

Note: all of the books below were read and summarized by Benjamin Soskis except where noted otherwise.

• **Helmut Anheier and David Hammack, eds., *American Foundations: Roles and Contributions* (2010)**

A book of essays from leading scholars in the field that addresses the question of “what difference have foundations made” and what difference they are making today. Takes a broad historical approach, covering material from the late 19th century to present day, and divides up material around key policy/programmatic fields; determines that “foundation impact” could best be assessed “in the context of particular fields at particular times,” and so places a particular emphasis on relationship of philanthropy to government programs and funding. Focus is on the largest foundations (top 5%), and not on nonprofits more broadly. Combines qualitative and quantitative approaches and sources, relying heavily on data from the Foundation Center’s Foundation Directory, as well as on the full range of secondary literature.

This is a very valuable *overview* of the field, but many of the chapters have such a broad chronological range, covering a half-century of work in two dozen pages or so, that while large-scale change and trends are clearly defined, there is little opportunity to focus on the impact of specific philanthropies or programs, as opposed to the “underlying theories of change” that animated them. There are a few chapters that do have a more specific emphasis—one on the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s work in the health and health care fields, and another on the role of foundations in welfare reform, but even in these cases, the analysis does not go into much depth into any particular program or initiative. Ultimately, the book is deeply invested in addressing the question of impact (see, for instance, pages 5-6), but also acknowledges the difficulties of measuring it (see p. 258 on lack of compelling evidence in international giving). Overall, a superb overview, but one that only marginally serves the purpose of this inquiry.

• **Helmut Anheier and Diana Leat, eds., *Creative Philanthropy* (2006)**

A book of case studies, with both American and British examples, that seeks to demonstrate “the unique value of foundations in a democracy,” placing a special emphasis on foundations’ roles as innovators, change-agents and contributors to pluralism. It offers several dozen short vignettes, most only a page long, of examples of what the authors deem “creative philanthropy.” But it then provides more in-depth case studies of nine different foundations, that address history and current programs, how each developed more creative philanthropic strategies (with a particular emphasis on the internal/institutional “drivers of creativity”), as well as the issues and problems it faced in that process. Each chapter then concludes with a brief (usually page long) discussion of the results of the programs. The book itself concludes with lengthy essay sorting through the studies to determine “what makes for creative philanthropy.” This book, similar to Fleishman’s in some ways, could be useful, but the limited focus on impact might be an issue.

• **Robert Arnove, “The Ford Foundation and ‘Competence Building’ Overseas: Assumptions, Approaches, and Outcomes,” *Studies in Comparative International Development* 12 (1977)**

An article that details the FF’s funding of education in Latin America from the 1950-70s, especially in the social sciences, and that chronicles the shift in strategies from institution building to capacity building. Arnove provides some solid background on foundation effort’s overseas and those programs’ relationship with American foreign policy; he also addresses the FF’s understanding of the nature of development, using especially foundation reports. His project is heavily ideologically inflected; he levels a critique of philanthropy’s technocratic approach and its elitist and hegemonic orientation. He also takes on the question of effectiveness, suggested that the FF did little to assess the impact of its programs, and that they did not achieve the foundation’s stated goals; but his emphasis on hegemony suggests that the programs were quite effective in other ways (ie, bolstering the dominant socio-economic system). An interesting approach, but too ideological to be of great use.

• **David Arons, ed., *Power in Policy: A Funder’s Guide to Advocacy and Civic Participation* (2007)**

Contains “mini case studies” of foundations effectively using public policy strategies, just a few pages long, with a focus on advocacy and its impact on policy; very much geared toward foundation denizens. There is only one chapter that delves into specifics—foundations involvement in welfare reform—as well as a chapter on how to evaluate public policy grantmaking, but it contains general prescriptions, not case studies. A good start but too brief to be helpful.

• **Tim Bartley, “How Foundations Shape Social Movements: The Construction of an Organizational Field and the Rise of Forest Certification,” *Social Problems* 54 (2007), 229-255**

A close examination of how foundations helped to create the field of forest certification in the 1990s, which served as a practical alternative to timber boycotts; Bartley offers this analysis as an intervention into the debate over the role of philanthropy in social movements and its moderating effect on radicalism. He pays special attention to the specific causal mechanism by which foundation funding might channel movement activity into a new field. “Empirically, my task in this article is to show how foundations engaged in collective action to support the development of forest certification and turn it into a field, and how this embedded social movement actors in new networks, logics, and standards of success. To do this, I draw on a quantitative data set of foundation grants, in-depth interviews, and some archival and secondary sources.” The article is most concerned with the analytic category of field-creation, and does not fully engage the question of whether field certification was more or less impactful than boycotts, but it does constitute a carefully research case study and should be consulted.

• **Edward H. Berman, *The Ideology of Influence: The Influence of the Carnegie, Ford and Rockefeller Foundations on American Foreign Policy* (1983)**

A work premised on the argument that foundations did indeed exert a considerable degree of influence in the post-WWII decades, but that their influence

extended beyond acknowledged activities and programs and that instead they should be regarded as “silent partners in United States foreign policy determination and as vital cogs in the ideological support system of state capitalism.” Berman argues that foundations were crucial in supporting and extending a worldview commensurate with the economic, military and political hegemony of the United States, especially within a Cold War context and that their service to this worldview encouraged some activities and precluded others. He pays special attention to how they justified systems of elite governance, both at home and abroad. He also maps out the division of labor within foundations in the Third World—the CF’s support for teacher education; Ford’s focus on social science and public administration; RF’s funding of the social, natural, biomedical sciences—and charts the close working relationships foundation officials established with government officials and foreign policy elite. Another chapter examines the provision of fellowships to Third World students to study in the US as well as the support for the area studies programs in the US that formulated and bolstered the theories of development to which foundation officials subscribed.

So on one hand this is a book that takes the question of impact seriously, and does map out carefully and thoughtfully how this impact extended from foundation offices to governmental agencies to the programs on the ground. But Berman’s emphasis rests on the broader hegemonic effects of these programs, and less so on their humanitarian impact (which was often where the foundations themselves preferred to focus their attention). There is not necessarily a huge gap between these two modes of analysis; after all, foundation officials believed that was what good for the interests of the capitalist system was good for the world more generally. But Berman’s emphasis on hegemony—from the perspective of the interests of the funders—does preclude his giving thorough attention other ways of understanding a program’s impact (from the perspective of recipients, for example). So this work would need to be supplemented with other accounts to be truly helpful. Also, although it is limited to just three foundations, it does cover quite a bit of ground, and so does not go into much depth into any particular program. Ultimately, then, I would classify this as only moderately helpful, though a stimulating read.

• **Harry Edward Berndt, *New Rulers in the Ghetto: The Community Development Corporation and Urban Poverty* (1977)**

Fleishman cites this work on urban community development corporations for his own case study of the Ford Foundation’s support for CDCs in Bedford-Stuyvesant. Much of the work considers the effectiveness of CDCs through criteria of community control, private sector participation, employment impact, and profitability, with a lengthy case study of a St. Louis CDC. There is also considerable historical background on the phenomenon, but there is little emphasis on philanthropy’s role (the Ford Foundation’s Gray Area program especially) in their development, and so it is not particularly helpful for our purposes.

• **Lester R. Brown, *Seeds of Change: The Green Revolution and Development in the 1970s* (1970)**

This is a historical account of the Green Revolution that offers more of a coherent narrative than Conway’s *Double Green Revolution* (discussed below), though somewhat

less analytically rigorous. It also provides an overview on the state of the field, so to speak, and discusses the “second generation problems” brought on by the gains in productivity (and income) produced by the Green Revolution. Brown addresses the unintended consequences of the Revolution, including the disparities of wealth it produced, the overloaded marketing systems, the social and public health challenges brought on by population growth, consumer resistance to new strains developed, among others, and there is a forward looking chapter discussing strategies to deal with these challenges.

Brown does engage the question of impact, discussing research “dividends” and “payoffs” (favoring the model of financial investment). But he does not place much emphasis on the particular “investments” made by philanthropy in this revolution. He does make clear the significance of the decision of the RF and FF to pool resources and establish a global agricultural research network, but discusses this only briefly. In general, the foundations are portrayed as one player, and not even the most consequential, in the revolution, along with the federal government, international development agencies, and multinational corporations, and it is difficult to determine their specific contributions in this regard. So in this sense, a good overview that might accurately reflect the plurality of forces at play in the revolution, but only a moderately helpful one for the purposes of this project.

• **Leighton E. Cluff, *Helping Shape the Nation’s Health Care System: A Report on the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation’s Program Activities, 1972-1989* (1989)**

An overview of RWFF’s programs, with a focus on the lessons learned. Most of the text consists of descriptions of the various programs—some just a page long, but others more detailed, as with discussions of nurse and doctor training programs. These are not especially well contextualized, and so ultimately, not especially helpful.

• **Gordon Conway, *The Doubly Green Revolution* (1997)**

This is the work cited most frequently by Joel Fleishman in his case study on the Green Revolution. It is written by one of the leaders of the field of sustainable agriculture (he coined the term in the 1970s), who also happens to have extensive foundation experience, serving as the rep of the Ford Foundation in India for several years and then as president of the Rockefeller Foundation. This book is an effort to stress the need for a conservation revolution along with the original Green Revolution’s goal of productivity. In a chapter on “past successes,” Conway addresses the achievements of this original revolution, which was sparked, in many ways, by a collaboration between the Mexican Ministry of Agriculture and the Rockefeller Foundation in 1943, which produced new crop varieties that led to dramatic increases in crop yields and the average daily calorie supply in significant parts of the developing world. Conway traces the spread of the “revolution” from South America to the Far East (where the staple crop was rice) and he contextualizes it with references to agricultural, scientific, and public health trends.

Conway’s book is very much focused on the “impact” of the Green Revolution; in general, he argues that it was quite significant, against those who have minimized it. He does spend considerable time addresses its missteps—what he calls its “teething problems”—brought on by limited transportation and marketing infrastructure; uncooperative government bureaucracy; public resistance to embracing new strains of

crops; pest and disease outbreaks; and the social upheaval brought on by increased productivity. The book grapples with the promise but also the limits of the Revolution—there is a chapter, for instance, addressing the question of whether it actually “trickled down” to the lives of the poor. Conway also pushes back against those who have claimed that the productivity gains attributed to the Revolution were really the result of other infrastructural or institutional transformations. He doesn’t claim that the new varieties were entirely responsible for the yield growth; they were necessary but not sufficient conditions, and he covers those other conditions. Which is also to say, he fully grapples with the complexity and challenges of identifying impact.

There is not a huge emphasis on the perspective of philanthropy or funders. The “Green Revolution” sometimes seems like an impersonal force that doesn’t necessarily reflect the strategies of particular agents. And much of the book is structured around considering how a second “Green” revolution might be initiated; it is forward-looking as opposed to historical in orientation and is not structured around a conventional philanthropic narrative. So it does not entirely fit the profile we are looking for. But it provides a carefully argued, detailed account of one of philanthropy’s accomplishments most often cited as especially impactful, and is at the very least a good work to start with on this important topic.

• **Marcus Cueto, ed., *Missionaries of Science: The Rockefeller Foundation and Latin America* (1994)**

This is a book of seven chapters, each examining a specific RF program in Latin America, ranging from the 1920s through the 1950s, and covering public health, epidemiology, agriculture and scientific research. They are each relatively short, around fifteen pages and rely on RF and local sources. The authors attempt to understand the RF programs in the context of the particular nation’s economic, political and social conditions—many of which, they argue, RF officials did not fully grasp or adapt to fully. This is a valuable addition to the literature and an important consideration missing in many accounts of philanthropic effectiveness. There is also considerable attention paid to the strained relations between RF and government officials, as well as local elites in the medical or scientific community. The essays do engage the question of effectiveness (some more than others), but because they are relatively brief, they do not do so in much depth. Moderately useful.

• **Martha F. Davis, *Brutal Need: Lawyers and the Welfare Rights Movement, 1960-1973* (1993)**

Not helpful (had been suggested by a colleague who does research in conservative philanthropy). Does not engage subject of philanthropic funders adequately.

• **Raymond Domanico, et al eds, *Can Philanthropy Fix our Schools? Appraising Walter Annenberg’s \$500 million Gift to Public Education* (2000)**

A 60-page report (available online), published by the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, made up of three case studies, studying the impact of Walter Annenberg’s \$500 million grant announced in December 1993, on the public school systems of three cities: New York, Philadelphia and Chicago. The report then concludes with an essay on what lessons could be gleaned from the limited success and the frustrations of the

Annenberg Challenge, which funded public ed reform largely through challenge grants, and primarily in the nation's largest cities. The report ultimately concludes that the grants did not transform school systems as was hoped, "because the essential idea on which they were based—that what public schools most lack is expertise and that talented and motivated outsiders working with the system can provide this—is itself erroneous." It also makes the related point that the nonprofits the Challenge funded did not push reforms such as charter schools or vouchers that would challenge the existing system; and it must be said that the foundation that published the report, and the editor that put it together (Chester Finn) comes from a distinct ideological position on school reform which infuses the report, if at times subtly.

The case study method in the report is generally successful, and each offers a close examination of how the grants proceeded in a different political context (especially the existing public school system and administration), from the process of applying for the grant to its implementation (though it makes a point of disclaiming to offer a comprehensive evaluation of any of the programs). The last part receives a considerable emphasis; the authors attempt to identify what the Annenberg Challenge actually accomplished, and what was left behind when the funds stopped. In the Philadelphia study, this is done through an individual school, which allows for a high degree of specificity. The authors ultimately point out the modesty of the gains achieved compared to the expansiveness of the initial ambitions, as well as the relative insignificance of philanthropic funding compared to the amounts of money the cities spent on public ed. The authors utilize interviews with public and foundation officials as well as media coverage; they search for empirical data, but often have to settle for anecdotal evidence of impact (though there is mention of a large scale empirical study in the works). So far, one of the more successful case study methods I've encountered, though limited by its relative brevity.

• **Mark Dowie, *American Foundations: An Investigative History* (2001)**

A general survey, highly critical of the field, that does not offer sustained case studies, and so not especially helpful.

• **Edwin Embree and Julia Waxman, *Investment in People: The Story of the Julius Rosenwald Fund* (1949)**

A decent institutional history, written by one of the leading officials within the Fund. It focuses on the Fund's programs in southern education, health and medicine, race relations and its fellowships awarded in science and the arts. Its breadth limits it from going into much details for any particular program, and so it is not particularly helpful in terms of providing robust case studies that provide detailed analysis of philanthropic impact.

• **John Ettl, *The Germ of Laziness: Rockefeller Philanthropy and Public Health in the New South* (1981)**

One of the best historical examinations of a major philanthropic initiative, the book traces the development of the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission for the Eradication of Hookworm Disease from its roots in early 20th century attitudes towards public health, philanthropic responsibility, and the "problem of the South," to the implementation of its

program (from 1910 to around 1915, with considerable background before that, after which the Commission shifted its focus to the international stage). Ettling fully embeds the campaign against hookworm in a robust political, cultural and social context and offers rich biographical portraits of the main protagonists. He focuses as well on the Commission's strategy of working through existing institutions (specifically state boards of health) and its ancillary goal of bolstering public health in the South. He does address the question of effectiveness, and recognizes that some of the stats most frequently cited to prove the Commission's success were not reliable, and he sorts through the gaps between the Commission's lofty goals—the eradication of hookworm—and its less heroic if highly impressive achievements in treating many southerners who had the condition and in bolstering public health. Overall, though it falls a bit on the early side chronologically, this is a key text in a close historical examination of how philanthropic campaigns work on the ground.

• **Daniel R. Faber and Deborah McCarthy, *Foundations of Social Change: Critical Perspectives on Philanthropy and Social Movements* (2005)**

A book of essays on the challenges facing those who promote “social change philanthropy.” The most important is probably a chapter detailing successful strategies of conservative foundations to shape public policy. It's a broad based overview, but still might have some use since conservative philanthropy's policy push is generally considered to be one of the more successful philanthropic initiatives of the last half-century. There are also chapters on progressive philanthropy and the funding of environmental causes, but they are largely overviews, concerned with the dilemma of how funders should relate to movement activists. There is very little discussion of impact in the book (because funding community action is assumed to be good in itself beyond the effectiveness of the programs themselves). Thought it could be promising, but not helpful.

• **John Farley, *To Cast Out Disease: A History of the International Health Division of the Rockefeller Foundation (1913-1951)* (2004)**

The companion to Ettling's work, since the IHD grew out of the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission. The book charts the work of the IHD throughout the world, from its founding in 1913 to 1951; ie, attempts to combat TB in Europe; hookworm, Yellow Fever, malaria, in Africa and SE Asia, and US; and its attempts to create vaccines. Takes a strong institutional focus, with careful attention to the personnel involved, the different strategies embraced, and the false starts and programmatic failures (this is, incidentally, one of the benefits of institutional surveys, since they often take in more than just notable successes). It is based on extensive research in the IHD archives. Its broad chronological and geographic scope limit the level of detail with which it can examine any particular program, but it does provide a fine overview that links shifting program strategies with various successes and failures. Concludes with a final chapter that addresses the nature of those successes and failures (singling out especially IHD's “narrow biomedical approach to public health”), and tying these in to more recent global health campaigns. Definitely worth a look.

• **James M. Ferris ed., *Foundations and Public Policy: Leveraging Philanthropic Dollars, Knowledge and Networks for Greater Impact* (2009)**

This is an important work for you to consider. It contains a number of chapters, written by practitioners and experts in the field, on foundations and public policy. There is a fantastic essay by James Allan Smith sketching out the history of that relationship, but more importantly, there are four chapters that provide field-wide case studies: one of foundations and health policy (specifically, the push to expand the State Children's Health Insurance Program, and particularly in California); one on foundations and wetland protection; one on foundations and child care policy; and one on foundations and school choice initiatives. In all these chapters, there is considerable detail provided about the strategic choices made, the different partnerships engaged in on different jurisdictional levels (local, state, federal), the different stages involved in policy work (problem identification, agenda setting, policy formulation, policy implementation, assessment); ie, the specific mechanisms to leverage philanthropic dollars through government. Much of the research is based on first-hand knowledge of the programs or on extensive interviews with participants. The authors do engage in something of a counterfactual when they ask whether foundations are innovators or followers (see page 229, for instance), but to what extent they grapple with impact is tricky to answer. On one hand, they definitely do, since the book demonstrates conclusively how foundations can successfully advocate for certain policies at the legislative or executive level. But the impact of those policies themselves is not really considered. That is, impact is measured in political terms. So definitely helpful, but with some limitations.

Additional notes from Elie Hassenfeld:

I looked at the four cases and they're not the type of information we're looking for. I'd classify them more as field landscapes rather than an assessment of what worked and why. The four cases focus more on categorizing activities, frameworking and discussing why an issue is important than they do looking at specific grants (or sets of grants) and trying to determine what impact they had on policy.

That said, the child-care case is helpful as a landscape example: it provides tables of (a) the activities undertaken by the foundations focused on child-care (i.e., a landscape) as well as (b) the foundations' reasons for getting involved. It doesn't provide funding figures but does provide the types of tables I can imagine asking a consultant to put together as part of their work for us going deeper on causes.

Also, there's a chapter from James A Smith, the head of the Rockefeller Archives on the history of philanthropy. It's heavily focused on older history so it's less relevant to us, but I'll probably read it eventually. It goes through the formation of the major foundations -- Rockefeller, Peabody, Sage, etc -- and what they focused on and why.

• **Joel Fleishman, *The Foundation: A Great American Secret* (2007)**

A sound survey of the foundation with careful attention to the institution's history, its powers and limitations, in the United States. Fleishman writes with a particular focus on foundations as drivers and as partners of programs and attempts to

demonstrate the particular value that foundations can provide society. He uses a broad survey of programs and initiatives from the history of US philanthropy (he published separately brief case studies of 100 of these programs in a companion volume) to chart out the various roles they can play: creating and disseminating knowledge; building human capital, advocating for public policy; shaping public attitudes; and changing the law. He then maps out the different tactics that have been effective in each category. He includes twelve brief case studies of “high impact initiatives” that serve as models; in these, he directly engages the question of impact, often usefully differentiating it from “outcomes.”

The book is not at all blind to the failings of foundations and Fleishman includes several chapters on “what ails” them (lack of accountability, lack of public profile, political vulnerability, etc.) and includes a set of prescriptions to address these issues. These sections are also informed by the material from the case studies, which are well integrated into the text. But in general, and even in the case studies provided, the focus on particular programs is not sustained enough and too brief to present the necessary depth of details. Discussions of impact are often just a paragraph long. This work represents a good starting point for the inquiry—Fleishman’s choice of case studies seems a reasonable selection from the history of 20th century philanthropy—but calls out for additional research to be truly helpful.

• **Ford Foundation, *Civil rights, social justice, and Black America: a review of past and current Ford Foundation efforts to promote racial justice for Black Americans in employment, education, housing, political participation, and other areas* (1984)**

Not helpful; too brief, little analysis of impact.

• **L.A. Gordon, “Wealth Equals Wisdom? The Rockefeller and Ford Foundations in India,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 554 (1997)**

Looks at the RF from 1916 through early 1970s and the FF in 1950s and 60s, with an emphasis on institution building and on the foundation’s relationship with Indian government. It also looks into the foundation’s possible ties with the CIA. Ultimately, a brief essay that does not offer a detailed analysis of programs. Not helpful.

• **Giuliana Gemelli, ed., *The Ford Foundation and Europe, 1950s-70s: Cross Fertilization of Learning in Social Science and Management* (1998)**

A series of papers delivered at a 1996 conference at the King Boudouin Foundation in Brussels. Provides a historical overview of the FF’s engagement in Europe, with particular emphasis on education and applied social science research, as well as the foundation’s interaction with European philanthropic institution and government.

It seeks to challenge a popular understanding of philanthropy acting as agent of “Americanization.” Includes two or three long, dense case studies (such as one on how FF disseminated theories of management education at several leading European universities), with particular focus on changing strategies and the challenges of implementation. The amount of detail is impressive but overwhelming, and difficult to gauge the ultimate impact of programs (though perhaps a more careful scrutinizing of the source is necessary). Not sure if this would be useful, but one of the more in-depth case studies of international philanthropy I’ve seen.

• **A. McGehee Harvey and Susan L. Abrams, “*For the Welfare of Mankind*”: *The Commonwealth Fund and American Medicine* (1986)**

An immensely detailed account of the Fund’s involvement in the support of medicine, covering a period of more than six decades. Addressing the fund’s support for academic and medical research in fields such as child health, mental health, rural public health, community hospitals, professional education, and scientific research, the book covers a vast range of material, relying on a wide variety of sources as well, both internal reports, interviews, and published material. The book offers an internal perspective, focusing on the personnel and decisions that propelled funding, but also does a relatively decent job of sketching out the basic context in which grants were made in terms of the state of the field and the basic challenges confronting the Fund, though more would have been definitely useful to determine how the Fund’s grants fit into the broader landscape of the growth of American medicine. The authors are able to trace grants through to the recipient institutions and to examine how funds were implemented, and map out the relation between Fund officials and public officials and the leaders of other medical institutions to demonstrate influence. The book’s granularity in its attention to individual grants does lead to two difficulties. One is that no individual grant is given more than a handful of pages and so discussions of broad societal impact are minimal. Relatedly, it is sometimes difficult to determine how all the grants added up, both literally in terms of the resources expended and more broadly in terms of the overall effects on American health and health care. The conclusion of each chapter often does contain a summary of a few pages, but these are often not entirely satisfying (and an epilogue does address many of these questions, and uses the Fund’s contributions to discuss the “unique place” of foundations in American society, but more analysis, integrated into the chapters, would have been useful). This is undoubtedly a helpful work, especially in the details it provides, but it does not provide as fully robust an analysis of impact as desired.

• **Frederick Hess, ed., *With the Best of Intentions: How Philanthropy is Reshaping K-12 Education* (2005)**

This important collection of essays takes on philanthropy’s funding of K-12 education. Its basic premise is that philanthropy spending on education has been considerably less effective than it might have been, and that not nearly enough is known about how much foundations spend on education, where that funding is directed, and what the results of that funding are. The chapters are written by a mix of scholars and “practitioners” from the education and foundation worlds. The most useful chapters are those in section II—“Approaches to Reform.” One chapter examines the impact of philanthropy given to support district-wide reform initiatives in three urban school districts—Charlotte, Houston and San Diego. Though the emphasis is on the way in which philanthropic funding was integrated into the school system, in each of these cases, the authors do ask whether the funding made a long-term impact, and back up their conclusions with a few pages of analysis (often involving increased testing scores or other such metrics). Another chapter details the efforts of philanthropy to improve the teaching force through two campaigns, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and Teach for America. The emphasis here is not so much on evaluating the effectiveness of these campaigns as on the importance of philanthropy in instigating and

sustaining them. Other chapters detail other important educational philanthropic initiatives—as in a chapter on Eli Broad—but the emphasis is on the lessons learned, and not as much on the impact of the policies adopted. Ultimately, this is an extremely good overview of the field and its relation to education, but only two chapters should be of interest. I would classify this as borderline helpful, but probably worth taking a look at.

Alicia Epstein Korten. *Change Philanthropy: Candid Stories of Foundations Maximizing Results through Social Justice* (2009).

Read by Holden Karnofsky – his summary below.

I was pointed to this book by someone who pointed me specifically to the chapter on Open Society Foundation's work on immigration as an example where a foundation seemed to get better returns from advocacy than from direct aid. The thing I like about this book is that it has 10 case studies of philanthropy that the author likes, and it really gets into the weeds on how the foundations decided to do things, how they generated their ideas & grantees, etc.

That said, there are some major limitations to the usefulness of the book for our purposes. It's mostly focused on very micro community-focused grantmaking - e.g., creating a particular change in a particular city or community. The biggest exception is the chapters on Ford and Open Society Foundations and their work on building the immigration rights movement. The other thing about this book is it seems a bit obsessed with unusual "structures" - giving local communities say over how to disburse grants, investing in a community rather than just grantmaking in it, etc. And the book really doesn't make a case for impact, so it's more interesting as a "how foundations decided what to do and found grantees" than as a "what philanthropy has succeeded at" guide.

I thought the most interesting chapters for our purposes were

Chapter 1: the very small Discount Foundation (giving out ~\$500k a year) hired a community organizer to be a sort of "program officer" looking for opportunities to reduce income inequality. She went to a meeting of an organization called BUILD (Baltimoreans United in Leadership Development) and was really excited by the concept of a "living wage," so she kept an eye on it. BUILD won a living wage ordinance in Baltimore and there were a bunch more victories before the Discount Foundation got involved. The foundation developed a strategy around promoting "living wage" that seemed to amount to "support labor unions, community groups, and faith communities" that worked on the issue. It commissioned a study on the impact of Baltimore's law. It then got into "advocating to other foundations" - the book claims that other foundations were especially leery of working with labor unions, and the Discount Foundation arranged "site visits" to help get other foundations sold on it. Without going into details (which I don't remember but could revisit), there was a huge amt of growing interest and a ridiculous amt of success in the movement, with living wage laws getting passed all over the place. The book credits this movement for an eventual hike in the federal minimum wage (the first in a decade or so).

Chapter 2: the Schott Fund (~\$1.6mm in grants per year) looked for groups that were working on state-level lawsuits trying to argue that states weren't providing enough education to comply with their own constitutions. Initially it supported 6 groups with \$50k each, but stuck with only one of them (in NY) and ramped it up. They encouraged it to go beyond just lawsuits and also do a legislative campaign (to ensure that the funds would be available if the decision was won), engage in P.R., and maybe more. They also funded other groups (unspecified) but everything was around this basic strategy of this ongoing lawsuit. There were a lot of twists and turns in the case. At some point larger funders (BMGF, Ford, Atlantic) funded a study on how much it would cost to comply. Eventually a bunch of celebrities and media gimmicks got involved and they won big.

Chapter 5: the Ford Foundation was interested in immigrant rights; it originally provided funding for lawyers, "which allowed them to more easily take time away from their practice to write" about immigration policy. Eventually coalitions for immigration policy reform started springing up and Ford supported them. The whole thing was very controversial and Ford stuck with it. "Many believed that the Ford Foundation played a particularly critical role, often through general operating support grants, in helping people develop the infrastructure that supported the movement."

Chapter 6: George Soros was concerned about welfare cuts' disproportionately affecting immigrants and he wanted to spend \$50mm on this problem to call attention to it. He wanted the money spent on direct aid (e.g., helping immigrants file for citizenship) but his prog officer wrangled as much of the \$ as he could away for advocacy (he got Soros to agree to \$5mm; he also supported multipurpose organizations that could spend some of the \$ on advocacy). Most of the money was granted "to local funders and immigrant networks to regrant." In some cases the guy felt he made grants so large they caused problems - orgs tried ambitiously to grow and they put people in positions they may not have been ready for - but he doesn't regret the big grants b/c "there was so much to do." These groups played a crucial role in organizing impactful marches later on.

General reflections:

- A lot of these stories look like "picking an area, getting to know all the groups, then providing them with genop support so they could get bigger and better."
- A lot of these stories seem to involve foundations initially giving small grants to big orgs and eventually deciding that they needed something more tangible/trackable, and so focusing on very specific communities/issues and building up small groups in big ways.
- I'm going to email the author of this book to ask whether there are more books like it. I think it's pretty striking (though not surprising) how little is written on "how to do good philanthropy" as opposed to "how to do ___" for most ___

• **Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, *The Politics of Knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, Philanthropy, and Public Policy* (1989)**

An astute account of the Carnegie Corporation, from 1911-1982, with a focus on how it has fulfilled its mandate "to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge

and understanding among the people of the United States.” Lagemann selectively examines certain CC’s programs in order to probe the larger questions of the role of philanthropy in a democracy, the nature of the “politics of knowledge” and the relation between public education and expert research. She chose large *domestic* grants that “have had relatively clear, and often quite decisive, effects.” Among them are grants to help establish and endow Carnegie libraries, the National Research Council, the American Law Institution, and Children’s Television Network. She also explores CC’s support for research into the business cycle, adult education and cognitive science, among other subjects, and of prominent academics and intellectuals like David Reisman and Gunnar Myrdal.

One of the key questions raised—though not entirely satisfactorily—by the book is the nature of those “quite decisive effects.” Lagemann notes that the CC’s influence on public policy was most often “indirect.” She also explores the way in which the influence of philanthropy waxed and waned depending on leadership and the political moment. Finally, a major theme of the book is the realization among CC officials from the 1940s onward that the philanthropy was operating in an environment in which its own influence was diminished by the increased prominence of public agencies like the National Science Foundation, other philanthropies, and the burgeoning federal government, and its drive to become more “strategic” in order to maximize this influence. This meant both developing programs that had “multiplier effects” and that could be supported and implemented by others (ie, developing the blueprint for public television, which would be funded by the federal govt). And so Lagemann spends a considerable amount of space examining various collaborations between the CC and the federal government.

But Lagemann does not really make the question of impact a focus of her book. She is ultimately interested in broader questions of the “politics of knowledge” and so she provides superb contextualization as to the larger intellectual and cultural issues that undergirded the choices faced and made by CC officials regarding the programs they supported. In the sections on the CC’s support for various institutions, such as the National Bureau of Economic Research or the National Research Council, she focuses on the debates surrounding those issues (often the tension between mass education and expertise). But she does not much follow through to demonstrate the influence of the institution once established.

In the sections on the CC’s focus on cultural philanthropy from the 1920-1950s, impact is given even less attention, in part because the grants were spread out over many individuals and institutions. She does note the important works of scholarship supported by the CC, but does not follow any particular work to demonstrate the influence it exerted. So she chronicles the backstory to the funding of Gunnar Myrdal’s masterpiece on racism in the US, *An American Dilemma*, but does little to demonstrate how it subsequently shaped attitudes or policies toward race. When she discusses the CC’s support of the social sciences (especially interdisciplinary behavioral approaches), she notes that grants were made in order to “influence the subsequent actions of other foundations and government agencies,” but she does not follow this thread further.

In one of the book’s final chapters, Lagemann chronicles how the CC helped “lay the groundwork for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.” But here there is another challenge in engaging the question of impact; Lagemann recognizes that ESEA had multiple authors, and that CC’s role in paving the way for it was “small,

significant and strategic.” She does a fine job in sketching out this role, but still, its import in the larger causal narrative is difficult to grasp completely. In the book’s final case study, on CC’s support for public educational television, Lagemann provides the reader with what she considers one of the finest examples of the “strategic philanthropy,” in which the recommendations of a CC commission were taken up with little modification by Congress. In general, then, this is an outstanding narrative of one of the most important American philanthropies, and definitely an important source to consider for our inquiry, as much as for what it does not do as for what it does.

• **Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, ed., *Philanthropic Foundations: New Scholarship, New Possibilities* (1999)**

This is an outstanding collection of essays on the state of academic research on foundations, heavily weighted toward historical inquiry. One set of essays that would be of interest to GiveWell are the four case studies of foundation philanthropy in the early twentieth-century (the shifting attitudes of the Russell Sage Foundation and the Twentieth Century Fund toward consumer debt; the Commonwealth Fund and the Milbank Memorial Fund and the development of health demonstration projects; the Rockefeller Philanthropies and the science of child development during the ‘20s and ‘30s; and the Russell Sage Foundation and the development of social science). These are relatively short essays (most of them started as conference papers), but they are all deeply contextualized (both within the historical period in which they are situated and within the relevant historiography), though perhaps not in-depth enough to serve as definitive case studies for this project.

There is also another section, which is probably even more useful, that contains five essays on foundations and recent social movements. They include investigations of the Ford Foundation’s programs in the 1960s to combat juvenile delinquency and urban poverty (by Alice O’Connor, probably the best of the bunch); the Ford Foundation and its programs to address race relations and education in New York City in the 1950s; the development of “social movement philanthropy” from 1953-1990; the Haymarket People’s Fund and its experiments with grantee empowerment; and the Ford Foundation’s funding of women’s studies programs. These essays, though also relatively short (10-15 pages) are just as historically contextualized as the previous set. And although they are not primarily organized around questions of impact, it is a topic that is addressed in all of them. If these essays were a bit longer, I think they would very much represent the material you are looking for. As is, they are more of a suggestion of that material’s possibilities (though they do provide some other paths in the footnotes).

• **Richard Magat, *The Ford Foundation at Work: Philanthropic Choices, Methods, and Styles* (1979)**

A book that came out of a report Magat wrote for the Board of Trustees of the FF, in preparation for new leadership. They wanted to know the most pressing problems the foundation should address, but also requested “a canvass of the FF’s experiences, successes, and failures during the last twenty-five years.” Magat supplies this in the form of sixteen relatively brief case studies, which cover in broad strokes what the foundation set out to do, the main strategies it adopted to do so, and then a brief consideration of the

program's success or failure. If these were longer, more detailed and contextualized, they would be helpful, but as it, they do not sufficiently grapple with the question of impact.

• **John J. Miller, *A Gift of Freedom: How the John M. Olin Foundation Changed America* (2006)**

A thoughtful, if adulatory account of how one of the leading conservative foundations shaped American life (it was written while the author was a fellow at the foundation). The book engages the foundation's support for the Law and Economics movement (covered in Teles); for the Federalist Society; the Collegiate Network (the consortium of college newspapers); and for leading conservative policy analysts and intellectuals (who sowed the seeds of welfare reform and school choice, among other policies). The book outlines the history of the foundation, from the roots of its founder's wealth in arms manufacturing, chemicals, and pharmaceuticals, as well as the roots of his conservative ideology. It also chronicles the development of what would be John Olin's—and his foundation's—main strategy of giving: targeting not institutions but influential individuals, especially scholars and opinion makers.

The book then addresses the main fields in which the Olin Foundation channeled its funding. There is a lengthy discussion of the foundation's support for the law-and-economics movement, to the tune of some \$68 million. Miller provides good context on the development of the movement, and by chronicling its spread to universities around the nation, is able to demonstrate impact. But it seems clear that his finger is on the scale; there is no consideration of any failure, and he gives little credit to any other institution or players in the field. Success is also defined within the context of the conservative movement, which limits Miller's ability to take a broader perspective on the impact of the philanthropy on society as a whole. His discussion of the foundation's support for the Federalist Society and conservative public interest law firms, as well as its support for various publications of the conservative movement and various conservative intellectuals is similarly constrained. There is also a more general challenge in identifying impact in this book because the Olin Foundation prides itself on funding *ideas*. Miller takes different approaches in arguing for the impact of those ideas: book sales, various markers of intellectual prestige; testimonies of leaders in the field (and often the howls of protest from liberals). But it isn't always clear what it all adds up to. Sometimes Miller establishes a definite causal relationship between the work of an Olin-support scholar and some development in public policy (as with a work that defined the school choice movement). But this relationship is often assumed and not demonstrated conclusively. He makes clear that Francis Fukuyama's *The End of History* and Samuel Huntington's *Clash of Civilizations*, each funded by Olin, were influential works. But the discussion of the actual impact of the books is—perhaps unavoidably—vague. For these reasons, I would rate this book as only moderately helpful.

• **Alice O'Connor, “Community Action, Urban Reform, and the Fight Against Poverty: The Ford Foundation's Gray Areas Program,” *Journal of Policy History* 22 (1996)**

Chronicles FF's experimental programs in urban areas in mid-50s to early 60s with a focus on its “community action” programs. Describes the evolution of these programs and the strategic role foundations played in cultivating models for federal

programs. Ultimately details the failure of these programs to grapple adequately with “the social and economic changes that gave shape to poverty in postwar urban America,” limitations “that were the product of institutional constraints, political expediency, and the ideological boundaries of postwar liberalism.” Though an institutional history, deeply contextualized in terms of intellectual and political trends. A very solid case study that is worth looking at, though its discussion of the impact of these programs is relatively brief; O’Connor argues that they relied too much on behavioral adjustments and were not systemic enough (and that they shied away from questions of racial inequality). I would put this at borderline-helpful.

• **Susan Olander, *Money for Change: Social Movement Philanthropy at Haymarket People’s Fund* (1995)**

Olander looks at a small New England public philanthropy, headquartered in Boston, the Haymarket People’s Fund. Since its founding in 1974, it had given away \$7 million to progressive local social-change organizations, especially to fund local grass roots community organizing. The book, based on two years of intensive fieldwork at the foundation and on more than 40 interviews and 300 hours of meetings, represents an unprecedented look at how a small foundation operates. Its most relevant chapters look closely at four community groups that received multiple grants, and examines the role of grants in their development.

Its primary focus is on what Olander terms “the social relations of philanthropy,” the relationship between the wealthy funders and the movement activists who make up its board (a relatively unique arrangement); it is not on the question of impact. Part of the issue is that empowering communities is assumed to be a good in itself, and so the question of what exactly they are being empowered to do is not explored. And so though technically a case study of a single foundation, it is not particularly helpful.

• **Michael Pertschuk, *Smoke in their Eyes: Lessons in Movement leadership from the tobacco wars* (2001)**

This is an insider’s account of the failed “global settlement” btw tobacco companies and public health advocates; it is the book that Joel Fleishman cites in his case study of the campaign. The emphasis is clearly on the advocates, not on the government officials or lawyers or tobacco industry leaders (Pertschuk recommends Richard Kluger’s *Ashes to Ashes* for a broader narrative). Philanthropy has a place in the story; specifically, the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation and its funding in the 1990s of a new advocacy organization focused solely on tobacco control, the National Center for Tobacco-Free Kids. It is a book primarily about strategy—with the Center at its heart—with lots of internal emails and interviews with key advocacy figures.

Pertschuk is upfront that the book does not take a broad perspective to give much context in terms of shifts in political climate or public health. In this regard, Kluger’s book might be the better bet, but it came out before much of the events in this book took place. The book does not focus on a consideration of “impact;” it is much more concerned with the lessons that can be learned from the campaign. There is some discussion of the multistate settlement between the tobacco industry and state attorneys general in 1998 that came out of the failed “global settlement,” which established a foundation to be funded by tobacco companies that has since funded hundreds of millions

of dollars of anti-smoking ads. But there doesn't seem to be a lot of discussion of the results of the settlement. Ultimately, the perspective of the book is that the settlement that was struck was a failure given what could have been achieved. Considerations of "what could have been" are certainly important in examining philanthropic impact, but this is such a deeply personal, insider-y account, with such a clear focus on what public health advocates can learn from the campaign, that I think it is only marginally helpful for our purposes. It is a fascinating topic, though, and other works that address it might be more useful.

• **Kevin Quigley, *For Democracy's Sake: Foundations and Democracy Assistance in Central Europe* (1997)**

This is a valuable work, examining efforts of foundations to support democracy promotion in Central Europe. For a number of countries—the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia (and with a chapter on George Soros's involvement)—Quigley details total resources provided by foundations and the range of their activities, as well as their different objectives and strategies. In each chapter, he provides a broad overview of foundation involvement and then focuses on a particular foundation, relying heavily on internal reports (Quigley is himself an ex-foundation official). He concedes that the work is not meant to be a comprehensive evaluation of these programs, but does take on directly the question of impact, which he divides into three components: how the programs influenced the participating individuals, how they altered institutions and how they affected society more broadly. At the end of each case study, a brief discussion of "Results" details these different types of impact, and a final chapter makes broader claims about successes and failures. It does not match your needs exactly, but I think it is worth looking at.

Additional notes from Elie Hassenfeld:

The book focuses on 1989-1994. The main body of the book focuses on case studies in four Central European countries.

These chapters discuss some of the organizations set up with foundation support. They don't discuss (a) whether (or which of) these organizations would have existed without foundation support or, more importantly, (b) what the impact of these organizations has been. I only skimmed these chapters, but I can't tell whether they show organizations that are semi-random and are just examples of foundations setting up some NGOs, or important organizations that really mattered.

There's also a chapter on Soros. It's more overview than detailed case. For example, something like 1/2 of the money Soros spent here went to set up the Central European University. But, there's no information re: how important it was, what it accomplished, etc. We just know that it existed; it had some detractors; it was good in some ways. It's not specific enough to be helpful to us.

• **Thomas C. Reeves, *Freedom and the Foundation: The Fund for the Republic in the Era of McCarthyism* (1969)**

A lengthy history of an offshoot of the Ford Foundation that championed civil liberties in the 1950s, placing it in the context of McCarthyism and controversies over the place of philanthropy in America. Much of the book details the struggles over the Fund's legitimacy and attacks on it from conservatives, as well as the politics—internal and external—of the Fund. It is comprehensive in its treatment of the Fund's programs, but does not really engage the question of impact thoroughly; it is clear that the Fund championed civil liberties, but I am less clear from a quick survey of the book what case the author makes for the impact of its crusade (other than that it got a lot of right-wing ideologues very, very mad). Also, none of the many grants it made are followed to detail how successfully the funds were spent (to the ADL or the YMCA, etc) or the programs implemented. To some extent, this goes to a general problem of evaluating the impact of a “corporate body designed to sponsor, create, and disseminate ideas,” as the author describes the Fund. For these and other reasons, not especially helpful.

• **Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, *To Improve Health and Health Care: The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Anthology***

The RWJF publishes one of these each year. Each volume discusses the various national programs the foundation has focused on, and then devotes a slightly more detailed look at one particular *local* program. Although they cover different material, the general approach of each volume seems relatively consistent. The local program of volume 8 (2005) was “The Chicago Project for Violence Prevention,” which offered a detailed look of some 20 pages at the program's development, implementation, and relation to national trends. The volume also contains chapters on several other programs, such as RWJF's “Assaults on smoking.” The reports are written by journalists or by foundation professionals themselves, and often rely on interviews with foundation staff. With a few exceptions, they are not particularly analytically rigorous—making them readable is clearly a priority—and only occasionally take a critical approach toward the foundation's programs (the anti-smoking chapters does touch on the major criticisms of the initiative). Also, the essays only occasionally offer political, economic or social context or engage the question of quantifiable impact. But they do offer relatively concise, detailed case studies that provide a decent granular account, as well as broader lessons extracted from the programs. These sorts of publications are some of the more promising sources in this quest, and it would be a good idea to look at others in the series.

- The 1997 volume represents the first fruits of RWJF's effort to get the evaluators and directors of its programs to “discuss the reasons the programs were undertaken, examine what happened as they were implemented, and explore lessons that can be learned from them,” all in language that a layman could understand. Several programs are featured in their own 20-page chapters; the most comprehensively of which was the All Kids Count Program, which sought to develop computerized child immunization registries, esp for pre-school children. This was a national program launched in 1991 by RWJF and a few other funders, prompted by an especially bad measles outbreak that ultimately funded fourteen different projects, with half million dollars in funding. The chapter goes into some detail about the registry system components, addresses the difficulty of public and private sector collaboration, and the challenges faced by the designers regarding security and confidentiality issues. It is a clear and informative chapter, but does not have much

contextualization (in terms of other efforts—private or governmental). The program’s goal was a 90% coverage level in 2000, but the chapter does not spend much time analyzing the effectiveness of the program as it was. And so it seems representative of the chapters in the RWJF anthology more generally; it is moderately helpful, but not especially analytically rigorous on the question of impact (I would characterize another chapter in the same anthology on the RWJF’s Homeless Families Program, as slightly more helpful, though it did stop short in providing a detailed account of how the findings of the studies funded shaped public policy on homelessness on the local, state or federal level).

• **Judith Sealander, *Private Wealth and Public Life: Foundation Philanthropy and the Reshaping of American Social Policy from the Progressive Era to the New Deal* (1997)**

This is one of the more impressive historical works on early American foundations that directly engages the question of effectiveness. Sealander looks at the small collection of early foundations—the Rockefeller funded philanthropies (the Rockefeller Foundation, the General Education Board, the Rockefeller Sanitary Commission, the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund (LSRMF), among others; the Commonwealth Fund; and The Rosenwald Fund—that were able to effect public policy change in the first three decades of the twentieth century. She positions herself between two poles of scholarship—those who have argued that the foundations wielded considerable power for good or for evil—by stressing the limits on their power, their failure to accomplish precisely the policy aims they set for themselves, and the way that their programs had to contend with other players in the field—government officials, popular reform movements, etc. She writes: “Both critics and defenders of the early-twentieth-century foundation have paid too much attention to stated goals—too little to results.” She sets out to chart the gap between intent and outcome. She also makes a big point of situating the efforts of these foundations within a historical context, deftly addressing political, economic and cultural trends. The work is heavily steeped in the foundation sources themselves; lots of internal reports and communications. Among the subjects addressed are the role of foundations in the development of agricultural reform and vocational education; the role of the LSRMF and the development of parental education and the discipline of psychology; the Russell Sage Foundation and the push for mothers’ pensions; foundations and the development of the juvenile justice system; the Rockefeller funded Bureau of Social Hygiene and the development of sex research; foundations and the support for public recreation. This is definitely a work to take a closer look at.

• **Cathy Siebold, *The Hospice Movement: Easing Death’s Pains* (1992)**

This work was cited in Fleishman’s case study for the Commonwealth Fund’s early support for the hospice movement. It aims to “give the reader an overview of the history of hospice care, of the circumstances that facilitated the popularity of the modern hospice movement, and of the movement’s evolution.” Siebold places her emphasis on identifying how the movement coalesced, discussing the pre-history of the movement (going all the way back to the early medieval period), the mid-century cultural context, the different theorists and activists involved, and the strategies they took to go about reforming the care of the dying. There is also a chapter on the movement’s “broader

impact” on American life, in terms of its influence on both terminal care and on attitudes toward death and dying more generally. But philanthropy barely seems to play a role in the account; the Commonwealth Fund is not mentioned in the index and I could not find any references to major foundations in the text itself, so I doubt it is especially helpful for this project.

• **E.C. Stakman, Richard Bradfield, Paul Mangelsdorf, *Campaigns Against Hunger* (1967)**

An early, comprehensive and rather triumphant account of the “Green Revolution,” written at the invitation of the Rockefeller Foundation and very much with its focus on the foundation itself (as compared to Conway). The authors offer a description of a revolution in agricultural productivity and in scientific culture in Mexico, gained through a collaboration btw the RF and the Mexican government, with little room for doubt or setbacks. It is the Foundation’s scientists, as opposed to the Mexican officials, that are given pride of place in the book; the book’s treatment of the Mexican officials involved in the program is rather condescending. In fact, the book presents a sort of great man theory of philanthropic success; the authors make much of the character of the agriculturalists who helped change the world. There is little discussion of the other forces that might have contributed to the revolution in agricultural productivity; at one point, the authors do consider the counterfactual possibility, but then quickly dismiss it by arguing that if it is true that increased agricultural productivity would have come to Mexico eventually, it would not been nearly as fast without the intervention of the Rockefeller Foundation crew. Because of this focus on the Foundation and its officials, the book does offer a detailed account of the RF’s hand in the agricultural revolution, and of RF officials’ interaction with American and Mexican government officials (though not from the latter’s perspective). There are lengthy discussions of the RF’s specific programs and how they were implemented for corn, wheat, beans, soil cultivation, water management, pest control, livestock, among others. There is little discussion, however, of the unforeseen consequences of agricultural productivity or the “second generation problems” discussed by Brown. So program impact is described in uniformly triumphant terms. Final chapters discuss the expansion of the program in Central America and in India, though with lesser detail, as is the case with a chapter on the collaboration between the RF and the Ford Foundation to create the International Rice Research Institute.

The book is not well sourced, and so it is often difficult to determine exactly where the authors are deriving their information from, though I assume much of it comes from internal RF sources. The book has a limited perspective, and does not demonstrate the nuance of some of the other books on the Green Revolution I consulted, but what it does cover it does so thoroughly, and so should be consulted.

• **Eugene Staples, *Forty Years: A Learning Curve. The Ford Foundation Programs in India, 1952-1992* (1992)**

A good account of the foundation’s programs in India, based on extensive research in the foundation’s archives (it was published by the India office of the Ford Foundation). Covers much material in 80 pages, and four decades, so it does not delve deeply into any particular program, but it does address questions of impact and does not shy away from critiquing programs for various failures or limitations, while also

addressing successes. Much good material but I think just falls short of being helpful because of limited amount of focus given to any particular program. If one were willing to look at all these programs holistically, as one giant program, then perhaps it could be considered more helpful.

Steven M. Teles, *The Rise of the Conservative Legal Movement: The Battle for the Control of the Law.* (2010)

Read by Elie Hassenfeld – his summary below.

In brief, he argues that in the '60s and '70s liberals gained power in the legal profession. This manifest itself in (a) court appointments, (b) court decisions (e.g., the Warren Court), (c) liberal public interest law firms (e.g., Ralph Nader, NRDC, ACLU) and (d) was helped along by funding from the Ford Foundation for, among other things, law school-clinics focused on helping the disadvantaged. It was of course, also supported by the broader social change towards liberalism in the '60s.

He argues that the broader conservative movement as we know it started in the '50s and really came to power around 1968 with Nixon's election, but in the legal movement, there was a period in the 1970s where conservative funders tried to get involved but they didn't have much impact. Teles argues that this is because they relied on business as their funders and this meant that they had to take positions friendly to business whether or not they were "conservative." I don't remember this being particularly well-argued, but I'm not sure this is essential to his argument.

In the 1980s, a few things happened:

- A couple conservative public interest law firms that were "principled" rather than beholden to business interests were started. They were funded by conservative foundations, in particular the Olin Foundation. They tried cases for the conservative movement, e.g., anti-affirmative action, eminent domain, and pro-states' rights.
- The Federalist Society started. This was a network of people at law schools. I think students were largely just members of this network and over time it was a way to network with like-minded lawyers. I think they received funding of several million dollars and I think they held conferences and things. They're apparently now quite influential (e.g. the head advised Bush on whom to nominate to the Supreme Court).
- A discipline called Law and Economics (L&E) was stated by Richard Posner and then developed and grown with significant support from the Olin Foundation. Teles argues that L&E gave conservatives a positive way to push their views. In its absence, conservatives lawyers were seen as "anti-helping the poor" which was a tough position to stake out. The development of L&E is a huge part of this book.

Something that I couldn't get a sense for in this book is how important the L&E movement is and what they world would look like without it.

Methods

1. He explicitly notes the fact that he's often not able to argue strongly for causation, especially since a lot of what he's writing about is a function of large-scale social change (e.g, liberalization among lawyers from the '40s to the 70s and the creation of the modern conservative movement in America since the '50s).
2. His sources are foundation archives (including meeting minutes, internal memos about strategy) and interviews with people who were making decisions at the time.
3. I'm not clear how the institutions he profiled fit into the larger scope of the conservative legal movement. I.e., he talks about two public interest law firms, the Federalist Society and Law & Economics. Is this everything? What else was funded? Why did Teles choose to write about these and not those other programs? He also doesn't get into how much total money was spent. Both who else was a part of the movement and how much was spent are things I'd want to know.

I basically felt like this was close to what we're looking for in many ways (focusing on philanthropists trying to fund social change) and figuring out what happened but definitely missed some key questions we'd normally ask.

• **Luc Tayart de Borms, *Foundations: Creating Impact in a Globalised World* (2005)**

Focuses on European foundations (though does not ignore the American scene), and takes up the question of impact directly, through brief case studies, one page long (though a few get more extensive treatment). On topic thematically, but not in depth enough to be helpful.

• **Martin Wooster, *Great Philanthropic Mistakes* (2010; 2nd ed.)**

This somewhat quirky book consists of eight case studies that the author considers to be philanthropic failures. These include some obvious choices, like the Annenberg Challenge and not so obvious ones, like the Carnegie Corporation's support for PBS. There's also a chapter on the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations' funding of population control. And they often touch on the author's critiques of philanthropy as preferring centralized, bureaucratic control by mandarins (one of his favorite words), or an expanded federal bureaucracy; there is also considerable indictment of foundation policy being warped by its own institutional interests. Ultimately, Wooster points to foundation "arrogance" as the main culprit. The chapters are long and go into considerable depth into the backgrounds of each philanthropic initiative, both within the particular institution featured and in the broader political context. The question of impact is central to the book; in each of the chapters, Wooster highlights programs that failed to achieve the intended impact and he does a relatively good job at evaluating those failures (though I think he is a bit too quick to indict; he's not a general fan of philanthropy and I would quibble with some of his conclusions). But I'd consider this a helpful source.