed a personal motive behind their volunteer work. For example, hospital fundraising volunteers may also be grateful patients, university fundraising volunteers may be alumni, and so on.

Going back to an earlier point about social values, fundraising volunteering is often regarded as a civic duty that aids in nation-building. Here, diversity and inclusion serve as pacifying markers of citizenship rather than a tool of financialization. However, to be a volunteer fundraiser one must possess an acceptable level of social and symbolic capital, making some groups more “desirable” than others. According to Jamie Magnusson (2000), “Conflating certain ethnic groups with social class categories achieves a rearticulation of both the ethnic identity and
the social class identity. Or, within neoliberal hegemonic discourse, as another example, the interventionist state is articulated as a curtailment on individual freedom, thereby achieving a rearticulation of the relation between the state and civil liberties” (p. 75). This observation acts as a harrowing reminder of the collusion between the imagined Canadian values of benevolence and diversity, leading to great social and political unevenness.

In addition to volunteering, the figure of the immigrant philanthrocapitalist has created a new opportunity to witness the financialization of philanthropy take hold. As noted in Chapter 1, philanthrocapitalism was coined by Matthew Bishop (2006) a decade ago to articulate the codependence and intimacy between philanthropy and modern day capitalism. For me, the language of philanthrocapitalism centres on financialization, not just the economy writ-large. Matthew Bishop and Michael Green’s (2010) description of philanthrocapitalists aptly highlights these subtleties of language:

As they apply their business methods to philanthropy, philanthrocapitalists are developing a new (if familiar-sounding) language to describe their businesslike approach. Their philanthropy is “strategic,” “market conscious,” “impact oriented,” “knowledge based,” often “high engagement,” and always driven by the goal of maximizing the “leverage” of the donor’s money. Seeing themselves as social investors, not traditional donors, some of them engage in “venture philanthropy.” As entrepreneurial “philanthropreneurs,” they love to back social entrepreneurs who offer innovative solutions to society’s problems. (Bishop & Green, 2010, p. 6).

Just as the global economy is informed by its historical antecedents, bilateral partnerships, and circulatory systems, the financialization of philanthropy should be regarded as an “overarching project that is not confined to singular developments, such as the spread of microcredits. Rather,
it denotes the comprehensive transformation of this field along the template of finance” (Thümler, 2014, p. 4).

In addition, philanthropy appears to pacify the goals and impact of financialization through its human interest and values-driven narratives. In this regard, fundraisers are unintentionally complicit in these schemes, as they continue to incorporate stories of impact throughout their solicitations. In fact, there are now many how-to guides on perfecting the fundraising narrative to secure a gift (see Clarke, 2009; Burnett, 2002; Seiler et al., 2010). In their academic study of philanthropic storytelling, Altaf Merchant, John Ford, and Adrian Sargeant (2010) showed that following exposure to an incident or problem in a charitable appeal, prospective donors express negative emotions which are converted into positive emotions when they are given the opportunity to help a person in need. In this regard, storytelling can also be considered a didactic tool to support the financialization of philanthropy.

I am not suggesting that everyone in the charitable sector is aware of the apparatus of financialization and, therefore, consciously supporting a neoliberal agenda. Ironically, charitable giving is commonly regarded as a step towards social equality by working through elite actors. In reality, however, the non-profit sector has become a space where corporations and financial institutions can exercise their public relations might through sponsorships and philanthropic gifts. In an effort to initiate a critique of fundraising within giving circles, Gara Lamarche (2014) cleverly asked, “Why are we hypersensitive to the dangers of big money in politics, but blind to the dangers of big philanthropy in the public sphere” (p. 55)? In terms of the corporation’s public image, Ilaria Baghi and Veronica Gabrielli (2013) rightly noted,

Cause-related marketing is growing rapidly, together with many other initiatives aligned with social corporate responsibility. This area is becoming more and more complex and integrated with businesses’ core activities. This is why several companies have already
started to associate their core production with social, charitable or environmental causes. In doing so, companies are sometimes unsure about the best course of integration between for-profit and cause-related activities. (Baghi & Gabrielli, 2013, p. 226)

The distance between rich and poor, secure and precarious, and elite and impoverished are defined by the former’s capacity to hegemonize and colonize the latter. Magnusson (2013) described the frightening potential and impact of the orchestrators of financialization:

The picture emerging on the ‘security’ side of the coin is the intensification of technologies of social and political control through what could be thought of as full spectrum practices of imperialism: surveillance, prisons, riot control, and so on. These technologies and practices of imperialism are being innovated through the speculative dynamics of the market, and used as instruments of coercion to maintain an accumulation regime that thrives best on insecurity, social crises, war, and even disaster. Money is to be made speculating on the ‘future earnings’ of security. (Magnusson, 2013, p. 74)

This study suggests that elite immigrants along with philanthropy pacify and cover-up the work of financialization actors. In other words, to put an affluent immigrant philanthropist at the front of an issue or problem, draws on the rhetoric of diversity to help financialization quietly flourish. This is observed in other facets of life, perhaps most recently in Prime Minister Justin Trudeau’s selection of cabinet ministers. To place a turbaned Sikh army officer at the helm of National Defense, for example, has the potential to smother any critical discussion about racism in policing, surveillance, and armed conflict – domestically and internationally. The early public celebration of diversity within federal politics seems to have already undermined the continued struggle of justice and equity by demonstrating some sort of reconciliation to the overtly racist and oppressive regime of Stephen Harper. On the topic of reconciliation, Rinaldo Walcott (2011) stated,
It is my contention... that the politics of reconciliation only matter to the extent that such practices tell the alternate and much more disturbing story of global capitalism’s apparent triumph and, concurrently, the attempts to resist it and undo its impacts in the past, present, and future. What is at stake is an exercise that tells the tale of the cost of European expansion as one which is bigger and more brutal than the myth of Europe’s conception of the world being the only valid idea of human life and a brutal practice and logic that must continually repress ideas of living differently in pre-contact cultures that remain with us still. (Walcott, 2011, p. 347)

**Monopoly capital and philanthropy**

For me, both imperialism and monopoly refer to a kind of siege over people and societies that have been deemed profitable for financialization. In his discussion of monopoly capital, Wesley DeMarco (2001) noted, “Both the political and the economic versions of the discussion too often slide over important distinctions (I say ‘versions’ because the arguments about monarchy and about monopoly are both ultimately about *power*). It does make sense to distinguish between monopolies that result from sufficiently fair and open competition (so far as we can tell), and those that do not” (pp. 153-154). If philanthropy is the use of surplus value for public/private interests then, Paul Baran’s and Paul Sweezy’s (2010) notions of monopoly capital closely correspond to what I call “financialized benevolence.” They claimed,

> We want to show that the sum total of profits, interest, rents + (and this is crucial!) swollen costs of distribution + advertising expenses + PR + legal departments + fins and chrome + faux frais [incidental operating expenditures] of product variation and model changes = economic surplus, and that this economic surplus increases both in absolute and relative terms under monopoly capitalism. (Baran & Sweezy, 2010, p. 43)
In *Monopoly Capital*, Baran and Sweezy (1966) borrowed from Marx’s (1965) concept of surplus value to show how finance is at the heart of production. In this sense, all aspects of social life are related to the economic base. As Krippner (2011) pointed out,

> Financialization is not a turn away from production as an economic activity, as many presuppose; it is a process whereby finance increasingly becomes the precondition for production. Financialization then is, so to speak, a shift in where the ‘magic’ in capitalism happens: even firms solidly grounded in goods-production – whose *raison d’être* is producing goods to earn a profit – must increasingly pursue financial activities, with for instance General Electric or Ford now earning half or more of their profits via financial activities. (Krippner, 2011, p. 29 as cited in Mader, 2014, p. 605)

There have, of course, been many seismic changes to the nature of production since Marx’s time. Most notably, technology and globalization have completely transformed labour and social relations by, for example, deregulating standards and ensuring that economic surpluses are reinvested for further profiteering.

To be clear, Marx and Engels regarded charitable giving with great disdain, seeing downstream benevolence as vile and hypocritical. As Engels (1993) noted in *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844*:

> Charity which degrades him who gives more than him who takes; charity which treads the downtrodden still deeper in the dust, which demands that the degraded, the pariah cast out of society, shall first surrender the last that remains to him, his very claim to manhood, shall first beg for mercy before your mercy reigns to press, in the shape of an alms, the brand of degradation upon his brow. (Engels, 1993, p. 278)

Following, global philanthropy, now driven at times by elite diaspora actors, makes us question the role of transnational financialization and the circulation of money across national
borders. This phenomenon supports the idea that online giving platforms and microcredit programs are indeed part of the financialization machine, which orchestrates labour and profits under a veneer of kindness and generosity. As John Bellamy Foster (2012) contended,

> The question of profits by deduction (or reduction per alienation) and its relation to monopoly power has been globalized today through the global labor arbitrage organized around the systematic exploitation of cheap labor in the Global South at levels below the value of labor power, i.e., the costs of reproduction of the workers. As Samir Amin has stated, this takes the form of a “monopoly rent” or “imperialist rent” imposed on the populations of the periphery through the agency of multinational capital. Surplus meanwhile is incorporated in the real wages of the workers in the center of the world economy (as well as some relatively privileged workers in the Global South). (Foster, 2012, p. 21)

Before I begin to draw on the voices of the study participants, there are two additional issues that have informed this study. The first involves the sheer diversity and scope of what has been loosely called the “non-profit sector.” As I noted in Chapter 1, charities come in all shapes and sizes, and each takes up various social challenges. Patricia Wells (2012) noted that,

> More generally, although “third sector”, “non-profit sector” and similar terms are often used as collective nouns, organizations deemed to fall within them are just not uniform and can in fact be poles apart. Religious/secular; national/international; charitable/non-charitable; human/non-human focused are just some of the possible dichotomies that can be applied to such organizations. (Wells, 2012, p. 87)

Consequently, I argue that the presence of financialization in philanthropy is varied and highly dependent on its context. For example, while some non-profits may augment their budgets with for-profit activities (e.g., fee for service programs), others may spend their energies on annual
fundraising campaigns or by applying for one-time-only government grants. In all of these cases, financialization in the sector presents itself vary differently – either as a symptom or outcome – of contemporary life, making the task of synthesizing the experience of financialization very arduous.

The second issue centres on class mobility. Understanding that one’s access to resources can change over time, some elites have become overnight millionaires, having unexpectedly fallen into fortune or by having struck one or two lucrative deals. As a result, there is an air of dissonance between different classes, especially when select individuals within the group move up, suddenly turning their backs against their own. As Kearon (2012) pointed out,

> Recognizably bourgeois sensibilities begin to develop, emerge and become widely adopted, as a conscious process of differentiation by particular emerging bourgeois professional middle class fractions eager to distance themselves from (and define themselves against) the problematic other (be it a dissolute/spendthrift traditional or industrial aristocracy above, a threatening proletariat or a gauche and socially climbing skilled working class below, or the greedy acquisitiveness of philistines and other problematic sections of the middle classes). (Kearon, 2012, p. 387)

Class mobility is an important factor in the financialization of philanthropy because a gift is synonymous with one’s surplus value. The reality, however, is that there are class-related complexities to the gift. For example, a charity may receive a smaller gift from an affluent individual or, conversely, a single, working class person may leave a sizable bequest to a non-profit through her estate. The point is that there are unexpected peaks and valleys in the financialization of philanthropy – an unevenness that can impact perspectives and truths about the nature of charitable giving.
Facing the impact of financialization

As mentioned in an earlier section of this chapter, wide-sweeping provincial and federal cuts to the settlement sector in Ontario over the past fifteen years have given rise to a distinct fundraising mandate for immigrant- and refugee-oriented non-profits. Before they discussed the role of fundraising within their organizations, all of the SAEDs I interviewed helped set the scene by providing details about the broader funding environment. In at least four instances, free trade was noted to have a detrimental impact, not the non-profits’ service users. As one SAED noted,

I guess it was about 1991. What happened was that, as a result of NAFTA, many of the high labour type jobs, mainly manufacturing jobs from the southern US, moved to Mexico. And so we lost a fairly significant portion of our manufacturing base. The significance of that is that even though we had less qualified immigrants at one time, they were actually integrating much more quickly economically because they could get a factory job and, with a little bit of training and a machine, establish a middle class standard of living. (SAED 4)

Another SAED talked about how her charity emerged in response to the massive cuts to social services in late 1990s:

Okay, well, we have an interesting history because the seeds for the [name of charity] were planted in 1999. And if you remember, 1999 it was a rather bleak year in the world of the social, social work, social justice. The Harris government had just slashed the non-profit sector. Most organizations were clinging on to what they had left and worked very much, you know, in fear of more cuts. And, at the same time, the federal government was telling people, particularly people with refugee status or looking for refugee status, when they landed in the airport, to go and live on the Kingston Road motel strip. (SAED 6)
 Needless to say, income inequality remains at the forefront of political and social agendas here and all over the world. According to these and other SAEDs, funding cuts and multi-lateral trade deals have exacerbated precarity so much so that it is a given part of our everyday world. As a result, Stephen Shukaitis (2013) asked researchers to consider the following: “If today we are really all precarious, what does that tell us about what it means to be precarious? What conceptual or political clarity is brought to bear by the concept” (p. 642)? To answer these questions, I rely on a couple of other SAEDs who described the on-the-ground impact of precarity from within their own charities:

Yes, yes, yes there is a collective agreement that’s now binding on the organization and it has an annual increase but I cannot deliver it because the funding from the government is not there. And the government does not care about the collective agreement between this organization and the union. They tell you, “That’s your headache.” They don’t care about the agreement between the union and the organization. So where do I get the money, the 2%, for example, inflation adjustment? Then I have to go back to the union and tell them the bad news that is there is no money. So instead of 2% or 3% (whatever the collective agreement says), it’s 0%. So let us find another memorandum of agreement to go forward. (SAED 8)

For another SAED whose organization provides healthcare services to immigrants, eroding government funding has led to protests and demonstrations:

So what you find is now I’m not just a provider. I’m also an advocate. You know... the federal government refugee health cuts this year were dramatic for our organization. So when you cut funding for providing healthcare to refugees, I actually don’t have the resources to pay for a specialist to deal with appointments and tests and things like that, as I did in the past. So our employees were out. They were out on the street in front of
Health Canada protesting with signs. I’ve never seen that before. Where people are like, “Okay, we’ve had enough now.” Like this is really an attack on a particular group of people and population. So you’re a provider and you’re an activist – in a way that you don’t usually see. Healthcare providers really picked up picket signs and went out into the streets. That’s been great to see. It puts a lot of stress in terms of recruitment though.

(SAED 2)

This experience reminded me of a doctoral dissertation I recently came across by Kenneth Ott (2012) in which he reviewed the impact of a non-profit hospital closure on black people in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina. Shortly after this catastrophe, the state shut down the hospital as funding needed to be redirected to another rescue effort. After many attempts by workers to reopen the hospital, the authorities came to ensure that the doors remained closed forever. Borrowing from Naomi Klein (2007), Ott called this move “disaster capitalism” in which “‘disaster’ is prolonged as a way of life; and the permanent displacement of the most vulnerable populations from the social landscape as a perceived remedy that actually exacerbates [chronic disaster] syndrome” (Adams et al., 2009, p. 615).

Government funding issues were also of great concern to the CFLNPs I interviewed. According to one participant:

Very early on I decided that, in fact, politics was a very different game than about changing the world. It was about power and the management of power. And, in fact, governments were really not very good at solving problems [laughter] and that you know every so often you see these broad objectives to solve global hunger, poverty in Canada, homelessness. You know governments have strategies, “Within 10 years will eradicate X”. You know they never succeed. They never succeed. (CFLNP 3)
For me, this point about the management of power recalls François Ewald’s (1991) chapter on insurance and risk in *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* in which he surmised, “What distinguishes insurance is not just that it spreads the burden of individual injuries over a group but it enables this to be done no longer in the name of help or charity, but according to a principle of justice, a rule of right” (pp. 205-206). In this study, the so-called promises of the government (e.g., universal healthcare, access to education, and regular work) have morphed from basic rights to giving opportunities. As a result, governmentality or – as Foucault (1991) said – “the art of government” is orchestrated to support its own (profitable) desires before the needs of its constituents. As another CFLNP put it,

I think we’ve certainly looked to the kinds of approaches that government has taken or political parties have taken in terms of mobilizing support. But, you know, their ends are different. Their ends are very much driven by getting elected, calling on favours, to win influence. I think our motivations in the charitable sector are quite different. It is really to legitimately engage, to try to ensure that we’re being as reflective as possible of the society around us. We’re in it for far more ultra-realistic purposes than governments are. Therefore, I think our approach can be a little different. Government often wins support from different stakeholder groups by somehow promising access and influence. And, I think in our case, yes, we are looking for access and influence but for a very different reason....That is, to really build up our community and to make sure that we’re as reflective as we possibly can be. I think it’s the difference of the motivations of the politicians and charities we approach. That, um, says something about the values that we hold as institutions, you know. There is a reason that I think our governments and politicians aren’t as well trusted as the charitable sector. I do think it revolves around a certain set of values that we have; values that engender trust and loyalty. It’s for that
reason that I think we can approach diverse communities in a different way. I wouldn’t want to, in fact, just emulate what politicians and political parties and government have done because I’m not sure that will lead to long-term legitimacy and long-term engagement. (CFLNP 2)

The power of what I call “bureaucratized financialization” rests in its ability to exercise force upon non-profits to prove that there is the potential to generate private support to complement government funding. Through these actions, governments are sending a clear signal that charities need to diversify their funding pool in order to show viability and legitimacy. Fundraising volunteers are acutely aware of this new public-private paradigm shift. One IFV, for example, recounted how she had to quickly mobilize her networks to show the government that her organization was worthy of public support:

The fundraising had to start right away because projects like the [name of charity] which I also helped set-up in the 70s, started on these little shoestring government grants that were, like, for a summer or maybe a year. So you had to get on with it right away to find something more long-term, so it meant immediately going into lobbying mode and approaching the most logical places where you might get a hearing. So, in the case of the [name of charity], it was the provincial departments. For the [name of another charity], we went to the board of health at the city. We learned very quickly that to impress policy people and government we needed community support. We couldn’t just go ourselves. (IFV 7)

Here, social networks are deemed to be critical to the financialization of philanthropy because of their indirect role in providing legitimacy for state investment. This phenomenon reminded me of Sean Parson’s (2014) conclusion that the “hidden ‘network’ of non-profits and state actors has...
formed a ‘shadow state”’ (p. 38) in which private actors assume a leading role in the funding of social welfare.

**Financialization as biopower**

Financial accumulation can also be regarded as a kind of biopower, which was defined by Foucault (1976) as an “explosion of numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugations of bodies and the control of populations” (p. 140). In essence, Foucault saw biopower as a tool that governments and elites use to direct and manipulate swaths of people. However, the hegemonizing impact of financialization has led to a kind of valorization of wealth, which Andrea Fumagalli and Stefano Lucarelli (2011) called “biocapitalism” where financialization becomes a practice of social control:

In order to understand an accumulation regime unable to construct long-lasting modes of regulation, there is only one alternative: assume a new point of view that immediately focuses on the problems of command and power. This new capitalism needs a social control compatible with democratic societies, where order is based on the formalized participation of great masses. One of the new characteristics of the financialization process that involves us is its mass participation, at the same time a sort of formal democracy and a biopolitical power. (Fumagalli & Lucarelli, 2011, p. 95)

In this study, financialized philanthropy can be seen as a form of biopower insomuch that it has the capacity to not only substantiate social, political, and economic unevenness, but also the ability to concentrate power amongst elites. In this regard, affluent immigrants are main actors in the financialized non-profit sector, especially as they draw on philanthrocapitalist strategies to advance society. These moves are in no way conducted unconsciously; in fact, many of the IPHILs saw their gifts as a replacement for government investments in social welfare. As one IPHIL put it:
We have grown from a feudal set-up up of society. All over the world, feudal with a very strong presence of a state, whether it was the current modern government or kings and viceroy. So, in the feudal system you did not have to take care of everybody; you just had to take care of the elites. And the state was the only means of production and profit. So the state did whatever else it felt was necessary to fund it. Now, we are inching towards, we desire to be, a very egalitarian society. It’s very much a democratic set-up. You can’t just take care of some people. Everybody has to be taken care of and the new state does not control the economy....The state no longer has the means of production control. So it’s all in private hands. So you will have to enlist and invoke the power of the private to take care of societal needs. And also, civility and civil society cannot be, in my view, attained through the state. The old civil society has to help build a new civil society. (IPHIL 1)

I argue that philanthrocapitalism is not only based on creating profitable opportunities; it draws on low taxation so donors can save money. Three of the IPHILs I interviewed talked about the tax incentives of giving as a major motivator to “invest” in charities. For example,

In Canada, we’re catching up, there is no question about that. The tax laws are fair in this country and they are going to get better and better – the real wealth people have gotten in the last 20 years have come from stock options, and the fact that you can take...I mean this is unbelievable. I just hope they never wake up to that. You buy, you have an option of buying a share at $10 and 10 years down the road it’s worth $50. And you are not taxed on that amount. But better than that, whatever you give it away, you get a full tax deduction. Basically, the government is telling you this is subsidizing them and it’s heavy, heavy, heavy. The same thing is going to happen if you donate your private company shares – no tax. It will have to be liquidated and you don’t see the deduction
when it is liquidated. That’s the enormous incentive for the price of the extra land you have on your cottage. And you know the organizations will accumulate this, but you won’t get a deduction until they’ve sold it. But that was a great incentive for people who have done well because it still costs money when you give. Obviously it costs you something, but it’s a maturing cost. If it cost you 30 cents on the dollar or something, people feel good about that. Even the [name of large charity in Toronto] used to play that game by saying “You give us a million dollars or you put a million dollars in the government. With us, it’s easy. It’s three for one.” And then the money you gave is used for the next guy, it just went around like so. (IPHIL 7)

As I mentioned earlier, one of the problems around the gold standard of “donor-centered fundraising” (Burk, 2003) is that donors’ interests have morphed considerably under financialization, putting non-profits at great risk of mission drift or donor influence. No longer are philanthropists interested in simple stewardship activities; they want to be deeply engaged in planning, budgeting, and operations – to have their “fingers in the pie,” as SAED 3 put it. Many senior CFLNPs, however, have embraced the donor-centered fundraising rhetoric, having adopted some of the attitudes of a growing community of philanthropists who see the sector as highly wasteful and in desperate need of corporate-like structures and strategies. According to one CFLNP,

The donor rules and the donor has the opportunity to shape behaviour. If they continue to permit or continue to respond to institutions X, Y, Z, blah, blah, blah, in one-offs, then they want to see their long-term objective met. So it’s very important. I think a lot of donors at the very senior level want to have impact across a variety....They want to see the charitable sector more rationalized than it is. I mean there are like 300 charities involved in cancer. So how do you choose one that you think is going to really have
impact over the longer term? Very difficult to do unless you have a foundation with it and staff that can research this kind of thing for you. And then it all depends on what access they have to that information. (CFLNP 6)

This notion of a certain “shaping of behaviour” is centered on wealth creation, since money – according to most philanthropists – is the only panacea for poverty reduction, social justice, and innovation. As one IPHIL noted,

I deeply believe that wealth needs to be continuously created, okay? But the use of that wealth needs to be free. If I am about to lose a home, for example, I would use capitalist means to save it...buy more homes. I would like to use altruistic means to use my wealth. So what I mean is that we need a society where, it may sound sloganish, we take care of the lowest of the low. There has to be dignity in society... whatever society I’m part of, we should always think about the dignity of everybody. And that’s not about doling out. I would think about what we can do for that person so that they lead dignified lives themselves....I don’t mean that you dole out and become a welfare society. No. So wealth creation will be one and the second one will be that bringing dignity, how society becomes civilized, how we become a responsible nation, one world. (IPHIL 1)

Notice here how dignity is measured by wealth. Although no one would openly declare that the poor and working class are without dignity, what becomes abundantly clear is that basic human emotions – pity, empathy, and love, for example – are interpreted through the lens of financialization. Simply put, spending surplus value on a charity (to engender profit) is considered to be noble, enviable, and compassionate. As a result, philanthropy – what was once regarded as “the love for humankind” – can be seen as a project of advancing both neoliberalism and financialization.
Translocal financialization

As noted in Chapter 4, in all of my discussions with the IPHILs, I observed pockets of ambivalence about giving to “one’s own kind” (i.e., people from within the same diaspora or racial group); instead, several of the participants preferred a blended approach, where mainstream charities would act as an intermediary between the donors and their own community. The feeling was that large charities can also provide more opportunities to bring different communities together – to create a new sort of diaspora, rooted in Canada first, elsewhere second. As one IPHIL noted,

Well, when you look at Canada, we’re the second largest country in the world. From one coast to another, you travel nine hours by plane, so geographically we’re very, very big; population-wise we are very, very small. And, how do you reach people geographically, connect them, and hope that everybody has the same vision for the country? It’s easier said than done. We are a resource-based economy that’s fine today, but, we don’t know what the future will bring. And then we have our cousins south of the border that we depend so much on, for trade, and then the new geo-political issues between India and China; Europe has a whole different set of issues. So we are, as a country, isolated to some extent, but you cannot be economically isolated from the rest of the world. I just want us to use our resources very wisely. (IPHIL 6)

On the one hand, this perspective feeds into an earlier point I made about the growing chasm between rich and poor within the same diaspora group, and how varying interests of the motherland influence translocal relations. In this regard, researchers must remember that “diasporas are living, moving, breathing, maneuvering and growing entities; constantly in flux and always lying dialectically somewhere between being and becoming” (Allahar, 2010, p. 64). According to one IFV,
When you say mainstream, what is “mainstream” and what is the mainstream doing? If a mainstream organization can explain what it is that they are doing, what their work is, what relevance it has to individuals, then I think that the community would be prone to supporting the mainstream. I think a lot of the – let’s say, can we call the Cancer Society mainstream? We can say that kid’s cancer is mainstream because it impacts people of all races, colour, ethnic groups, etc. Everybody is giving to the Cancer Society simply because they understand what this is. They understand how it does not discriminate, you know, that cancer hits everybody wherever they are. They understand that it is individual giving that creates the envelope that makes support for researchers and other people who are looking for the cure. (IFV 5)

IFV 8 shared a similar sentiment:

With no exceptions, everyone of my [name of country of origin] friends are around my age. We all grew up in poverty and we had nothing. And we were able to sort of overcome that. But then to give us a better understanding of being on the other side of the stick, how important it was for us to give back to the community? Part of the problem is this: You as an ethnic group have responsibility for two things. Number one, to mainstream charities and institutions because you live here. You’re a Canadian. You also have a loyalty back to your own ethnicity, but you can’t be exclusive back to there. And that’s a challenge sometimes. So you see a lot of support, for example, for healthcare from the Chinese community for [name of charity], right? But beyond that, where do people go? Do they go to their own hospital? (IFV 8)

Another IFV regarded translocal philanthropy as a fragmented process. Here, again, notice his perspective on giving to political (government) parties and “back home:”
You can look at contributions on two currents. One is your political contributions – that also comes out of philanthropic donors, in a way. You have to feel philanthropic towards democracy and the systems of government and what not. Then it comes to other social causes. The one thing is, in our case, I don’t think that the [name of country of origin] is doing much more back in [name of country]. There are a very few who are doing it, but we don’t do as much back in the old country. So where do we do it? I think we do it in local markets. (IFV 3)

For me, this IFV’s latter point about giving to the “old country” underlines an earlier discussion about the role of financialization and philanthropy in the intensification of precarity on both local and global levels. Some of these concerns are, of course, rooted in the sometimes abstract nature of precarity. As Shukaitis (2013) pointed out, “There is an ambivalence located in the core of precarity as a concept. It is a tension between precarity as a strategic, political concept emerging from the autonomist and post-workerist traditions of politics, and a more sociological or empirical focus on precarity as a condition to be investigated.” (p. 642)

Fundraising, on the other hand, is a tangible activity that, like all else, has a financialization referent. In fact, one IPHIL equated fundraising to sales:

IPHIL 4: I’m looking for a more tangible deliverable, but maybe in the end there isn’t one. Maybe in the end it’s the deliverables that will gestate in people’s minds. And two years later, the guy will pop up and say, “Geez, let’s do this!” So, it is who you’ve inspired in the process.

Krishan: Yeah the ROI is difficult when it’s about dialogue.

IPHIL 4: It is.

Krishan: Really, right?
IPHIL 4: Yeah it’s...in case you haven’t noticed we haven’t achieved world peace yet. That’s worthwhile, you know, because at the end of day, I picked up a phrase which – might apply to you – someone who is in the retail business in Europe said, “Retail is detail.”

Krishan: Right.

IPHIL 4: You guys are in the retail business, right?

Another IPHIL equated fundraising to investment banking:

As a professional, you will know that even the past 15 years have seen a sea change in how the work is done and what is expected of a director. I always say to people when you join a foundation you are a trustee of other people’s money. Again, I don’t think that people quite understand what that means. I think trustees of a foundation have three jobs: to raise money, manage money, and disperse money. That’s it, right? And everything about that is complicated. You’re asking A) people to part with their money, B) telling them you will manage their money, and C) that you will trust us to hand it over to the hospital or to the department in the university or whatever, according to your wishes.

(IPHIL 3)

In a profession where it is said that people give to people (Rosso, 1991; Weinstein 2009; Hart et al., 2008), it appears ironic or contradictory that finance would be central to charitable impact. But, needless to say, fundraising is inseparable from revenue generation. In other words, the primary purpose of the professional fundraiser is to work with money, for money, and in money. The fact that many fundraising departments are now called “advancement” offices suggests that private capital is at the heart of “advancing” the missions of these charities; although, one could easily argue that the renaming of these departments masks their true purpose in order to minimize the obvious presence of privatization and financialization in the non-profit sector.
Working hard for the money

What makes the financialization of philanthropy particularly unique within a translocal context is how culture is considered to be a major factor in philanthropic decision making. It can be said that everyone has different opinions about money – how to make money, spend money, talk about money, and even part with money – and all of these matters have a huge impact on fundraising success, particularly in culturally diverse environments. As one CFLNP pointed out,

You know, when I’m sitting in front of CEOs on Bay Street, I can give them very precise information about their, you know, net worth, holdings, all that kind of stuff. How much money you think that they can give? Who’s prepared to strong arm them? And help us get a gift from them? With the Chinese community, it has got to be a lot more oblique. So you can’t present all the information that you might have because they’ll see it as offensive. They’re very private and they need to give you information on the basis of what they’re comfortable giving you. So even those processes have to be adjusted based on your knowledge of how the community works. This is a really important learning for the fundraising community – that you have to adapt your processes and you have to adapt the way that you think about doing your business, knowing that they’re cultural differences with respect to how people contribute and how people want to perceive information. (CFLNP 2)

As noted earlier, one of the other issues about engaging “diverse” people in fundraising is the relevance of a charity’s mission to a particular community. One IFV noted that,

Fundraising is...charity is our business. You’ve got to spend money to make money, it’s the bottom line. I feel really sorry for the grassroots guys who have nothing. I really do. Also, the ones that see the money, they don’t get it. Like the [name of large non-profit publication] guys came to me and they said, “You know, it’d be great if we could raise
some money in the Chinese community.” I said, “Show me your last 40 issues. Any articles in there that even address this community in a Canadian context?” They said, “No.” I said, “Then don’t bother.” (IFV 4)

These two examples underscore the balancing act that neoliberal charities are currently enduring. On the one hand, some are playing into the diversity rhetoric to show that their organizations can attract gifts from the “new” Canada as a matter of pride; on the other hand, many charities struggle to prove that their offerings have meaning and application for these emerging donor groups. In a counter-intuitive way, then, the conversation about money is eventually taken off the front burner as many large charities recalibrate on the programmatic level as part of their fundraising strategizing. As one CFLNP noted,

I think the big challenge going forward is going to be specificity – the relationship of the donor to specificity and accountability. It used to be about philanthropy. It’s now about ROI [return on investment]. So I think what the donors look for is the ROI. And the ROI is not just in terms of personal gain but in saying, “I know I’m really making a difference.” I don’t want to just give you money and say, “That’s great you did this,” but I want you to show me that I gave you money and it made a difference, it had an impact and it made for great outcomes. And that’s totally different. In particular, the boomer generation was starting this but the next generation, I think, are going to be all about ROI and there’s going to be very little sort of pure philanthropy. “I want to do good, you know. It looks like a good place. Here’s my money.” No. They’re going to question, and they are going challenge, and they’re going to want to be involved. They want to be engaged, they’re going to just want more and more say in where their money is going and how it’s being spent. (CFLNP 8)
But these strategies are not easy to absorb. In thinking about “diversity,” some charities have questioned the efficacy of fundraising in ethnic communities because their annual Chinese New Year and Diwali galas have yielded meagre cash returns from the Chinese or Hindu communities. Some fundraisers have even concluded that “those communities simply aren’t charitable” (CFLNP 3). In the end, however, most senior fundraisers of large charities recognize that superficial communicative acts of diversity are not enough, and if a charity is unwilling to offer deeply engaging opportunities, particularly at the governance level, their splashy holiday events will continue to flounder. In speaking about a prominent donor from Syria, one CFLNP noted,

> It was us understanding it, hearing it, listening to it, getting to know him, and then seeing how that aligned with the opportunity that we had. And doing that in a very open and trusting way. I would say that happens with every very large gift and sometimes it takes six months or sometimes it takes six years. (CFLNP 5)

From a psychological perspective, all of these points centre on one salient value: trust. In fact, donor trust has been one of the symbols of a well-functioning and supportive civil society (Sargeant & Lee, 2004; Sargeant et al., 2006; Naskrent & Siebelt, 2011). But in 2013, the Muttart Foundation reported that trust in Canadian charities is on a downward trajectory – a concern that many fundraising leaders have been hearing for several years now. Some of this distrust is due to inflammatory media reports about “bad apples” in the sector or the cost of overhead (Pallotta, 2008). On occasion, politicians have joined this chorus of skepticism by supporting private member bills to cap non-profit salaries or adding surveilling tools to an already overburdened sector. As one SAED noted,

> Taxes and donations should not be replacing each other, but we are worried that more people are interested in donating to something they believe in and not putting it into tax
dollars or it’s because they don’t trust anybody who's receiving tax dollars. So we are worried about that and that’s part of this erosion of democracy, too. I’d rather give my money charitably than through taxes and we think the taxes are important and we don’t want to see any erosion there. (SAED 9)

From a translocal point of view, it is also important to remember donors’ experiences of charitable giving back home influence how they participate in giving in Canada. As a result, some charities have embarked on an educating agenda, where they speak to communities about how philanthropy is a Canadian value. As one IFV put it,

There has been a slow decrease in what used to be the “sending countries” so that the people who are joining us now are not coming from Europe, not coming from the conflict areas of Europe, you know, refugees from war. So the newcomers are coming from China, from India, from Pakistan, from the Caribbean, from Africa. So you have this before you and then we have to look at education. I spent a lot of our time, a lot of years, doing this educating [about charitable giving]. (IFV 5)

On a related topic, I believe that the pursuit for “diverse” revenue also dilutes race and ethnicity into singular categories. Within a transnational context, as noted earlier, relations between here and there are highly contextualized, operating at very different speeds and with varying degrees of strength. In this sense, charities can become complicit in mythologizing what “back home” means. As Elena Neiterman and Ivy Lynn Bourgeault (2012) pointed out,

We would like to suggest that once we accept the proposition that a homeland is a mythological construction, which is formed and maintained by a diaspora group, it is impossible to limit the boundaries of this homeland to a geographic location identifiable on the map. A homeland is only what is constructed as a homeland, whether it is a shared land, culture, or some other collective memory. (Neiterman & Bourgeault, 2012, p. 55)
I also take issue with the notion that perspectives on money are tied to a native cultural belief system. I contend that there is no common denominator within a specific race or culture about money. Contrary perspectives dilute any critical discussion about why some groups have more access to money than others. While there is an entire body of literature that speaks to the politics behind the “colour of money” (see Ivanic et al., 2011; Brown, 1999; Li-Ping Tang et al., 2006 ), I approach these topics very cautiously so as not to essentialize how racial or ethnic groups accumulate, save, invest, and spend.

Within this context, the financialization paradigm is exacerbated by elite immigrant philanthropreneurs who are pushing the boundaries on the old-fashioned charitable gift giving paradigm. Should today’s gifts preclude any financial return to the donor? Traditional fundraisers contend that a gift must be managed at arm’s length and that the return (other than a charitable tax receipt) is personalized and timely donor stewardship. However, more and more charities are beginning to embrace these new models, where investments support the financial aspirations of the investor. In areas like higher education and healthcare, the first wave of philanthrocapitalist gifts centered on donor-sponsored activities that directly benefitted the donor through research outcomes, product development, public relations, and teaching (see Eyre, 2002; Hottenrott & Thorwarth, 2011; Shannon & Perlis, 2012). In this regard “the pro-diversity neoliberalism of philanthrocapitalism excludes the more conservative, industrial, and resource extraction-based sections of the capitalist class who refuse to co-operate within philanthrocapitalism’s marginal limits and don’t share its aesthetic or cultural values” (Drury, 2014, p. 20). Now, charities are recasting these ethical issues as new opportunities brought about by the financialization of society. As one CFLNP surmised: “So when I say we’re not in the fundraising business, what we are is in the business of helping people intelligently use their resources” (CFLNP 7).
The rhetorics of diversity, inclusion, and civic engagement have been brought about and supported by the state and corporations because of the promise of profiteering. Charities and immigrants have, then, become willing actors through hegemonic tools that cover-up neoliberalism and financialization. According to Ivan Drury (2014), the key to hegemonic power “is the formation of the ‘common sense’ of the day: the embedded beliefs and assumptions that people accept as natural, like that tax cuts fuel economic growth, that gentrification is inevitable, that economic growth is healthy, or that locally produced food is more ethical” (p. 16). In the end, through hegemony and false consciousness, people assume responsibility for public welfare as taxes are redirected to advance private and corporate interests. As IPHI 5 claimed:

I think politicians spend a lot of money to make themselves look good. There’s a saying in French which means we have the politicians we deserve. And it’s a very sad state of affairs, I think, because maybe people have to get more involved in the life of the city, of the country. Maybe we have to be more proactive and caring about what happens, not only in our household, but in our building, in our neighborhood, in our city, and in our country. And I think that we have to care more about that if we want...because philanthropy is about charity. The reason that it exists is because there are people who have needs. And maybe if the tax money was spent more wisely, people will pressure more....I am definitely not saying that the government should be responsible for everything, but the people in government are also people. And it should all work together. (IPHIL 5)

In this next (and final) section of this chapter, I will pay closer attention to the role of diversity in the financialization of philanthropy.
Diversity as a tool of financialization?

At the beginning of her book, *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*, Sara Ahmed (2012) asked two very important questions about the nature of organizational diversity initiatives: “What does diversity do? What are we doing when we use the language of diversity?” (p. 1) Through a series of interviews with diversity practitioners in higher education, Ahmed found that institutional diversity essentially draws on the cooperative and idyllic vision of equal opportunity, a narrative commonly used by early diversity theorists (see Goldberg, 1994; Gordon & Newfield, 1996; Taylor & Gutmann, 1994; Royce, 1982) to dilute issues of colonization, racism, patriarchy, and other forms of oppression. Moreover, Ahmed found that diversity remains an unfulfilled promise because of the uneven and scattered focus within (and across) institutions. She noted,

The project of “integrating diversity” by not having a diversity unit, which works on the principle that “everyone” should be responsible for diversity, does not seem to work. I would speculate that “everyone” translates quickly into “no one”: unless responsibility is given to someone, it is both refused and diffused within the organization. By implication, working on diversity and equity requires an acceptance of the uneven distribution of commitment, rather than a fantasy that “everyone” can share responsibility. Of course, this issue remains complicated. On one hand, to depend on the uneven distribution of commitment is to repeat that unevenness (to allow diversity to be “given” to some units or bodies and not others), whereas on the other hand to act “as if” diversity is a shared responsibility both conceals the unevenness and diffuses any commitment. (Ahmed, 2012, pp. 136-137)

Needless to say, the proliferation of diversity programs in the field of fundraising – spanning from education and professional development events to board recruitment and human resources –
points to the growing preoccupation of organizational leaders to transform their institutions into more socially and culturally relevant spaces for their service users, donors, and volunteers. In other words, to have all-white donors and staff, particularly within a diverse city like Toronto, is generally considered to be a glaring problem or weakness in strategy and management. But what is, then, diversity’s endgame?

To answer this question, I would like to briefly turn our attention to a couple of policy and discussion documents published by two Canadian research centres. In 2010, the Martin Prosperity Institute at the University of Toronto developed a series of pre-election position papers in which questions of creativity and production were configured as urbanization and economic development issues. For the authors of the report, “Cities that promote diversity and tolerance also tend to become places that are open to new ideas and different perspectives, promoting creativity. This in turn builds cities that are attractive to individuals and businesses involved in the creation of new ideas, products and services” (King et al., p. 1). The report’s focus on consumerism and urban planning alludes to a specific economic agenda whereby diversity is noted as a propeller for financial prosperity. Similarly, Maytree, Canada’s largest think tank on diversity and inclusion issues, published a report entitled, “Diverse leadership fuels organizational effectiveness and prosperity,” in which a five point rationale for diversity was outlined:

Diversity in leadership in elected office, corporate, voluntary and public institutions is important because it: 1) Supports improved financial and organizational performance; 2) Provides stronger links to domestic and global markets; 3) Helps organizations attract and retain the best talent; 4) Supports creativity in decision making; and 5) Promotes social inclusion because leaders shape the aspirations of young people. Organizations can
diversify their leadership by emulating those organizations that have taken action and succeeded. (Maytree, 2010, p.1)

This report stands alongside a plethora of US- and UK-based studies (for examples, see Ottaviano & Peri, 2006; Bellini et al., 2013; Hiebert et al., 2015) that have convincingly linked social and cultural diversity to economic stability and growth. For me, however, the language of diversity in the context of the non-profit sector in Canada is deeply implicated in the financialization of the everyday world. When terms like “global markets,” “organizational performance,” and “retaining talent” are used in the same sentence as “diversity,” “inclusion,” and “multiculturalism,” it becomes clear that diversity is a key component of a distinct economic agenda. This focus on diversity is a recurring feature of global capitalism, particularly in racially diverse global cities. As Slavoj Žižek (1997) pointed out:

The ideal form of ideology of this global capitalism is multiculturalism, the attitude which, from a kind of empty global position, treats each local culture the way the colonizer treats colonized people – as ‘natives’ whose mores are to be carefully studied and ‘respected’. That is to say, the relationship between traditional imperialist colonialism and global capitalist self-Colonization is exactly the same as the relationship between Western cultural imperialism and multiculturalism involves patronizing Eurocentrist distance and/or respect for local culture without roots in one’s own particular culture. In other words, multiculturalism is a disavowed, inverted, self-referential form of racism, a ‘racism with a distance’ – it ‘respects’ the Other’s identity, conceiving the Other as a self-enclosed ‘authentic’ community towards which he, the multiculturalist maintains a distance rendered possible by his privileged universal position. (Žižek, 1997, p. 44)
If diversity and multiculturalism are tools of white privilege and financialization, then how do philanthropists react to being used as the face of diversity for mainstream organizations? One IPHIL noted that while diversity may help pay for the entrance fee into the old establishment, his insights and work ethic are the true markers of credibility:

Krishan: Do you sometimes feel that you are called upon because you are different, because you are [name of culture]? “We need diversity here, there’s not enough diverse faces or voices.”

IPHIL 1: I think it may be that. Mostly of places where I am called, they may be ticking off that box, but they know that I’m way more than that. I hope you understand it?

Krishan: Yes I do.

IPHIL 1: Many of us have that criteria, but we think nothing like that.

Krishan: It’s just a check mark?

IPHIL 1: It’s a tick mark. But they know that I’m much more than that. In fact, my – and I want to think about it – my being a [skin colour]…that’s who I am. There are many places that I will not be invited, even if they are in need. You know why? Because I would be doing much more than the other guy. I would expect and they will have to be, keep me at their level if not more than that. So I think about it this way.

In a similar vein, another IPHIL didn’t seem too bothered by being the token diversity representative:

Krishan: Do you ever feel you are asked because you are [name of culture]? “We need [IPHIL name]. We need some diversity on this board.”

IPHIL 4: Possibly. One example that is still ongoing is [name of charity]. They came to me a few years ago. Now that is mainly because there’s not enough knowledge in the visible minority population about donating… So why do they need an [name of cultural
They actually told me that I would be representing all [name of cultural group] because of my profile or whatever okay? And there’s a South Asian actress…you know that beautiful actress? She’s been tapped as well.

In these two cases, the prestige of being the only “diverse” representative is understood as a symbol of exclusivity. For IPHILs, this exceptionalism is worn as a badge of honour since they are seen as the pinnacle of model citizenry. That said, the white IFVs and CFLNPs demonstrated a distinct preoccupation in finding a more efficient way to usher in greater diversity. One IFV even asked me to help her identify potential fundraising board candidates:

Yeah and home is here, there’s no question on that. But if you have any tips on diversity and governance, I would be really, really, really interested in hearing about it. Because I’ve been involved in a couple – not personally – of groups. I was on boards that recruited [diverse] people that lasted a year and a half, and they never said a word. I thought that they were like fish out of water. They didn’t know how they could get through here and the organization didn’t do enough heavy lifting to give them proper guidelines or an orientation [about] what it means to be a director. You can’t presume that people know what’s expected of them. They’ve never been on a Canadian not-for-profit before. (IFV 3)

A CFLNP described the kind of bravery organizations need to possess in order to take on diversity:

You have to be prepared to take risks and if you have an organization that is risk-adverse, this kind of fundraising is not going to be one that, you know, is going to come particularly natural to you. You have to be prepared to fail; you have to be prepared to take your lumps. You have to be prepared to accept that it’s not going to be successful all at once, especially for an organization that is driven on being highly successful. You
know, making sure the culture of the place is also tolerant of failure or, you know, not everything going the way that you want because this is new ground…Well you've got to be prepared to accept that. Again, that’s where I think the leadership of the organization has to play a significant role because they have to say that, “You know, it’s okay that we didn’t do as well as we thought we would in this first instance, but let’s learn from it and move on.” So, there is an element of risk around this and an element of “It’s not always gonna work the way you want it to” in the first instance and you've gotta be prepared to accept that. (CFLNP 2)

I was struck by this description of diversity as a potential risk or failure, as if mainstream charities are taking a big leap of faith in the giving of their hospitality. I wanted to see if there was any truth to these hesitations, so I asked IFV 4 who is connected to CFLNP 2 about perceptions of risk,

Krishan: So, let me ask you this question. Is there a false sense out there that the [name of cultural group] community is richer than it really is, or more philanthropic than that it really is? I’m hearing that maybe this is all smoke and mirrors, this diversity shit.

IFV 4: Smoke and mirrors, no. You know what throws it off? The same thing that throws off people looking for gold. If out of a million people one person strikes it rich, everybody’s going to use that guy as the example. So the same thing in the Chinese and the South Asian community. There have been massive donations, right? How often does a Mike Lee-Chin come around? How often do any of these donors that make large massive donations (and they happen to be very tightly aligned) connect with the community? You’re not going to get those every day. Having said that, there is massive wealth coming from China, in Toronto. Massive wealth, and this is what I always explain to people, is just because there are a lot of people with a lot of money doesn’t mean the
money will go to you, right? They became very wealthy for a reason. Not by giving it all
away.

I also observed that the CFLNPs used descriptors akin to finance and economics. Here, I argue
that the financialization of philanthropy is the driving force of diversity in the non-profit sector.
As CFLNP 3 described,

Well, diversity is a hot topic because the nation has changed so fundamentally in terms of
its population. And the real and substantive demographic shifts in the country have
profound implications of where philanthropy goes. As a percentage of GDP, philanthropy
hasn’t changed very much in the last 20 or 30 years. But where that money is going is
quite different and a lot of that has to do with the diversity agenda. So one talks about
religious giving in Canada, which on the whole has been declining in market share, but
growing in real terms. If you look at where the money is going, all the growth is being
driven by new communities in Canada. (CFLNP 3)

In essence, diversity has the dangerous potential to deduce immigrants to economic units for the
expansion of philanthropy. While this may be old news in other sectors, the trouble with this
paradigm within the non-profit arena is how it operates as a socially progressive and moral
imperative. In reality, however, it is a propeller of financialization, just as it is in the public and
corporate sectors.

Conclusion

The financialization of philanthropy brings two supposedly conflicting sectors together in
a complex orchestration that ultimately privileges neoliberalism. Under financialization,
corporations, banks, investment managers, and bureaucrats regard charities as sites for control
and profit-making. By endorsing private donations, these actors tug on people’s heart strings,
convincing them that pulling out their wallets and purses will make solve a social or
environmental problem. It is of no coincidence that the horrific images of death along the shores of the Mediterranean have yielded a philanthropic response by everyday people all over the world. Arguably, these gifts buy governments some more time to put the all mechanisms in place to ensure that national security and the economy are not threatened by the deluge of refugees.

Affluent immigrants play a curious role in the financialization of philanthropy for a number of reasons. First, charities have become fascinated with diversity and inclusion because of the hegemonic belief that cultural representation is a symbol of justice for and acceptance of others. In this pursuit, socially-conscious and progressive charities have skipped over the primary problem of social welfare restructuring under neoliberalism. Simply put, inclusion programs have become a public distraction, giving financialization a chance to get ahead by coming through the back door. Second, the novelty of philanthrocapitalism and other forms of charitable investing within this financialized era have forced charity leaders to reconsider the foundations upon which non-profit organizations have been built. However, I argue that these forms of giving are akin to age-old “strings attached” sponsorships where the donor benefits more than the beneficiary. In this regard, charitable organizations that have embraced these new forms of giving are actually facilitating the conversion of public goods into private commodities. As a result, philanthropy can be seen as – to borrow from Derrida (1992) – an annulled gift. Finally, I surmise that since it is harder to generate wealth within an already depressed and over-burdened settlement sector, immigrant philanthrocapitalists are directing their gifts to better-oiled machines with PR engines and global reach. The chasm between rich and poor is growing deeper through this competitive funding environment, forcing some organizations to implement new revenue streams, such as translation services and fee-for-service programs, just to keep their doors open. These tactics are also changing non-profits into business units, which again, point to the hegemonic power of financial bodies, corporate elites, and all of their subsidiaries. All of
these issues roll up into a startling realization that non-profits have come under siege by financialization.
Chapter 6: Conclusion: A Complicated Kindness

Chapter overview

How does the philanthropy of Toronto’s immigrant elites interplay with the strategic growth of the non-profit sector? An exploration of this overarching research question has uncovered a number of critical issues about the role of individual wealth, governments, and corporate influence in the making of the modern philanthropic state and the new Canadian establishment. Accordingly, in this chapter I briefly summarize the findings from each interview cluster, followed by some additional notes that contribute to the theoretical discussions from Chapters 3, 4, and 5. I then conclude with my own personal reflection on how this new knowledge may impact the practice of fundraising and the study of charitable giving.

Overall insights from the interview participants

I would like to begin this chapter with my own synthesis of the participants’ voices, lessons learned, and the contributions of this investigation to the field of diaspora, financialization, philanthropy, and non-profit studies:

*Lessons from immigrant philanthropists:* The IPHILs I interviewed continue to possess the means to make considerable gifts to many different charities; and, indeed, all of them have already made a tremendous philanthropic mark within the local non-profit scene. Each expressed great pride in their efforts to help “build Canada,” since this country has been very good to them, particularly on the social and economic fronts. All of them are “here to stay” and their charitable interests are now driven by their future ambitions (for themselves and successive generations) in Canada. This privileged position is rooted in early and ongoing recollections of familial charitable giving and an acute desire to belong to a defined community. For them, a charitable gift earns respect and access into exclusive circles, and this membership offers great power and
public admiration. For them, to be rich is no longer the endgame, just as Gates and Zuckerberg have shown the world in recent years. Philanthropy is the ultimate symbol of success, which brings about a penultimate sense of prestige and honour. This is not to say that the IPHILs have questionable or overtly ego-driven intentions; in fact, I observed a genuine and highly saccharine level of concern for helping others and bettering society. Based on my critical understanding of the field, however, these gifts-as-solutions are symbolic of the hegemonic power of charitable giving, and they minimize the neoliberal and financialized structures that create, sustain, and expand inequality.

For me, many of these philanthropists have debunked the rags-to-riches narrative that is often associated with newcomers. While only a couple of them arrived as millionaires, all possessed many of the “right” resources and skills – a university degree, excellent English language facility, financial capital, a track record of entrepreneurship, great capacity for cross-border mobility, and a small yet mighty network. These and other forms of capital clearly gave them a distinct advantage in Canada. More importantly, their philanthropic interests are closely aligned to charities that give new resources to themselves, including new networks and profile.

There are a number of tensions and inherent politics associated with the strategic deployment of these forms of capital. First, the transnational expression of giving is less evident amongst the IPHILs than I had first hypothesized. While many of them have maintained their networks and connections back home, most are deeply committed to giving to local Canadian charities. Their gifts are unevenly charted and come with varying obligations, and the details of the benefactions (particularly the amounts given) are generally kept private. Their charitable gifts to back home are closely aligned with the no-strings-attached ethos that is often associated with traditional gratuitous giving. In Canada, however, mega-gifts are often attributed to mainstream organizations that offer naming rights, networking opportunities, PR, and global reach.
Regarding the latter point, non-profits that can bridge the homeland and Canada are most likely to attract the attention of diaspora philanthropists, as they offer the rare and dual benefit of publicity and “impact” here and there.

The IPHIL men I interviewed displayed an overt philanthrocapitalist orientation in that their gifts were connected to new opportunities to acquire additional capital – either financial or symbolic, or some of both. Their engagement with a cause was motivated by a combination of “What can I do to make this issue/idea/agenda better?” and “What will I be able to get out of this gift?” The financialization underpinnings of these queries correspond to an escalating excitement about the promises of new and creative ways to give in a profitable way. The women IPHILs, on the other hand, saw their philanthropy as a nurturing or maternal expression of charity. Notably, the men rarely talked about their mothers, wives, and children as they shared stories of their corporate and philanthropic pursuits; all of the women I interviewed, however, spoke with great detail about their families as part of their philanthropic legacy. These observations provided me with a number of insights about the role of patriarchy and gender in charitable giving, as more fully described in Chapter 4.

Lessons from immigrant fundraising volunteers: As discussed in Chapter 2, I decided to interview immigrant fundraising volunteers soon after I had completed a number of interviews with IPHILs who had noted the crucial role of various “door openers” from within their own community. Even though the addition of ten more interviews protracted the timelines of this study, I believe that I now have a more full-bodied understanding of the social relations that inform the process of fundraising. For me, there were many similarities between the IFVs and IPHILs – a distinct desire to leverage networks to gain respect and prestige, a keen understanding of how volunteering can provide access to elite circles, and a clear resolve to diversify the image of the good Samaritan. However, there are some distinguishing features within this group that are
worth noting as well. For example, all of them endured poor or working class conditions upon arrival in Canada, and their early experiences of exclusion, racism, and struggle served as a kind of kindling to work *within the system* to change it. In all but one case, the IFVs remain deeply connected to their ethno-cultural community; they are also well-respected by the ultra-rich diaspora, local politicians, and other community heavy-hitters (e.g. religious leaders, media personalities, and so forth) and are often called on to act as a spokesperson for their community. Understandably, then, their perspectives on charitable giving align with the diversity and inclusion rhetoric that permeates across Canada. For them, the non-profit sector needs more “colour” in terms its volunteer cadre and donors – and it is up to them to realize this change. While institutional diversity and inclusion projects have been regarded as strategic tools to maintain the status quo (see Ahmed 2012), the IFVs saw their efforts as a form of social activism inspired by an idyllic vision of a multicultural Canada with fair and equal representation and voice.

The IFVs were key figures in the narratives of the CFLNPs. In fact, as I interviewed members of both groups, I discovered that were telling the same story but from their own perspective. For example, IFV 4 talked about IPHIL 3 and both were used as examples by CFLNP 8. This sort of exchange occurred time and time again, indicating that the circulation of information and resources between these groups are intimate, interwoven, and co-dependent. Moreover, the perception about the growth of diversity in Toronto does not mean that there is a new abundance of new “diverse” donors to tap. While “millionaire migrants” (Ley, 2011) are a growing demographic in Toronto, many of the people I interviewed have been mainstay actors in the fundraising scene for more than fifteen years. I am not suggesting that the composition of the super-rich in Canada has remained stagnant, but when it comes to the fundraising activities of
large charities, IFVs and CFLNPs tend to focus on cultivating the “tried and true” philanthropists from the South Asian community, the Chinese community, the Jamaican community, and so on.

From the lens of financialization, the IFVs are quietly complicit in advancing the charitable industrial complex. Their participation on university and hospital fundraising boards, for example, are filled with good intentions, but, in the end, they are subject to the conditions, rules, and practices of these institutions, particularly when it comes to neoliberal fundraising. For example, all of the IFVs have distinct fundraising deliverables that often come with the honorific title of “campaign chair” or “cabinet executive member.” The recognition they receive from the leaders of these organizations upon the completion of these campaigns, creates a “halo effect” (Timothy Coombs & Holladay, 2006) that overrides any feelings of complicity.

For me, the IFVs proved that there are some additional complexities to Derrida’s “odyssey of the circle” (Derrida, 1999, p. 24) or never-ending sense of obligation based on gift exchange. However, Derrida never considered the role of an intervening body in the deliverance of new benefactors to beneficiaries. Derrida likely saw this group as part of the “foreigner” category; however, as this study suggests, they are critical to the coopting of a resource-rich diaspora. This understanding, I believe, is a new contribution to Derridean critique as it relates to gift theory and immigration studies.

Lessons from chief fundraisers of large non-profits: Of all of the groups that I interviewed, the CFLNPs possessed the most privilege, even though one may assume that, with all of their financial resources, the IPHILs would be at top of the “non-profit food chain.” Since all of the CFLNPs I interviewed are white, highly-educated, and leaders of their own multi-million dollar operations, they are not only in a position to direct the priorities of their charities, but they also possess the power and prerogative to disregard the IPHIL community in its entirety, especially if they are confronted with the difficult task of transforming the existing culture of
their organizations to better align themselves with this emerging donor class. In this regard, IPHILs and IFVs are subject to the hospitality of the CFLNPs, who wield great power when it comes to the production and promotion of the model minority.

For the most part, however, the CFLNPs were genuinely curious about how to identify and cultivate this donor group. They either wanted to share their experiences with me to obtain validation about their efforts or seek input on how to deploy their ideas more effectively. In this regard, I observed great variances in the quality and frequency of planning and programming focused on “diverse communities.” Some of the CFLNPs had a long history of diaspora investing, while others had no idea where or how to begin. All of them understood, however, that these pursuits require an investment of personal time and many trust-building activities. Some of the more advanced charities used IFVs to broker introductions to high net worth members of their communities and organize both small- and large-scale projects to prove that, for example, Charity X wanted more than someone’s money. In other cases, a culturally-themed gala – like a Bollywood fundraiser – is the only way some organizations raise money from the Indian diaspora. These events tend to have an apolitical and celebratory tone to them that inevitably unearth questions about cultural appropriation.

I observed some discomfort amongst the CFLNPs when I brought up the issue of race or racism in fundraising. No one was prepared to label their organizations’ past practices as racist or exclusionary; instead, many people talked about a need to better “reflect” the community. In fact, all of the CFLNPs expressed a kind of fortitude about doing a better job of having their staff, volunteers, and donors mirror the broader demographics of Canada. As I probed further into these motivations, they shared a distinct concern about “relevance:” Will Charity X continue to have meaning to the community it serves in five years? Will Charity Y be outrun by another community-specific organization? These discussions tended to focus on a charity’s competitive
advantage, not on tackling race and gender problems. Informed by these discussions, I believe that fundraisers are adopting diversity practices as a matter of best practice without really understanding why it needs to be done. I call this the “diversity bandwagon effect” where charities begin implementing diversity initiatives because of these vague concerns about relevance and reflection, which are sometimes shrouded in the language of “cultural fluency,” “cultural competency,” “cross-cultural dialogue,” or “inclusivity.” Rarely did I hear about how these activities confront racism, white privilege, (un)conscious bias, or class and gender issues.

I also observed that the majority of large charities have robust international programs that have a simultaneous appeal to the translocal and transnational sensibilities of highly-mobile diaspora elites. The CFLNPs are taking advantage of these programs, which promise more than national-level recognition; these investments have the potential to create the new stand-out category of “global citizen.” This luring title is a clear motivator for aspiring immigrant philanthropists, and more CFLNPs are leveraging this opportunity and achieving great fundraising success. This is when the intersections of transnationalism, hospitality, and the gift are best observed: the “global citizen” is subject to the host’s recognition of the gift. This is further explained in the next section.

Lessons from settlement agency charities: Across the board, the executive directors of these non-profits displayed a certain level of paralysis (or aporia) about fundraising and the role of individual philanthropy in the work of their organizations. The SAEDs expressed many concerns about privatization, corporatization, exclusion, and the outsourcing of social services. Unlike the CFLNPs, rarely did they speak about diversity; rather, they were concerned about issues of access, equity, human rights, and anti-oppression. Accordingly, the SAEDs shared an activist orientation where fundraising is regarded as a questionable pursuit that requires a divestment of time and resources away from primary service delivery – and a suspension of
organizational and personal values as well. Immigrant and refugee settlement agencies are, I argue, amongst the most misunderstood and underfunded charities within the non-profit sector. While the question of sustainable funding is of grave concern to all NGOs, settlement agencies exist in a state of amplified financial crisis. As this study has shown, the slow (or sometimes sudden) retraction of government funding has had a damaging impact on the capacity of these agencies. And the fundraising-as-a-solution paradigm requires a new investment of cash in order for it to take root. But where is this money going to come from?

I interviewed settlement agency directors because I wanted to get a sense of their experiences of cultivating and soliciting high net worth individuals from within their cultural community. Several of SAEDs said that connecting to “their own” was a monumental challenge in part because their charities do not embrace philanthrocapitalism or other profit-driven charitable schemes. Furthermore, the level of prestige and recognition these charities offer have less cachet in the eyes of immigrant philanthropists. Finally, the networks and connections offered by these agencies tend to be with other service-oriented non-profits, which have little reciprocal value to high net worth diasporas. In this sense, gift exchange is an exercise of affirming class consciousness and articulating social exclusion.

When it comes to fundraising activities, most of the SAEDs tend to rely on one or two volunteers to organize grassroots events or membership appeals. The heavy lifting, however, inevitably falls onto the shoulders of the executive directors who are often over-extended and over-worked. The IFVs slip in and out of these environments, often frustrated by the lack of infrastructure and attention; they are also subject to the wooing efforts of large mainstream charities. Repeatedly, I detected a kind of resentment towards the CFLNPs, who have volunteer corps to support their efforts, marketing budgets, CEO buy-in, and a lucrative and “attractive”
roster of investment opportunities. A common refrain I heard was, “Imagine what we could do with that kind of money!”

The SAEDs also expressed a personal disconnect with elite members from their own diaspora group. Other than language, race, and perhaps shared history, they are divided by a Bourdieuvian sense of class differentiation or “distinction” (Bourdieu, 1984). For them, the IPHILs have “moved on,” connoting some sort of amnesia on the part of the IPHILs – have they forgotten where they come from? This study shows that the IPHILs never relied on these settlement services when they arrived in Canada because they (or their parents) already possessed many of the resources needed to enjoy their middle class-ness. The sense of struggle, therefore, is very different than those of their brethren. The issue, then, is about an absence – not a forgetting – of experience. Furthermore, I argue that the rags-to-riches immigrant story is a construction of a simple, utopian Canada where anyone can make it if they have the determination to work hard.

On a practical level, all of these issues speak to the irony and burden most underemployed and working class immigrants must bear witness to – a recognition that even though opportunities exist in abundance, they remain out-of-reach. While one or two windfall stories of success mask the harsh realities of most immigrants in Canada, the IPHILs are capitalizing on this popular mythology of Canada. From a theoretical perspective, these problems have deep roots in Derrida’s ideas on hospitality. In the following sections, I continue to synthesize my observations based on the three broad themes of this thesis.

The hospitable gift

In Of Hospitality (2000), Derrida went to great lengths to prove that hosts and guests are defined by their difference and inseparability. Hospitality suggests that the guest/foreigner/outside is always subject to the welcoming gestures of the host/citizen/insider. These relations
speak to the inevitable power struggle between migrants and citizens, white and racialized, men and women, straight and queer, abled and disabled, old and young, and rich and poor. In terms of charitable giving, the welcoming gestures of the host contain a paternalistic benevolence worthy of the beneficiary’s gratitude – in finitude. These power relations, Derrida claimed, were at the heart of all social problems and the semblance of the self was inevitably defined, subjected, and managed by the host.

There are no shortage of examples to show the relevance and pervasiveness of hospitality. Simply put, we cannot manoeuver through a day without at least one appeal to our hospitality through charitable giving. Moreover, in an era marked by forced migration, racism, and global exchanges of labour and goods, it could be said that hospitality is full bloom. The purpose of thinking about the self and society through the lens of hospitality, “opens up our thinking about the other…[and] encourages more ethical and just ways of being with and relating to strangers who approach our thresholds” (Hogeveen & Freistadt, 2013, p. 44).

However, for me, there is a marked difference between “giving” and “giving away.” The former alludes to hospitality as Derrida defined it, while the latter refers to a movement towards reorganizing and redistributing power, something that all hosts would be unwilling to “give up.” This crisis of hospitality is intimately woven into Derrida’s theory about the impossibility of the gift. He saw giving as a selfish act that led to an aporetic deadlock in which giving becomes conditional, privileging the needs of the donor over the recipient. In a “donor-centered” (Burk, 2003) fundraising environment, these needs have made charities subject to the whims of their donors. And on an institutional macro-level, neoliberalism and capitalism can be configured as hosts to the welfare state, which is often regarded as highly problematic and in need of the host’s attention and acceptance.
While Derrida never clarified what he meant by the “gift,” his assertion about the unbreakable interdependency between the donor and the beneficiary through the act of giving still has great currency within this hyper-philanthropic contemporary moment. In fact, I argue that the “philanthropic state” (McGoey, 2014) that has come define our milieu is informed by these interdependent power dynamics. Moreover, the growth of international free trade agreements, technological advancements in communications, and migratory flows inspired my interest in better understanding how translocal philanthropy influences and directs these social relations.

Translocal issues in charitable giving

As noted earlier, this study began as an exploration of the lack of diversity in fundraising and philanthropy, particularly in Toronto – a global city that openly makes the most of its reputation as a destination for immigrant success. This investigation quickly pivoted, however, in light of the growing body of work revealing a kind of unruliness and complexity about the nature of giving itself, especially amongst diaspora communities within these contexts. Layered on top are a variety of sometimes-covert exchanges that have elicited new queries about the “making” of diaspora, the social interests of immigrant elites, and the mobility of transnationals from above. How is class produced through philanthropy? Who is behind the definition of the model minority? What does charitable giving have to do with building a nation? And how are nonprofits facilitating the growing global orientation of diasporas, corporate elites, and other actors within a shadow state system?

Following several authors of translocalism and third sector research (see McFarlane, 2011; Langenohl, 2015; Brickell, & Datta, 2011; Rios & Watkins, 2015), this study suggests that the role of the “nation” is not only complex and unwieldy, but sometimes less salient than local or regional assemblages that render some communities as successes within the “local” – whether
that means here, nearby, over there, or far away. More importantly, however, is the notion that physical distance plays a secondary or tertiary role in translocal politics; of greater value and meaning is the strength of the networks that produce one’s social reality. As a result, I purposely chose to use the term “translocal” to think through the nuances of place and placement within the context of this study.

My participants taught me several lessons about the role of charities and giving in the process of making the translocal. First, large mainstream organizations are regarded as preferred facilitators of transnational philanthropy because they simultaneously provide local and international benefits that help sustain ties “there” and build new networks “here.” Second, immigrant volunteers are key actors within this orchestration and deliverance of diaspora gifts. This realization came early on in the interviewing phase of this study, as some of the CFLNPs noted how fundraising volunteers from within certain communities were critical in “opening doors.” These volunteers are not only important agents in the making of the new establishment, but they act as proof points that voluntary and charitable action is a distinctly Canadian value and moral imperative. Third, there are tensions within these communities – challenges that are cut along class lines. To put it simply, high net worth immigrants do not give in any major way to smaller immigrant-focused charities. While it may be harsh to say that immigrant philanthropists are turning away from the everyday needs of their own, settlement agencies continue to experience a funding crisis that could easily be put to rest by one mega gift. The fact that this tension even exists highlights the hegemonizing effect of some charities over others: large mainstream charities can offer more attention, access to new networks, and have more opportunities to leverage government funding. As a result, the philanthropic motivations of elite immigrant actors are informed by the promises held by these sorts of organizations. Ultimately,
while “local” charities remain troubled by their own missions and fight for survival, large charities are strategically internationalizing with the help and leadership of diasporas.

Financialization and philanthropy’s new endgame

As noted throughout this dissertation, over the last five years, a growing body of critical literature has provided tremendous bench strength to an emerging focus on how different modes of philanthropy are attempting to reconcile the unprecedented chasm between the rich and poor within a highly networked and financialized global regime. These works find their roots in various accounts of how neoliberalism is dismantling the social welfare state. Carol Thompson (2014), for example, provided a detailed overview of how the magnitude of neoliberal reforms of the 1980s acted as an “assault on governments’ participation in any economic sphere beginning “with removing government from the production sector, declaring all parastatals as inefficient” (p. 394). This phenomenon, in concert with the deregulation of capital on a global scale, has helped set the stage for new social and financial experiments in the pursuit of “doing well by doing good” (Streeter, 2014).

In my interviews with the SAEDs, I was struck by how these contextual notes have intensified precarity, particularly within the settlement sector. As was noted in Chapter 5, philanthropy has been regarded as the proposed antidote to the crises created by sweeping cuts to non-profits and, in extension, the broader welfare state system. These developments have been in the pipeline for at least twenty years: the precursors to the financialization of philanthropy – microfinance and public-private partnerships – have set the stage for philanthrocapitalism where donor objectives supersede the needs of an organization’s users. In essence, all of the players in this game are increasingly bound and directed by financialization. As Mader (2014) noted,

From the philanthropist or ‘social investor’ via the developmental NGO to the beneficiary herself, participants in this financial chain are asked to think of themselves as capitalists
and risk-takers, channeling market forces towards the aim of promoting development. By acquiring new meanings – as socially necessary and benevolent – the rules of mainstream finance, which include regular repayment schedules, monitoring, and a drive for profitability, enter into developmental activities previously considered the remit of NGOs and civil society. (Mader, 2014, p. 611)

Immigrant philanthropists play a curious role in philanthropy for a couple of reasons. First, their donations are regarded as positive symbols of diversity, inclusion, and social progress – that Canada has been good to them and so they are doing everything to pay it back/forward. In this regard, it would appear unsavory – perhaps even un-Canadian – to openly interrogate the ethics behind the accumulation of surplus capital or to question how much of it is making up for government contractions in social welfare spending. Second, newer models of financialization in philanthropy – namely impact investing, social enterprise, venture philanthropy, and social impact bonds – suggest that financial actors are better suited to solve some of the challenges that non-profits have taken on for decades, from climate change to higher education and newcomer settlement and healthcare. One thing is certain here: philanthropists consider themselves deft at making money and this is why many fundraisers look to them for advice and leadership within the charitable sector. That said, innovation in fundraising is often code for the privatization and financialization of social goods.

In a new book entitled The Self-Help Myth: How Philanthropy Fails to Alleviate Poverty, Erica Kohl-Arenas (2016) took a close look at how foundation funding has sustained poverty within California’s Central Valley, one of the world’s most affluent agricultural production regions with a significantly poor population. Her research corresponds with some of the findings in The Revolution Will Be Funded (Incite, 2007) and No Such Thing as a Free Gift (McGoey, 2015), where the self-interests of donors compromise the true possibility for social justice within
the non-profit sector and beyond. Kohl-Arenas explained that this environment is not devoid of resistance or politics; however several attempts to challenge funders and the status quo have led to further precarity amongst poor workers. She stated,

> When fearful of collective action or uprising, foundations reign in financial commitments and re-inscribe limits around what kind of self-help is acceptable. Eventually, the aspirations of grass-roots organizations are derailed by grant agreements that prescribe firm limits and make demands on the time, energy, and ideology of newly professionalized staff. (Kohl-Arenas, 2016, p. 8)

In *No Such Thing as a Free Gift*, Linsey McGoey (2015) provided a number of contemporary accounts of philanthrocapitalism, namely that of the Gates Foundation, where she unveiled the damaging implications of these business-like (and strings attached) tactics on local and international charities. She surmised that these moves have their roots in early philanthrocapitalism:

> The great industrialists of the last nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were dubbed robber barons due to the widespread condemnation of their predatory business tactics. Today, some of the world’s most celebrated philanthropists, from Gates to George Soros, earned billions through business tactics that have compounded financial instability, eroded labour protections, and entrenched global economic inequalities. (McGoey, 2015, p. 9)

As my study suggests, these symbols of neoliberalism and financialization are pacified by the politics of inclusive leadership where the racialized/immigrant CEO is strategically placed at the helm as an act of corporate cooption and collusion. This is not to say that immigrant philanthropists lack agency or the talent, or – better yet – have corrupt motives. Their actions emulate, however, the power of the white establishment under which many of these social issues
have become subject to financialization. Here, race and class certainly can – and should – be regarded as tools that advance the financialization of philanthropy.

Even the heirs of the super-rich are beginning to talk about the problem (and insider-ness) of financialization and philanthropy. For example, in 2013 the New York Times published an opinion piece where Peter Buffett (son of Warren Buffett) mused over the inherent problem of the philanthropy-capitalism question:

*Because of who my father is, I’ve been able to occupy some seats I never expected to sit in. Inside any important philanthropy meeting, you witness heads of state meeting with investment managers and corporate leaders. All are searching for answers with their right hand to problems that others in the room have created with their left. (Buffett, 2013)*

More recently, in December 2015, Facebook captain Mark Zuckerberg and his wife Pricilla Chan announced that they have committed to donating 99% of their shares (amounting to roughly $45 billion USD). A few days later, the media storm around the “Chan-Zuckerberg Initiative” took hold once it was discovered that their charitable monies are housed within a limited liability company that would direct spending, that *may or may not* have a charitable purpose (Sagan, 2015). This model, unfortunately, appears to be the direction that philanthropy is being taken in – an endgame that values and prioritizes financialization in an era marked by unprecedented debt and concentrated wealth. As this study points out, elite immigrants are looking at these new models as a viable and, perhaps more impactful and profitable, way of doing business. These choices, needless to say, are made in a vacuum without careful consideration about the downsides of the issue.

**A final word**

I have learned so much about the possibilities and limits of philanthropy, and my own role in this narrative of complicated kindness. When I started this research, I wanted to track this
growing group of affluent immigrants who are making a visible contribution to the charitable sector. Were they also giving elsewhere, perhaps back home? Were Canadian charities really resonating with their philanthropic needs? How is their philanthropy anchoring their sense of belonging in Canada? Now, however, this project has unlocked a number of different questions and, frankly, a new set of crises – of the self, of the community, of what is right, and of what is just. More specifically, this project has initiated a new journey about the changing role of philanthropy within the broader context of neoliberal politics, sociality, and economics.

For me, gestures of fundraising and philanthropy are everywhere. From the donor names adorning university buildings to appeals for support in the mailbox, we are constantly confronted by symbols of generosity and need. And there is no sign that philanthropy is cooling down. In fact, as wealth becomes further concentrated, we are likely going to see an upswing in giving – and a corresponding spike in need. This study adds to a growing refrain about philanthropy’s role in stretching racial and class stratification. Since my day job is spent confronting these challenges, I have become very sensitive to the double-ness of inclusion. In other words, the growing desire for charity leaders to develop an inclusive philanthropic culture can serve as a distracting agent and hegemonic force of a larger neoliberal powerplay where the surplus capital of the new establishment is regarded as an untapped resource that can fill the gaps in social welfare created by cost-containing governments. Within this context, diversity programs within the charitable sector are regarded as levers of economic restructuring rather than effective vehicles for social equity.

While there are clear winners and losers within the non-profit sector, I believe that fundraisers, donors, volunteers, and non-profit leaders need to be brave. We need to look at these issues head-on. We need to call-out injustice and question the role of capitalism and financialization in the work we do. We need to think about who benefits and who gets left
behind. We need to ask donors to be honest about their motivations and renegotiate what “impact” means for them and us. We need to ensure that the state is held to task when it comes to the provision of health, education, social welfare, and innovation. Ultimately, these calls to action are critical to our understanding of who we are and our ability to care for one another, especially in light of all the new ways people can “make a difference.” The orchestration, celebration, and promotion of philanthropy must be met with critical discussions about resisting privatization. Let’s not let the joys of diversity and inclusion distract us from these important insights.
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Appendices

Appendix A – Sample Invitation to Participate in Study

Date
Name
Title
Organization
Address
City, Province Postal Code

Dear Name:

My name is Krishan Mehta and I am a PhD candidate in the Department of Social Justice Education at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education at the University of Toronto. I would like to invite you to participate in my study which explores how immigrants are participating in the charitable sector in Canada.

Description of the research project: Currently, I am conducting research on the giving motivations and interests of the new Canadian establishment. Given your philanthropy/volunteer work/fundraising leadership/charitable mandate, I would like to interview you and hear about your experiences of giving/raising funds and what lessons non-profits and charities have to learn from you about the sector. I would be pleased if you would consider this opportunity to be a part of this new and exciting field of study. Broadly speaking, I am interested in learning about diversity and the charitable sector in Canada. It will fulfill part of my requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) and is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Rinaldo Walcott from the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto. My research topic has been approved by the Research Ethics Board of the university.

What participation in this study involves: I would like to interview you for approximately one and a half hours, at your convenience, to discuss your perspectives on the charitable sector in Canada and how you are working with organizations to support issues that matter back home.

Benefits and risks of participation: By participating in this study, you will have the opportunity to reflect on your own experiences and help charitable leaders in Canada understand the importance of diversity and the possibilities of better engaging philanthropists, like you, in their work. There are no particular risks associated with this study. However, your interview will be included in my doctoral thesis and perhaps in some articles published in scholarly journals. Since this is a scholarly research project, it is important that your privacy and confidentiality be respected. To that effect, you will be invited to choose a research name that ensures your anonymity. I will ensure that only your research name will appear in my notes and the final publication. If you agree to participate in this study, I will also ensure that you are given ample opportunity to ask questions about the research and its use in academic settings. If you feel uncomfortable with the information that is gathered, or if you want to withdraw from the study completely, you are free to do so without any consequence. I am also open to discussing other ideas you may have about confidentiality and privacy, at any time.

If you have any questions about this research, you can contact me directly, or my supervisor Professor Rinaldo Walcott at rinaldo.walcott@utoronto.ca or 416-978-0400.

Your participation in this research would be greatly valued and appreciated!

Krishan Mehta
krishan.mehta@mail.utoronto.ca
Appendix B – Sample consent form for study participation

Appendix B – Sample consent form for study participation

Yes, I agree to participate in Krishan Mehta’s PhD research project.

I understand that Krishan will audio record and transcribe our interview. Information about me and the organizations we will discuss will be treated privately and confidentially. Pseudonyms will be used instead of real names in storing and reporting the data. Krishan has also informed me that all of the information pertaining to his study will be kept in a secure location for up to ten years and then destroyed. I have been assured that the sole purpose for using this information is for academic research and study.

If I feel uncomfortable at any time, Krishan will stop the interview at my request and turn off the recorder. I will be provided with a copy of the transcript for review upon completion, which I am free to edit and/or revise.

My participation in this study is completely voluntary and I may withdraw from the research, for any reason, at any time. I may refuse to answer one or more of Krishan’s questions as well.

Print Name:

__________________________

Signature:

__________________________

Date:

__________________________
Appendix C – Interview guide: Immigrant philanthropists (IPHIL)

**Background**
1. When did you come to Canada?
2. Under what citizenship category did you apply to become a resident of Canada?
3. When did you become a Canadian citizen?
4. What is your marital status?
5. How many children do you have?
6. What is your primary occupation?
7. How did you get into the line of business you are in?

**Context Setting**
1. Do you currently have familial or business connections to your country of origin?
2. What were your first impressions of Canada?
3. Why did you choose to come to Canada over another country?
4. What were the challenges that you encountered as you were settling?
5. What did you bring with you that gave you an advantage to settling successfully?
6. At what point did it become apparent that you were becoming a role model to other immigrants?

**Philanthropy**
1. What are the top five charities to which you have made significant contribution?
2. Describe your first experience giving to a charity in Canada?
   a. What was the name of the organization?
   b. Who asked you to make the donation?
   c. How much did you give?
   d. Did you have any prior contact with the charity?
3. What charitable causes resonate with you and why?
4. Have you made, within the past five years, a financial contribution to an organization based in your country of origin?
   a. Describe the organization.
   b. How much did you give?
   c. What motivated you to make the donation?
5. You’ve received some media attention because of your philanthropy within Canada. How has your giving increased your profile?
   a. What impact has this profile had on your professional and philanthropic work?
6. What is the general perception of giving in your country of origin?
7. How has this perception influenced your decisions about making charitable donations?
8. Do you believe that new Canadians should contribute to mainstream organizations? Why or why not?
9. Is there a difference between making a donation to an organization based within Canada and one based in the country of your origin? Are your motivations for making donations inside and outside of Canada the same or different? Please describe.
10. How involved do you expect to be involved with the allocation of your donation? How important is it to you?
11. Please provide an example of how you gave to an organization, but also influenced how the organization carried out its mandate.
12. Are there lessons from your professional success that have given you a new perspective on how charities run, or should be run?
13. Because you are successful professionally, do you feel pressure from the mainstream community or your country of origin to make significant contributions?
   a. Is there an expectation, because you’ve “made it” in Canada, you must give back home?
14. What are your expectations for your children in terms of giving locally and abroad?
15. What advice would you give a professional fundraiser who is looking to approach you to support their organization?
16. Does it matter who approaches you for a donation? Does it matter if the person comes from your community or not?
17. Do you feel a certain level of responsibility in promoting philanthropy to people in your community?
18. Describe any negative experiences you’ve had about giving.
   a. What made it bad?
   b. What did you learn from it?
19. When it comes to giving, how do you want to be remembered?
Appendix D – Interview guide: Chief fundraisers of large non-profits (CFLNP)

**Background**

1. What is your role in your organization?
2. When did you start at your current organization?
3. How many people are on your team?
4. How many years of total experience do you have in the fundraising field?
5. What is the organization’s current fundraising objective?
6. Are you currently involved in a fundraising campaign?
   a. What is your annual fundraising goal?
7. Does your organization have a diversity committee or a special group of volunteers or staff focused on emerging community-based donor groups?
   a. If so, please describe your expectations and their performances.
8. What is the role of government in your organization?
9. Do you see a role for governments to play in advancing diversity in the non-profit sector?
10. For many years, politicians paid attention to diversity and inclusion as a way to promote civic engagement. Have you ever worked with government officials or elected leaders on fundraising and diversity matters?
   a. Have they been able to assist you in identifying diverse fundraising volunteers and donors?

**Immigration and Philanthropy**

1. Do you believe that immigrant donors care about who makes the request?
   a. Does the fundraiser need to be part of the community the donor comes from?
2. What are some of the current challenges your organization is facing (or has recently faced) when it comes to the issue of diversity?
3. Describe an example of a donation from or a relationship with an immigrant philanthropist that you believe to be noteworthy.
   a. What makes this story special to your organization?
   b. What factors contributed to this success?
4. Toronto is considered to be one of the most diverse cities in the world. Do you believe that it is important for your organization to reflect this diversity?
   a. How does the diversity of Toronto impact your fundraising strategy?
5. What areas do you need to strengthen to enhance your professional practice in the area of diversity?
6. Does your organization have an international focus?
   a. Do you see possibilities in connecting your international work with immigrant communities in Canada?
   b. Do you have an example as to how you have leveraged a local community for a project?
7. Based on your fundraising success, what are your perspectives on how charities run or should be run?
8. What advice would you give a professional fundraiser who is looking to approach donors of diverse backgrounds?
9. Have you ever struggled in developing a relationship with a ‘diverse’ donor? What did you learn from that experience?
10. What are your predictions for the future for the fundraising sector, as they relate to immigrants and philanthropy?
Appendix E – Interview guide: Immigrant fundraising volunteers (IFV)

Background
1. When did you come to Canada?
2. Describe your first memories of Canada. What were the first few years like?
3. What was/is your primary occupation?
4. Do you currently have familial or business connections to your country of origin?
5. Why did you choose to come to Canada over another country?

Volunteering and Giving
1. What was your first true, meaningful experience of volunteering within a charity (back home, in Canada or elsewhere)?
2. What are the top charities to which you have made significant contribution?
3. Describe your first experience of volunteering for a charity in Canada:
   a. What was the name of the organization?
   b. What was the nature of your work?
   c. How much time did you give?
   d. What did you and the organization accomplish?
4. What charitable causes resonate with you and why?
5. What is the general perception of volunteering for charities in your country of origin? How has this perception influenced your decisions about volunteering?
6. What role do you think immigrants should play in the non-profit sector? Why is their involvement important?
7. Have/do you serve on a mainstream non-profit board? What have your experiences been like around the board table? Describe a positive and negative experience.
8. Have/do you serve on a non-profit board that delivers services to immigrants or newcomers? What have your experiences been like around the board table? Describe a positive and negative experience.
9. How did charities identify you as a potential volunteer? How were you recruited?
10. Have you ever felt that an organization needed you to open doors to your community? What was that experience like? How effective were you in delivering your community to the mainstream?
11. How have donors from within your own community reacted when you asked them to support an organization that you volunteer for?
12. What do you think are some of the challenges of raising money for a mainstream organization from your own community? Can you give an example of this challenge?
13. Describe a really meaningful fundraising effort that you were a part of. What made it special? What did you learn?
14. How have charities thanked or recognized your efforts?
15. Have you ever felt that a charity took advantage of your volunteer work?
16. What lessons can we learn from your successes that have given you a new perspective on how charities run, or should be run?
17. Have you ever lost a friend from your own community because he/she thought that you were only interested in their charitable interests? What are some of the tensions surrounding “the ask”?
18. What advice would you give a professional fundraiser who is looking to approach you to volunteer for his/her organization?
Appendix F – Interview guide: Settlement agency executive directors (SAED)

**Background**
1. When was your organization established?
2. For how long has your organization had charitable status?
3. How much money does your organization raise, on average, per year?
   a. How do you raise money?
4. Are you currently involved in a fundraising campaign?
   a. What is your fundraising goal?
5. Do you have a dedicated fundraising committee or is the entire board committed to fundraising activities?
6. Have you had success in raising major gifts from immigrants or the community you are serving?
7. What are some of challenges in attracting major gift donations from high net worth immigrants?

**Philanthropy Questions**
1. How has the funding environment changed for your organization over the last ten years?
2. What role do you see philanthropy playing in the future stability of your organization?
3. In your opinion, does the fundraiser need to be part of the community the donor comes from?
4. What are some of the current challenges your organization is facing (or has recently faced) when it comes to the issue of diversity?
5. Describe an example of a donation or a relationship with an immigrant philanthropist that you believe to be noteworthy.
   a. What makes this story special to your organization?
   b. What factors contributed to this success?
6. Toronto is considered to be one of the most diverse cities in the world. Do you believe that it is important for your organization to reflect this diversity?
   a. How does the diversity of Toronto impact your fundraising strategy?
7. What areas do you need to strengthen to enhance your professional practice in the area of diversity?
8. Does your organization have an international focus?
   b. Do you see possibilities in connecting your international work with immigrant communities in Canada?
   c. Do you have an example as to how you have leveraged a local community for a project?
9. Based on your fundraising success, what are your perspectives on how charities run or should be run?
10. What advice would you give a professional fundraiser who is looking to approach donors of diverse backgrounds?
11. What are your predictions for the fundraising sector as they relate to immigrants and philanthropy?
Appendix G – A Donor Bill of Rights

A DONOR BILL OF RIGHTS

DEVELOPED BY:

Association of Fundraising Professionals (AFP)
Association for Healthcare Philanthropy (AHP)
Council for Advancement and Support of Education (CASE)
The Giving Institute: Leading Consultants to Non-Profits

PHILANTHROPY is based on voluntary action for the common good. It is a tradition of giving and sharing that is primary to the quality of life. To assure that philanthropy merits the respect and trust of the general public, and that donors and prospective donors can have full confidence in the not-for-profit organizations and causes they are asked to support, we declare that all donors have these rights:

I
To be informed of the organization's mission, of the way the organization intends to use donated resources, and of its capacity to use donations effectively for their intended purposes.

II
To be informed of the identity of those serving on the organization's governing board, and to expect the board to exercise prudent judgment in its stewardship responsibilities.

III
To have access to the organization's most recent financial statements.

IV
To be assured their gifts will be used for the purposes for which they were given.

V
To receive appropriate acknowledgment and recognition.

VI
To be assured that information about their donations is handled with respect and with confidentiality to the extent provided by law.

VII
To expect that all relationships with individuals representing organizations of interest to the donor will be professional in nature.

VIII
To be informed whether those seeking donations are volunteers, employees of the organization or hired solicitors.

IX
To have the opportunity for their names to be deleted from mailing lists that an organization may intend to share.

X
To feel free to ask questions when making a donation and to receive prompt, truthful and forthright answers.
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