Gregory R. Witkowski
Arnd Bauerkämper

Editors

German Philanthropy in Transatlantic Perspective

Perceptions, Exchanges and Transfers
since the Early Twentieth Century

Springer

Nonprofit and Civil Society Studies

An International Multidisciplinary Series

Gregory R. Witkowski • Arnd Bauerkämper
Editors

German Philanthropy in Transatlantic Perspective

Perceptions, Exchanges and Transfers
since the Early Twentieth Century

Springer

ISTR
INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR
THIRD-SECTOR RESEARCH

Editors
Gregory R. Witkowski
Lilly Family School of Philanthropy
Indiana University
Indianapolis, IN, USA

Arnd Bauerkämper
Freie Universität Berlin
Berlin, Germany

*This book is dedicated to Georg Iggers,
a mentor and friend to us both. He worked
for transatlantic dialogue throughout
his career and facilitated our scholarly
collaboration years ago.*

Contents

Contributors

Thomas Adam Department of History, The University of Texas at Arlington, Arlington, TX, USA

Frank Adloff Institute of Socio-Economics, University of Hamburg, Hamburg, Germany

Arnd Bauerkämper Freie Universität Berlin, Berlin, Germany

Volker R. Berghahn Columbia University, New York, NY, USA

Nina Berman Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ, USA

Kevin Cramer Indiana University—Purdue University Indianapolis, Indianapolis, IN, USA

Florian Hannig History Department, Martin Luther University of Halle-Wittenberg University, Halle, Germany

Gabriele Lingelbach Department of History, University of Kiel, Olshausenstraße, Kiel, Germany

Malcolm Richardson National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, DC, USA

Stefan Toepler International Laboratory for Nonprofit Sector Research, National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

Schar School of Policy and Government, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA, USA

Peter C. Weber Nonprofit Leadership Studies Program, Murray State University, Murray, KY, USA

Gregory R. Witkowski Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, Indiana University, Indianapolis, IN, USA

About the Editors

Gregory R. Witkowski is an Associate Professor of Philanthropic Studies. He received his Ph.D. in history from SUNY Buffalo in 2003. He became the Director of Graduate Programs at the Center on Philanthropy in 2011 and helped transform it into the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, the world's first school focused on the scholarly study of societal impacts of giving and best practices of philanthropy. His main research interests are the relationships between philanthropic aid, civil society, and democracy. Greg has published widely in history and nonprofit studies journals.

Arnd Bauerkämper is a Professor of the History of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century at the Free University of Berlin. His research focuses on the history of Britain in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; fascism in Europe; social history of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic; democracy and civil society in West Germany in the transatlantic relationship with the USA; Europeans and cultural heritage in the Middle and Far East; and methodological and theoretical problems of comparison and entangled history of Europe. He has written and edited numerous books.

Chapter 1
German Philanthropy in International and Transnational Perspective

Gregory R. Witkowski and Arnd Bauerkämper

Philanthropy has been an essential element of many if not all societies. It is separate but often linked to either state policies and business practices. This volume aims to examine twentieth-century German philanthropy in the context of transnational exchange. Whereas previous publications on German philanthropy have been national case studies or investigated the transatlantic relationship to the United States, this volume will place German philanthropy in a triangular relationship that also integrates the developing world, primarily through Africa. It will thereby contribute to transnational studies of philanthropy that deal with contacts, coalitions, and interactions between nongovernmental institutions and actors across state boundaries. Transnational history transcends the national paradigm, highlighting the nations' positions in a wider geographical context. As such, it paves the way to symmetrical or asymmetrical comparisons and more complex, multilateral studies of cross-border exchange and interaction. In methodological terms, this approach allows for a better understanding of the development and appropriation of ideas, concepts, and practices of philanthropy in diverse political, social, and cultural contexts. Thus, the volume aims to shift the analytical focus from singular interactions between donor (in one country) and recipient (in another) to multiple forms of connectedness, entanglements, and transfers at various subnational or supranational levels.

G.R. Witkowski (✉)
Lilly Family School of Philanthropy, Indiana University,
University Hall, Suite 3000, 301 N. University Boulevard,
Indianapolis, IN 46202-5146, USA
e-mail: gwitkows@iupui.edu

A. Bauerkämper
Freie Universität Berlin, Koserstrasse 20, 14195 Berlin, Germany
e-mail: baue@zedat.fu-berlin.de

Defining Philanthropy

The original meaning of the word philanthropy, which has its origins in Greek and is a combination of *philos* (love) and *anthros* (humanity/mankind), was commonly used throughout the nineteenth century. In his pioneering dictionary for American English, Noah Webster, for instance, made a distinction between philanthropy, conceived as benevolence toward all, and friendship, which was directed at specific individuals (Sulek 2010: 197). Charity, likewise, indicates love of others, coming from the Latin *caritas*. These root words suggest a positive understanding of charity and philanthropy as a means of expressing donor concern for recipient. In these definitions, the donor plays an altruistic role, helping his fellow man in any way he can, while the recipient is sometimes viewed as a passive receiver of a gift.

Scholars of philanthropy have sought to refine this definition so that is at once more inclusive of practices but more specific in its usage. For instance, Lester Salamon defines philanthropy as "the giving of time or valuables for public purposes." Robert Payton has perhaps the most expansive definition calling philanthropy "voluntary action for the public good" (2008: 27–28). This definition like others indicates that a positive outcome is at least intended and plays an important role in the definition. In doing so, this understanding echoes the Greek meaning of the word. Dwight Burlingame slightly revised this definition to "voluntary intended for the public good," to account for the fact that actors can never know the full consequences of their actions. In this, he mirrors the views of Immanuel Kant who argued that "good will" was the only thing, "which can be regarded as good without qualification" (Sulek 2010: 198).

Other modern definitions also include both the act of giving as well as the intention. According to Helmut Anheier and Regina List, philanthropy refers to the use of personal wealth, skills, and time for the benefit of public causes. Philanthropic actions are "intended to enhance the well-being of humanity, relieve misery, or improve the quality of life through personal acts of kindness, compassion, or financial support" (Anheier and List 2005: 196). Scholarly analysis of philanthropic giving has also examined the donor–recipient relationship in a more critical fashion in order to take account of specific aims. Jon Van Til considers philanthropy to include both the giving and receiving of aid (1990). In doing so, he and others argue that there are benefits for both the donor and recipient (Ostrander and Shervish 1990: 67–98). Paul Schervish refers to philanthropy as a moral obligation created through the entreaty of the recipient (1988: 600). Donors usually expect some reward for their support, for instance recognition, prestige, or even financial gains. Especially rising elites usually seek to convert economic capital into recognition, status, and prestige ("social" and "cultural capital" according to Pierre Bourdieu). These interpretations suggest that giving is due to both altruistic motives and particular interests.

Not only does philanthropy presuppose trust, but it also entails reciprocity. Thus, it shares basic norms of civil society (Kocka 2006: 42–44; Smith 1999: 34–51;

Anheier and Appell 2004: 8–15; Hammack and Anheier 2010: 389, 391).[1] As Kevin Robbins has argued, philanthropy becomes a contested space where the values of donor and recipient are engaged. In this way it is a "civil war by other means" as donors put forth competing visions for society (Robbins 2006: 26). In fact, the switch from an emphasis on charitable giving to relieve basic needs to scientific philanthropy to attack problems at its core, a process that began with the Enlightenment, almost assured that philanthropic giving would be more than altruism as each donor sought to find solutions to societal problems. "Scientific philanthropy" that emerged in the early twentieth century aimed to prevent social problems from occurring or to solve preexisting problems.

In this volume, we argue that philanthropy is the giving of individual time or private money without compulsion for the benefit of those outside of the family intended to make improvements in society. Although they are sometimes difficult to separate from self-interested behavior, vested interests, and lobbying, philanthropic actions are intended to enhance the well-being of human beings, relieve misery, or improve the quality of life through personal acts of support. Philanthropy comprises a wide array of activities, ranging from individual donations and collections to institutionalized foundations. Whether providing for common obligations that create a sense of belonging or common ties that form the basis of democracy, individual giving of time and valuables has played an important role not only in creating interpersonal relationships but also in forming societal connections. In this way, philanthropy relates closely to the development of independent ties that become a bulwark for civil society. On a normative level, moreover, philanthropic activities comply with crucial values of civil society: empathy, tolerance, appreciation of the other, and engagement with social issues. Yet empirical investigations have demonstrated that the norms of civility go hand in hand with the pursuance of particular interest and aims. Like civil society, philanthropy is a multifaceted, ambivalent, and even ambiguous term and concept.

Philanthropy in German History

Some of the oldest European charitable foundations were formed on German territory, stretching back to the Middle Ages. Christian Clerics appealed to the believers to help the poor, disabled. Charity was to save souls and serve God. In the sixteenth century, wealthy merchants like the Fugger family in Augsburg donated in order to be remembered after their death. Christian charity persisted, but was increasingly replaced by the efforts of economic elites to raise their social status. At the same time, monarchical rulers (like kings and dukes) continued to support artists and scholars. Enlightenment thinkers no longer accepted social problems like poverty as

---

[1] For a brief overview of the concept of reciprocity, see Adloff (2004: 269–285), esp. p. 272, 279; Adloff (2005: 9–57), esp. p. 10, 24, 43, 47, 49; Siegmund (1986: 333–348), esp. p. 335, 324–345. On "capital", cf. Bourdieu (1986: 241–258).

God-given, especially in German cities. In eighteenth century Hamburg, for instance, citizens organized comprehensive poor laws, seeking to attack poverty at its core by providing for training of workers. These efforts floundered against the mass of the problem and the mobility of the workers, forcing a more stringent Elberfeld System for defining and coping with poverty in the nineteenth century (Lindemann 1990; Frohman 2008). At the same time, the number and size of foundations increased tremendously with industrialization and the wealth it generated as well as trusts and other broad-based philanthropic institutions (Hardtwig 1993: 81–103).

As German cities grew in the late nineteenth century, a profound transformation of urban elites occurred. The old mercantile patricians who had enjoyed full citizenship rights in early modern urban communities were gradually replaced by the wealthy bourgeoisie of new entrepreneurs and businessmen (*Wirtschaftsbürgertum*). The educated classes of the *Bildungsbürgertum* (for instance teachers, professors, and high-ranking civil servants) also challenged the supremacy of the old notables. Together, the educated and business classes shared a commitment to the ideal of selfless support for their communities in Imperial Germany that had emanated from the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–1871. The *nouveaux riches* of the bourgeoisie and the new educated classes also cherished similar values such as self-reliance, family life, and civic engagement for the common good. These notions lent the two rising groups a fragile unity. Not least, they shared the aim to displace the traditional patrician notables in German cities as much as the noble estate owners in the Prussian countryside.

Philanthropy became one expression of these shared ideals of civic engagement. It provided women opportunities to participate in civic life, often bridging distinct class differences within civic associations organized around themes of patriotism and nationalism (Quataert 2001). At the same time, the bourgeoisie adopted the entrenched paternalistic attitudes of the old patrician and landed elites. Charitable gifts by individuals were gradually replaced by more collective forms of giving and philanthropic institutions like associations that supported social engagement for the disadvantaged (for instance poor relief) as well as the cultural activities of museums, concert halls, and operas (Frey 1998: 11–29; Kocka 1998: 30–38; Hein 1997: 75–92). Big business, too, faced new challenges to their influence in the early twentieth century. Companies increasingly supported the sciences in Wilhelmine Germany.

By the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, however, the role of the state was significant and may have limited the impact of bourgeois philanthropy. As communal and state welfare expanded, city councils took over or closely guided social relief that administrations institutionalized and professionalized. More complex welfare schemes including health insurance, pensions, and workers compensation were established, often incorporating private efforts but placing tight limits on them. In many German cities, a combination of public welfare and more private philanthropy prevailed before 1914 (Adam 2009: 232f, 249, 259, 265, 272–274; Adam 2001: 6–24).

The First World War strengthened the authority of state direction, as Germany faced the unprecedented challenges of the transition to the war economy and scarcity (Feldman 1990: 87–111). In the Weimar Republic, the *Bürgertum* lost its central role in philanthropy. The hyper-inflation of 1922–1923 reduced the fortunes of the bourgeoisie and the educated classes. It wiped out the endowments of many German foundations so that they could do much less after WWI. Moreover, the Great Depression of the late 1920s and early 1930s led to the collapse of numerous companies and impoverished at least a sizeable section of the bourgeoisie.

After the Nazi seizure of power in January 1933, the rulers of the Third Reich deprived Jewish philanthropists of their property and the gentile bourgeois donors of their autonomy. The new German Communal Order (*Deutsche Gemeindeordnung*) of 1935, in particular, allowed city councils to disband foundations that the Nazis defined as contrary to the principles of the racial state. As a corollary, leading Nazi functionaries set up their own foundations. Altogether, bourgeois patronage was replaced by nepotism and corruption (Werner 2011: 463–466; Werner 2009: 71–94; Rawert and Ajzensztejn 1998: 157–181). Civic organizations were "coordinated" (*Gleichschaltung gleichgeschaltet*) by the Nazis who sought to eliminate any freedom of organization in the name of creating one community (*Volksgemeinschaft*). The new rulers imposed strict control on foundations that they did not disband. Whereas before the Nazis, Germans had numerous associations often split along class lines, these were joined into one group led by Nazi leaders of the Third Reich (Allen 1984; Bergerson 2004). This unity even extended to philanthropic giving as the National Socialists emphasized social action as a means to create a national community. Founded in April 1932 as an association, the National Socialist People's Welfare (*Nationalsozialistische Volkswohlfahrt*) provided Germans with indispensable goods from 1933 onwards and thus tied them to the rulers. Among the actions taken were efforts to encourage families to save by eating two simple meals on Sunday and donating the remainder to the Winter Aid campaign. Formally started in 1931 before the Nazis took power, it grew tremendously after 1933 as a Nazi means to support the less fortunate in Germany during the Great Depression and into the Second World War (Welch 2004: 213–238).

Large-scale destruction in the course of the Second World War and a second round of hyper-inflation dealt another blow to the assets that had served as a basis of bourgeois philanthropy. For instance, the war destroyed much of the material resources and inflated the financial assets of foundations. War and defeat also led to the loss of the territories east of the rivers Oder and Neisse and the partitioning of Germany into four administrative ones. The American, British, and French zones became the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) in 1949, commonly referred to as West Germany, whereas the German Democratic Republic (GDR) emerged from the Soviet zone in East Germany. In West Germany, the currency reform of 1948 reduced fortunes once more. Despite the postwar "economic miracle," West Germany's bourgeoisie only gradually recovered from these setbacks from the 1950s onwards. Moreover, state control continued to be strong. In particular, public authorities in the FRG regulated the establishment of foundations. Their statutes were to be acknowledged before formation. This was to secure that they worked for

the "common good." Contrary to the legal framework of giving that had been deregulated in the 1960s, West German foundations continued to strike a balance between the requirements of state authorities, business, and civil society (Lingelbach 2007: 127–57, 269–75).

State control was even stronger in the GDR. Many foundations had lost their landed estates by the land reform that the Soviet occupation authorities and the East German Communists had enforced as early as 1945. Eight years later, foundations were deprived of their role as independent institutions promoting welfare and scientific advancement. The East German state tried to limit independent action among its citizens and eliminated many institutions that could challenge the authority of the regime broadly, i.e. provide services that the state also provided. Nonetheless, the East German authorities was neither consistent in its application of this approach nor completely successful. What this meant was that some foundations formed before the Second World War continued throughout the time period of the GDR; they were mostly engaged in housing and such locally focused things. By the 1980s, they were dying a slow death because there was not money for repairing buildings and they did not bring in much money from rent either. From a standpoint of the government, they were no threat. Civic organizations were dominated by the communist party, which supported youth groups, trade unions, and even service provision organizations. In particular, the "People's Solidarity" provided care for the elderly within the GDR (Strachwitz 2010: 149–151).

The only institutions that were able to retain some independence were the Christian churches. These provided institutional shelter for engaged citizens to meet and address issues far beyond religious instruction. In the late 1980s, they ultimately became centers for political opposition. The Protestant and Catholic Churches succeeded in establishing collections for international causes, for instance launching "Bread for the World" in East and West Germany (Witkowski 2009: 313–333). Their focus on international aid proved important in maintaining independence and led to the creation of other independent collections for international humanitarian causes.

After the two German states had been unified in 1990, state regulation of philanthropy was increasingly called into question. Two reform bills that were passed by the *Bundestag* in 2000 and 2003, respectively, paved the way to a different understanding of the role of state authorities in philanthropic activities. As a result of more liberal laws and the distribution of wealth by the generation that made its wealth in the postwar economic boom, the number of foundations has increased dramatically in the last two decades. Germany currently has one of the most developed networks of foundations (a 2007 study placed them second to the United States in terms of number of foundations) as well as a strong tradition of philanthropic giving. As Europe looks to the Unites States to provide a model for philanthropic endeavors, it is appropriate to analyze the indigenous German tradition of giving and to find points of interaction with the United States and the rest of the world (Strachwitz 2007: 99–126).

State of the Field

Despite Germany's long history of vibrant philanthropic engagement, there are few works that address German philanthropy. Rupert Strachwitz has written extensively on German foundations (*Die Stiftung—ein Paradox?*) but has concentrated his scholarship on this type of institution at the expense of other nonprofit organizations. Specific eras of German history have likewise not been fully explored. Apart from Michael Werner's case study of Hamburg (*Stiftungsstadt und Bürgertum*), scholarship lacks studies of philanthropy in the Third Reich. Philanthropy in the Federal Republic from the 1960s to the 1980s has likewise received little attention. Gabriele Lingelbach's book (*Spenden und Sammeln*) is an exception to the rule. Even more notable is the absence of any comprehensive study of voluntary giving in the GDR. More contemporary studies are the now out of print books by Helmut Anheier and Wolfgang Seibel (*The Nonprofit Sector in Germany*), but this work does not cover the transnational connections of German philanthropic aid. Scholars like Annette Zimmer have likewise focused on contemporary German civil society and nonprofit organizations (*Gemeinnützige Organisationen im gesellschaftlichen Wandel*) (Strachwitz 2010; Lingelbach 2009; Anheier and Seibel 2001; Werner 2011; Zimmer and Priller 2004).

None of these works systematically investigate transnational relations in philanthropy. Investigations that have taken a more comparative approach have tended to be published in English, but these have had different foci than our work. Thomas Adam has written one monograph (*Buying Respectability*) and edited a volume (*Philanthropy, Patronage and Civil Society*), but these focused on the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Studies of philanthropy in the interwar period have primarily investigated aid for German refugee scholars from the Rockefeller Foundation (Giuliana Gemelli, ed., *"The Unacceptables")* and philanthropic support for academic institutions in the Weimar Republic and the early years of Nazi Germany (articles and chapters by Malcolm Richardson, Carola Sachse, and Kristie Macrakis). Volker Berghahn (*America and the Intellectual Cold Wars in Europe*) focused on Ford Foundation support for Germany during the Cold War, illustrating transatlantic connections but concentrating on the work of one influential program officer, Shepard Stone. Claus Dieter Krohn's articles and chapters have dealt with on transatlantic support for West Germany under American occupation (1945–1949) (Adam 2009; Adam 2004a; Gemelli, 2000; Berghahn 2001).

This volume will concentrate on the specific conditions in Germany but with an understanding that there were multiple streams of connections between Germany, the United States, and the developing world. It presents a differentiated conceptualization of the relationship between philanthropy and civil society that traces this relationship from an early democracy (the Weimar Republic) through the dictatorships of the National Socialists and Communist East Germans to the stable democracy of the Federal Republic of Germany. By investigating the activities of foundations, public charities, and other philanthropic efforts under different politi-

cal systems, the chapters also highlight the changing relationship between philanthropic organizations and the state.

In particular, the contributions to the volume demonstrate that transatlantic exchange between German and American philanthropic organizations cannot be reduced to a bilateral relationship. In fact, it has been inextricably intertwined with philanthropic activities in the Third World, especially since the 1950s. Not least, the transnational approach is directed against static conceptions of philanthropy that proved changeable in the twentieth century. More generally, this analytical framework is a particularly convincing reminder that philanthropic activities need to be placed into their specific historical contexts. Thus, some chapters of this book show that relations between the USA and German philanthropy have been asynchronous both in the interwar period as well as in the decades after 1945.

These investigations of multiple cross-border exchanges lead to flexible notions of spaces created by philanthropic activities. This relates both to physical and mental (for instance imagined or discursively created) spaces. As such it also helps to redefine the relationship between donor and recipient. Relations between these historical actors have been asymmetrical, but they have either replicated former patterns of hierarchy in a neocolonial manner or established new paradigms. As Paul Shervish has argued, donors, especially of substantial gifts, have agency over not only their own lives but the lives of others. This reality means that this asymmetric relationship needs to be further understood, and our work contributes to this approach while acknowledging that there is still a great deal more work to be done to understand the experience of philanthropic recipients.

Organization

This work draws on multiple disciplines including history, public policy, sociology, and comparative literature to examine German traditions of philanthropy in the twentieth century. The authors are scholars trained and working in the United States and Germany so that it provides truly bilateral perspectives on the development of transnational philanthropy.

The volume will be broken down into three sections. We start with an understanding of the theoretical approaches to philanthropy, written from sociological and public policy perspectives. These chapters will provide a theoretical basis for understanding the meaning of philanthropy and the relationship of the nonprofit sector to government programs. The next section explores the relationship of philanthropy to civil society by focusing on philanthropic associations in different political systems. The transition from democracy to dictatorship and back again proved to be the defining element of twentieth century Germany. These essays show the difficulties of fostering civil society through philanthropic activity in a weak democracy. The next section analyzes transatlantic exchanges that occurred between Germany and the United States. Whereas in the nineteenth century, American philanthropists looked to Europe for insight in coping with social problems, in the

twentieth century it was the United States that provided an aspirational if not real model for the development of philanthropic activity. While the United States did have an influence on the West German philanthropic marketplace, the next section shows how the West and East German philanthropic sectors developed in two very different political environments. The Federal Republic's philanthropic marketplace was defined by an increase in nonprofit organizations and competition among them played out through the media, especially since the 1960s. In the Communist German Democratic Republic, the voluntary sector was defined by the continuation of smaller foundations and associations that provided tangible benefits to East Germans and collections for international causes. The final section analyzes German international aid. Throughout the twentieth century, philanthropic aid increasingly crossed borders and for Germans these donations became part of their identity as defenders of humanitarianism after the horrors of the Holocaust and Second World War. In the Cold War, philanthropy also served as a tool in the contest between the two German states. From the perspective of the Communist rulers of the GDR, in particular, collections and giving for foreign countries promised to promote and support the campaign to achieve international recognition of the East German state and enhance its reputation globally.

In the three sections, the authors delve into themes such as the role of the state in the development of the nonprofit sector, the transnational exchange of ideas about philanthropy, the development of individual and national identity through international philanthropy, the relationship between donor and recipient, and the role of philanthropy in developing civil society and strengthening democracy or undermining dictatorship.

Philanthropy: Theory and History

As outlined above, there has been a great deal of scholarly debate about the nature of philanthropy and the development of the concept. Yet investigations of philanthropy have not often taken specific national contexts into account. First, important differences relate to terminology. Thus, the word and concept of "philanthropy" has not gained universal recognition in Germany, even in academic discourse. Instead, terms like *Stiften*, *Spenden*, and *Mäzenatentum* cover the semantic field, at times representing important legal differences. In historical perspective, moreover, individual charity (mostly rooted in religious tradition) still influenced practices of giving and donating in Germany. Though they assembled in various associations, many donors still insisted on a personal relationship with the recipients. In some cases, wealthy entrepreneurs even supported cultural activities in their companies in order to "educate" their workers and strengthen their loyalty to them. These personal donations receded in Germany after 1945, in the Federal Republic in favor of large-scale foundations, and in the GDR due to state pressure in the communist dictatorship of the Socialist Unity Party (SED). Yet personal relationships between donors and recipients continued to influence philanthropy in Germany. In the German

context, "civil society organizations" are used to signify the continued goal of mass participation among nonprofits and non-state organizations. By contrast, foundations helped create a larger nonprofit sector in the United States. They not only provided new ideas but also social services (Heydemann and Toepler 2006: 3–26; Frey 1998: 11–29).

There have been fewer conceptual pieces, however, from German scholars. The first section of the book features two scholars discussing the meaning of giving and outlining the contours of the nonprofit sector in the United States and Germany. Frank Adloff examines emotional ties that are created through the act of giving. It illustrates the importance of giving to creating a self-identity through such traits as altruism, shame, and respect. It reviews economic as well as socio-cultural motivations to give, expanding from the individual to the organizational and then the societal level. The essay includes such societal influences as religion and the role of the state to determine giving patterns. It juxtaposes the ideas of solidarity and hierarchy and stresses reciprocity as a basis of voluntary giving.

Stefan Toepler compares the size and scope, the structure, role and function of philanthropic foundations in Germany and the United States. The author stresses the problem of the lack of data on Germany. In fact, tax information is private, and assets are difficult to quantify. He shows that surprisingly in Germany, foundations' funding appears to be dominant in areas covered also by the state. In comparing the structure, Toepler demonstrates that operating foundations maintain a visible role in Europe, whereas they are less prominent in the USA. Lastly, by comparing foundations' function in society, Toepler suggests that the prominence in Germany of complementarity and innovation and in the USA of innovation and social and policy change stems from the different roles of the government in society.

Frank Adloff reviews economic as well as socio-cultural motivations to give, expanding from the individual to the organizational and then the societal level. He examines emotional ties that are created through the act of giving. This essay illustrates the importance of giving to creating a self-identity through such traits as altruism, shame, and respect. The chapter includes such societal influences as religion and the role of the state to determine giving patterns. It juxtaposes the ideas of solidarity and hierarchy and stresses reciprocity as a basis of voluntary giving.

Philanthropy and Civil Society

Although the development of civil society reached a new stage in the twentieth century, cross-border relations and entanglements had emerged well before 1900. In particular, networks between the local communities of the expanding towns in Europe contained seeds of an interconnected civil society as early as the Middle Ages (Keane 2003: 23–47, 27f). More commonly, the emergence of a transnational civil society has been traced to the literary circles, intellectual clubs, and Masonic

lodges of European Enlightenment.[2] These groups were encouraged by the promise of universal citizenship, and their interaction was also propelled by the concept of basic human rights. In the nineteenth century, new philanthropic societies sought to promote humanitarian issues. They agreed on cross-border cooperation in order to mobilize support for their specific concerns. Rooted in European Enlightenment as well as religious values, this movement could trace its origins back to 1839 when the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, often called the first Non-Governmental Organization (NGO), was founded. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, some of these organizations also campaigned for workers' rights, the emancipation of women and peace, respectively. After 1945, NGOs proliferated and encompassed the single-issue-oriented "new social movements." In the last two decades, contours of a global civil society have emerged if often difficult to define. Economic and social problems enhanced international solidarity and thereby nourished the formation of cross-border networks of civil society. As the "Westphalian system" of territorially bound nation states has started to erode, too, the activities of proponents of transnational civil society have gained momentum. Many political and social scientists have maintained that support for civic issues and civil society furthers social and political integration and thus consolidates democracies. Moreover, philanthropy is assumed to represent the engagement for causes that transcends vested interests. This approach complies with a conception of civil society that does not relate it to a definable space or a specific territory, but as an ensemble of interactions based on the basic values of civility like tolerance and mutual respect. Assuming some mutual benefit, scholars have usually presupposed an exchange on equal terms. Conversely, they have neglected the role of power and inequality in philanthropic activities. The chapters in the second section ameliorate these deficiencies (Bauerkämper 2003).

Through his study of the Gustavus Adolphus Association, Kevin Cramer argues that after World War I, the Association redefined its religious philanthropic mission to align it more closely with the secular nationalism of the Weimar period without breaking the foundational connection between nationalism and Protestantism. By using the concept of a "political theology of philanthropy," Cramer investigates how a racially inflected nationalism infiltrated the Associations' apolitical charitable mission. Hoping to maintain its relevance in the radicalized public discourse in the Weimar Republic—and to adapt to the Nazi seizure of power—the Association distanced itself from its original religious conservatism.

Peter Weber analyzes the relationship between the German School of Politics and US philanthropic foundations. The intellectuals close to the School of Politics were positioned at the critical intersection between private initiative and public action and aimed to influence the development of a German democratic society with the support of both German and American philanthropic institutions. This work

---

[2] For an extensive bibliography, see Hoffmann et al. (2003). The word "transnational" was coined by German linguist Georg Curtius as early as 1862. For an overview of the permutations of the term, see Saunier (2009: 1047–1055).

points to the asymmetric connections between American ideals of democratic processes and the realities of the German political system and hence raises general questions about the role of transnational philanthropy in support of democracy.

Philanthropy in Transatlantic Perspective

In the late nineteenth century, American philanthropists visited Germany in order to study the new foundations that had been set up in cities like Berlin, Dresden, and Leipzig. Apart from London, these communities became models for social philanthropy, i.e., the support for the social housing projects, hospitals and orphans' houses that were to raise the poor, marginalized groups, and underprivileged classes, especially in urban communities. The new commercial and business elites also observed German initiatives to fund museums and art galleries (cultural philanthropy) (Adam 2002: 328–351; Adam 2007: 46–72),

While the nineteenth century included considerable German influence on the United States, the twentieth century was marked by American philanthropic aid reaching out internationally. As early as the last years before 1914, large American organizations like the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (founded in 1910 by Andrew Carnegie) had supported scientific institutions like the *Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft*. After 1918, civic engagement for reconciliation and the democracy of the Weimar Republic also received American funds (Gemelli 2000; Fuchs and Hoffmann 2004: 103–119; Richardson et al. 2008; Richardson 2000: 44–109; Riezler 2008: 61–79; Feldman 1990: 87–111; Macrakis 1986: 350–358). With the onset of the Cold War, Germany became embroiled in the global confrontation between the superpowers. These efforts were by no means restricted to West Germany. In fact, institutions in Italy and France, for instance, received considerable support from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Endowment, and the Ford Foundation that initiated and set up large-scale international programs in the 1950s. Although major US foundations refrained from any direct political interference, philanthropy served as an important tool of American cultural diplomacy. Political, cultural, and scientific institutions, in particular in West Berlin, received large subventions in order to stabilize them against communism. Moreover, funding the social and political sciences as well as new fields like area studies and contemporary history was to restrict German traditions commonly associated with National Socialism and to promote American-style modernization. In West Germany, US philanthropy was inextricably intertwined with Americanization policies. Surprisingly, the impact of the substantial financial transfers of big US foundations on West Germany's philanthropy culture remained limited, at least up to the 1960s. When foundations were established or reconstituted in the Federal Republic in the 1950s, German traditions (including tight state control) proved stronger than American influences (Gemelli 1998; Krohn 2007: 228–232; Sachse 2009: 100–107; Sachse 2010: 38–40; Chrambach et al. 2011: 384–408; Müller 2012: 146–172; Rausch 2009: 185–214; Paulus 2010).

Volker Berghahn provides a sweeping overview of the policies of the Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations from the early twentieth century through the 1960s. Using Waldemar Nielsen's definitions of the roles of foundations, Berghahn examines the relationship between the foundations and the United States government to indicate that this relationship changed over time including both close collaboration and a distancing from the government. He sets this analysis within the context of the need to rebuild Germany after the destruction of the Second World War, pointing to the ultimate success of these efforts due in part to American foundation support. The chapter indicates the interplay between American foundation officers with American and German policies in a period of time when the United States held an unchallenged supremacy in the western world.

Arnd Bauerkämper investigates the interactions between American and German philanthropy by focusing on German academics. He analyzes the shift from the late 1940s and 1950s when in the framework of the Cold War US foundations tried to implement pluralism, mutual respect, and discursive openness to the 1960s when German actors looked at American models of academic funding (paradoxically at a time when US foundations were under attack at home). By using the concepts of converse interests and asynchronic relationship, Bauerkämper argues that German reformers used US models to pressure for internal reforms and thus points to a selected Americanization and appropriation of "American" solutions to justify particular domestic causes and interests.

Malcolm Richardson develops a case study of America's influence on German philanthropy and civil society through the career of Reinhold Schairer. After working with the Red Cross in Denmark during the First World War, he became a skillful administrator of student groups and helped to institutionalize exchange programs for German students in the USA. As codirector of the Abraham-Lincoln Foundation, he received grants from the Rockefeller Foundation and in a 1928 editorial urged Germany's wealthy to follow the example of American philanthropists such as Rockefeller and J.P. Morgan. After 1933, Schairer emigrated—first to Denmark, then Britain, and he arrived in the USA in 1940, where he created the U.S. Committee for Educational Reconstruction and positioned himself for a postwar career in Germany.

Philanthropy in Divided Germany

In the Soviet zone of occupation, the land reform that was enacted in September 1945 disposed many foundations of their immovable property. Moreover, they had to register with the authorities by 15 January 1953 and were placed under strict state control. Foundations also suffered from sequestration and expropriation. Yet philanthropic activities were by no means completely abandoned in the GDR. In fact, churches and ecclesiastical organizations like Bread for the World (*Brot für die Welt*) as well as official institutions such as the Solidarity Committee (*Solidaritätskomitees*) continued to collect money, in particular for the newly independent states of the Third World. Appealing to either Christian or Communist

notions of solidarity, their representatives reached out globally and thereby sought further East German engagement with the broader world. Still, they did not fully comply with the objectives of the leading functionaries of the SED, and therefore unveiled a subversive potential by directing attention to global need and human rights (Witkowski 2009: 313–333; Strachwitz 2010: 148–150).

Like its East German counterpart, the government of the Federal Republic claimed a particular philanthropic culture that was to be distinct from the state-controlled collections in the GDR. Yet giving was by no means free from official regulation in West Germany. On the contrary, corporate structures reflected the persistence of paternalistic attitudes to philanthropy. In the 1960s, however, market forces gradually influenced demand and supply of money for collections. By contrast, all efforts to liberalize the legal regulations that restricted the establishment and operation of foundations failed in the 1960s and 1970s. It was only in 2000 and 2003, respectively, that reform bills passed by the German parliament, the *Bundestag*, gave foundations more leeway (Lingelbach 2009: 269–275; Lingelbach 2007: 127–157; Bach 2009: 117–138; Frey 1999: 211, 221–223).

Gabriele Lingelbach shows that between 1945 and the 1980s, the interaction between donors and collectors functioned as a market (competition between fundraisers). She identifies two phases. Between the 1940s and 1960s, few collectors dominated a market characterized by cooperation rather than competition (oligopoly), thus leaving few choices to the donors. In contrast, from the 1960s onwards numerous collectors emerged, shaping a market that was demand-oriented, competitive, and professionalized (polipoly). This market offered more choices to donors but also less transparency. Lingelbach argues that in the first phase, the market was regulated by the state (through a 1934 fundraising law), which was driven by a paternalistic attitude. In the 1950s, both the debates over the National Socialist Law (which was declared unconstitutional in 1966) and the burden imposed on the Ministry of Interior by the task of controlling the collectors led to an expansion of the market. At the same time, the media emerged as a new major actor in regulating the market, but while guaranteeing transparency the exclusive focus on scandals and catastrophes may have become counterproductive.

Thomas Adam points out that while the East German regime wiped out private enterprise for ideological reason, endowments and foundations continued to exist in the German Democratic Republic. Mostly focused locally on providing social services, endowments and foundations in the GDR were reduced to their core economic function. As such, these endowments did not contribute to the formation of political dissent but rather may have helped to stabilize the political system.

International and Transnational German Philanthropy

The transatlantic dimension of German philanthropy has been integrated in more global networks after 1945. Especially from the 1960s onwards, foundations have increasingly turned their attention to the emerging Third World. In the GDR, collections were particularly devoted to African and Asian states that supported East

German state socialism and were allegedly suppressed by western "imperialism." As the Cold War lessened, decolonization raised humanitarian concerns. At the same time, anti-capitalist movements and the protests against American warfare in Vietnam openly questioned the policies of the United States in the Third World, even in the Federal Republic. Moreover, media coverage of (civil) wars and shocking poverty raised the awareness for human rights in the developing countries. In the 1970s, declining enthusiasm for grand Marxist promises of universal liberation as well as the disillusionment with modernist concepts of never-ending progress, too, enhanced the role of human rights in German philanthropy. It was only in that decade that the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 December 1948 and the European Convention on Human Rights drafted by the Council of Europe in 1950 were increasingly employed in order to legitimize interventions by German philanthropic organizations (Wildenthal 2013; Unger 2009: 253–286; Eckel 2012a: 22–67; Eckel 2012b: 603–635; Eckel 2009: 437–484; Hoffmann 2010: 26–36).

Despite allegations and occasions of fraud and corruption in many states of the Third World, foundations have intensified their efforts since the reunification of the two German states. In fact, global campaigns against the unequal distribution of wealth, the debates on the merits of civil society, and the recent financial and economic crisis have propelled German philanthropy. Beyond the established cooperation between governments, foundations, and institutions that collect gifts have increasingly collaborated with nongovernmental organizations.

Gregory Witkowski focuses on international philanthropy in the context of a state with totalitarian ambitions. He analyzes private forms of giving for international causes in the German Democratic Republic (GDR), including the communist Solidarity Fund, the government aligned Red Cross, Protestant Bread for the World, Catholic Need in the World, and various student collections for international causes. This work illustrates both the overlapping nature of aid and the way in which it became progressively independent from the state. The GDR serves as an excellent case study because little is known of its citizens' philanthropic activities and of their role in creating and broadening alternative public spheres.

Florian Hannig describes the transformation of Germany in the 1950s from a recipient to a donor country. By defining philanthropy as a mobilization of resources to which the recipients are not entitled, Hannig stresses collectors' accountability to donors rather than to recipients; hence, in describing the development of humanitarian relief in reaction to 1960s disasters (specifically the Nigerian civil war), he points to the question of legitimacy and domestic legitimization in the shift from pressures from the public sphere to interest in humanitarian aid.

Nina Berman describes the increase of charitable activities in Kenya in tandem with neo-liberal economic policies since the early 1990s. By using two specific case studies, Berman stresses the challenges deriving from long-term patterns of land alienation, the issue of local knowledge, the emergence of a culture of charity, and the disruption of local forms of community support by international charity. She argues that, in particular, the approach pursued by foreign-based MONGOS (MONGO stands for "my own nongovernmental organization") may have negative effects on the recipients of aid in Kenya.

Conclusion

Together, the individual essays paint a broad landscape with multiple levels of analysis. As the first section shows, philanthropic giving operates both on the individual and organizational level, with varying degrees of empathy and impact. Philanthropy can promote worldviews at odds with one another, as indicated for example, by conflicting views of internationalism and nationalism in the second section. The next section continues to see philanthropy as more than an exchange of money across borders, showing it also constitutes a cross-fertilization of ideas and practices. The often conflicting but sometimes complementary roles of the market and state are also revealed through analyses of philanthropy, explored in the fourth section through an examination of nonprofit regimes in two different political/economic systems in East and West Germany. Finally, the last section indicates that philanthropic giving aids the creation of individual and national identity through examples from both East and West Germany as mediated through their understandings of African needs.

This picture of conflicting interests, contrasting ideologies, asymmetric transfers of money, and ideas reveals the contested nature of philanthropic engagement. Furthermore, this study indicates that national traditions of philanthropic giving need to be seen in the context of transnational interactions, not only between donor and recipient but also mediated through other global partners. This volume, therefore, indicates the emergence of modern German philanthropic practices that have developed in the context of these complex transnational exchanges.

References

Adam, T. (2001). Philanthropy and the shaping of social distinctions in nineteenth-century American, Canadian and German cities. *Maecenata-Institut für dritte Sektor-Forschung, 3*(28), 6–24.

Adam, T. (2002). Transatlantic trading: The transfer of philanthropic models between European and North American cities during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. *Journal of Urban History, 28*(3), 328–351.