More than Money:
The social meaning of philanthropy in contemporary UK society

A thesis submitted to the University of Kent
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the subject of Sociology

Elizabeth Ann Breeze

Abstract

Philanthropy is a significant part of contemporary UK society that is over-exposed yet under-conceptualised. This thesis presents new data on significant philanthropists and offers a theoretical exploration of its non-economic properties. In particular, it seeks to identify the defining characteristics of philanthropy in the UK at the start of the 21st century and explore the suggestion that there has recently arisen a 'new philanthropy'.

Four separate and inter-related studies are presented. The first examines the wide variety of philanthropic behaviours and logics, and presents a new typology to bring clarity to the generic concept of philanthropy. The second study analyses philanthropists' rhetoric and finds it typically seeks to create and sustain a successful identity that integrates giving into a coherent account encompassing both personal and professional biographies. In contrast to the coherent narratives pursued by philanthropists, the third study finds that various contradictory representations of philanthropy exist in the public imagination. The final study finds no evidence that a substantively 'new philanthropy' exists and argues that any novelty lies largely in the way philanthropy is presented and discussed.

This thesis argues that contemporary UK philanthropy is not just a financial transaction, it is about much more than money. In particular, it has transformative potential for donors, contributing to their identity work and their pursuit of modern standards of success, notably significance, influence and authenticity. However, public representations of philanthropy are found to be incoherent and contradictory because contemporary UK society is not comfortable about wealth making, is unsure what status to give the wealthy and therefore does not know how to characterise or assess the desirability of wealth-giving. This results in the complex and confusing character of philanthropy in contemporary UK society that is documented in this thesis.

Acknowledgements

My sincere thanks to Professor Frank Furedi for agreeing to supervise me, for providing clear and constructive advice, and for giving me the confidence to believe I could complete this piece of work. Thank you to my parents, Susan and John Egan, for their support throughout my endless student years and for providing a bolt-hole-with-babysitting so I could actually write this thesis. Finally, thanks to my soulmate Michael and our beautiful boy Beren, for spurring me on to submission so I didn't miss too many more sunny days in their company.

Contents

Chapter 1
Introduction

As Wittgenstein first pointed out, there are two types of problems: problems of ignorance that require more facts and problems of confusion that require more clarification (Hart 1998:141). Attempts to understand philanthropy in contemporary UK society are hampered by both sorts of problem: there is a lack of robust empirical evidence on philanthropic giving and, where data does exist, it is, *"untouched by theoretical reflection"* (Halfpenny 1999:208-9). This thesis offers solutions to both sorts of problems: it contains new facts about the most significant philanthropists currently operating in the UK and it brings greater clarity to the meaning and purpose of their acts by presenting an analysis of philanthropy informed by sociological theory.

This introductory chapter begins with a review of the social, political and economic significance of philanthropy and notes the increasing attention to this topic as a consequence of escalating interest in the lives and habits of the rich. Definitions of the terms 'philanthropy' and 'philanthropist' are then discussed and found to be complicated by these being contested terms that evoke ideological reactions. Reasons for the relative neglect of this topic within UK academia, particularly in the social sciences, are then considered, and the chapter concludes with the rationale for this thesis.

1.1 The significance of philanthropy in contemporary UK society

In April 2009 David Sainsbury became the first UK citizen to give away more than £1 billion[1], almost exactly a year after a national UK newspaper had claimed that, *"a new age of philanthropy is revealed"*[2]. That declaration was prompted by the doubling of philanthropic donations made by members of the 'Sunday Times Rich List' since the previous year's survey of the 1,000 wealthiest UK-based individuals and families. Despite the recession, which began later that year and has continued throughout 2009, the following year saw a further rise in donations by the Rich List members, as shown in the second column of table 1.1. The third column refers to the minimum percentage of donated wealth that was required to win a place on the Giving Index in each year; these figures show that philanthropy has risen in relative, as well as in absolute, terms.

[1] 'Lord Sainsbury becomes first Briton to donate more than £1 billion to charity', Daily Telegraph, 20/04/09

[2] 'Sharing their good fortune'. Sunday Times (Rich List supplement), 27/04/08

Table 1.1: Philanthropic donations and philanthropic pledges from 2004-2009, adapted from the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index

Year[3]	Total value of donations and pledges by members of the Giving Index	Percentage of wealth given by the person/family in 30th place on the Giving Index[4]
2004	£299 million	0.59%
2005	£333 million	0.68%
2006	£453 million	0.89%
2007	£1.2 billion	1.36%
2008	£2.4 billion	3.00%
2009	£2.8 billion	4.5%

The first decade of the 21st century has also seen an increasing profile for philanthropy in the UK and world-wide. For example, a meeting at the Davos World Economic Forum in January 2009 featured former US president Bill Clinton, former British Prime Minister Tony Blair and the world's richest man, Bill Gates: this panel was not brought together to discuss international politics or global business issues, but rather to discuss philanthropy. Three years earlier, *Time* magazine named three philanthropists as its 'Persons of the Year 2006': the Irish rock star Bono plus Microsoft founder Bill Gates and his wife Melinda. To claim that philanthropists – rather than politicians, industrialists or international statesmen – best fulfilled the criteria of having 'done the most to influence the events of the year', was a defining moment in attracting attention to the activities and personalities of philanthropists. Within a few months, other media outlets echoed *Time's* decision, stating: *"There is no denying that philanthropy has become fashionable again"*[5] and another proclaiming: *"What's 'in' is to be seen to be spending copiously and carefully on those less fortunate"*[6]. Later that year, in June 2006, the world's second richest man, Warren Buffett announced he was donating almost all of his $40 billion fortune to the philanthropic foundation run by the world's richest man, Bill Gates, who had recently declared his intention to retire from business to focus on running the foundation. These acts sealed the perception that the philanthropic tradition had been 'revived and reinvented' and led some to suggest that philanthropy has become an integral part of being rich in the 21st century (Bishop and Green 2008:3 & 46).

[3] Although the Giving Index was first published in 2003, it contained only 10 names and did not provide full data on either the absolute value of donations or the relative value of donations as a percentage of wealth, therefore 2003 is excluded from Table 1.1.

[4] In the years 2004-2007, the Giving Index contained 30 names, in 2008 it was expanded to 50 names.

[5] 'The low-key rise of the smart trousered philanthropist', Sunday Telegraph 22/10/06

[6] '...Or even make a well-informed contribution to charity', Wall Street Journal 2/03/07

Despite this heightened awareness of philanthropy and the growing prominence of individual philanthropists, there is very little robust data on giving by the wealthiest people (Pharoah, Walker et al. 2006:165). Even the figures cited above must be treated with caution because they may, in part, be due to a greater willingness to share information about donations. The compiler of the Rich List Giving Index notes, there is *"a move towards being more open about giving [and]...increasing numbers are happy to talk about their charity work"* (McCall 2008:8). It is also important to note that the Giving Index contains pledges as well as donations that have actually been paid[7], although removing the most notable pledges still shows a more than six-fold increase in philanthropic donations by the richest people in the UK from 2004-2009.

The absence of robust information on the scale and scope of philanthropic giving is widely recognised. The compilers of 'UK Giving', the annual survey of charitable giving in the UK, agree that information on philanthropy *"is patchy at best"* due to the low probability of capturing significant philanthropists in an annual survey of 3,000 people who are selected by random probability sampling (Clegg, Goodey et al. 2008:35). For this reason, discussions on the philanthropic income of UK charities rely on data about 'charitable giving' and 'voluntary income', rather than data focused solely on 'philanthropy'; differences in the definitions of giving and philanthropy will be discussed further below in section 1.2.

The lack of accurate data about philanthropy in the UK is accompanied by widespread public ambivalence about the activity. Philanthropy is easily dismissed as either an antiquated concept or an American phenomenon - as something that belongs in an earlier century or in another country - yet it touches the daily life of most people living in contemporary UK society. Despite a common perception that all public services are organised and paid for by tax-funded arms of the state, and despite evidence from social attitudes surveys that government is viewed as the main provider for social needs (Taylor-Gooby 1993:11), many public services are delivered by organisations that rely to some extent on philanthropic donations. For example, despite the existence of the NHS, £1.1 billion was donated to health charities in 2007/08, including £63 million for hospitals (Pharoah 2009:78 & 80) and a significant percentage of research into the diseases that cause widespread public concern, such as cancers and heart disease, are funded by philanthropic donations. For example, Cancer Research UK has been the most popular of all the UK's fundraising charities since it was formed in 2002[8], it raised £354 million in voluntary income in 2007/08 (Pharoah 2009:28), constituting 74% of that year's total income of £477m[9]. Further examples of the presence of philanthropically-funded organisations in spaces assumed to be the exclusive preserve of the public sector are air ambulances and the national sea rescue service, most notably the Royal National Lifeboat Institution, which raised £142 million of voluntary income in 2007/08 (Pharoah 2009:64), constituting 84% of its total income of £170 million in that year[10]. As well as these services, many of the facilities that people encounter on a daily basis owe their existence to philanthropic action. UK philanthropists in previous centuries built many of the facilities that the public regularly use, including schools, hospitals, libraries, town halls, churches, parks, art galleries, museums, swimming pools and theatres. Contemporary philanthropy continues to facilitate the private funding of a vast and diverse array of activities including the arts, social welfare, medical research and educational provision. However, the embedded nature of philanthropic effort within the national fabric leaves many

---

[7] Most notably, the 2008 figure includes an aspiration expressed by Tom Hunter to give away £1 billion over his lifetime and the 2009 list counts Lord Ashcroft's announcement that he will leave a large charitable legacy, valued at c. £800 million.

[8] Cancer Research UK was formed in 2002 by the merger of two existing major charities, the Cancer Research Campaign and the Imperial Cancer Research Fund.

[9] As reported in Cancer Research UK's annual report and accounts for the year ending 31st March 2008, p.1

[10] According to the RNLI annual report and accounts for year ending 31st December 2008, p.13. The RNLI receives no government funding, non-philanthropic income is from trading and investment activities.

recipients unaware of the philanthropic origins of the services and facilities from which they benefit.

There are almost 165,000[11] registered charities in the UK; whilst many of the biggest charitable organisations earn substantial income from government contracts, fees and returns on investments, the vast majority rely on voluntary donations as the main source of income (Wilding, Collins et al. 2004:59). Indeed, although earned income has recenty overtaken voluntary income as the primary source of the sector's total income[12], over half of charities receive no funding from government (Reichardt, Kane et al. 2008:29 & 33).

The total voluntary income of charities in 2007/08 was £10.6 billion (Pharoah 2009:17), which accounts for 0.9% of GDP. To put these figures in context, total public sector spending in the same year was £560 billion (HM Treasury 2008:52) and accounted for 38.4% of GDP (HM Treasury 2008:51). The amount of donated income available to the charity sector was roughly equivalent to the amount of public spending on the environment (£10 billion) and only a fraction of that spent on social protection (£187 billion) or health (£103 billion) (all figures from HM Treasury 2008:52).

Although the amounts raised through charitable giving are relatively low, levels of participation are quite high as most of the UK population make charitable donations every month: 54% did so in 2008/09 (NCVO & CAF 2009:4), a figure which has remained relatively constant in recent years, as shown in table 1.2.

Table 1.2 The proportion of adults giving and the number of UK donors from 2005-2009 (Clegg, Goodey et al. 2008:9; NCVO & CAF 2009:4)

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09
Proportion of adults giving	58%	54%	56%	54%
Total number of donors	28.0m	26.8m	27.7m	26.9m

Amongst those giving, the average monthly donation in 2008/09 was £31, although this falls to £11 if the median is used instead of the mean, which corrects the distorting influence of outliers. In recent years charitable giving has slowly increased in absolute terms, but has not kept pace with inflation or rises in general wealth, until a dip in 2009 when the UK was in recession, as shown in table 1.3.

Table 1.3 Average monthly donations from 2005-2008, adapted from (Clegg, Goodey et al. 2008:9; NCVO & CAF 2009:4)

	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09
Mean amount per donor	£10	£10	£11	£10
Median amount per donor	£28	£29	£33	£31

[11] 164,046 charities are listed on the online Charity Commission register, which covers England and Wales, http://www.charity-commission.gov.uk [viewed 26/7/09]

[12] The dominance of earned income began in 2005/06 when it accounted for 50.3% of total income (Reichardt et al 2008:29).

As noted above, this data does not capture substantial information about the richest givers, but findings on the distribution of donation size are helpful in illuminating the significance of major donors. The UK Giving survey defines 'high level donor' as those who donate £100 or more each month. As table 1.4 shows, only 1 in 12 donors are found to give at this level, yet their collective donations account for over half of the total value of donations, whereas almost half of donors (43%) give less than £10 per month and collectively account for just 5% of total donations. This skewed distribution highlights the significance of the small number of people who have the capacity and the desire to make the biggest donations.

Table 1.4 The disproportionate contribution of larger donations to voluntary income (adapted from Clegg, Goodey et al. 2008:11)

Amount given per month	Percentage of donors giving at this level[13]	Percentage of donations accounted for by this level of giving
Under £10	43%	5%
£10 – £24.99	27%	12%
£25 – £99.99	23%	32%
£100 or more	8%	51%

Despite being only a fraction of the size of public sector expenditure, charitable and philanthropic donations are significant sources of income for the charity sector, and the contribution of this sector to the vitality of wider society has been recognised by politicians across the political spectrum. To give three examples: the Liberal William Beveridge promoted voluntary action alongside the welfare state that he famously helped to create (Beveridge 1948); John Major's Conservative government in the 1990s introduced measures that boosted charity income, notably Gift Aid[14] and the National Lottery[15]; and Gordon Brown, when Labour Chancellor, announced a Budgetary package of measures to 'Get Britain Giving' in 2000, which is discussed further below. The current UK government's policy on charitable giving and philanthropy was set out in a document entitled, 'A Generous Society' (Home Office 2005) in which the then Home Secretary, Charles Clarke, described giving as a way that the public can *"contribute to the social fabric of the nation"* and stated that,

> *"The Government is determined to do all it can to make it as easy as possible for those who want to contribute to do so, and to help develop a culture in which charitable giving is a natural part of everyone's life"* (Home Office 2005:2).

[13] The figures presented in UK Giving add up to 101%, probably due to rounding errors

[14] Gift Aid is a scheme that enables taxpayers to claim tax relief on donations to UK charities.

[15] According to Lottery operator Camelot, the National Lottery had raised £23 billion for good causes (not all of which are registered charities) by October 2009 (www.lotterygoodcauses.org.uk viewed 25/10/09)

As Kendall and Knapp note, there are four specific ways in which the UK government enables and facilitates the voluntary sector: direct funding, tax concessions, providing regulatory support and enhancing its visibility (Kendall and Knapp 1996:3). In terms of recent examples of government support for philanthropy, these four approaches include funding a national Giving Campaign[16] to promote a 'culture of giving' and funding strategic partners that promote philanthropy[17]; giving tax relief on all charitable donations made by tax payers since 2000; funding the Charity Commission which, since 2006, has a new duty to promote philanthropy; and providing encouragement and enhanced visibility by being publicly supportive of philanthropy[18] and awarding honours to philanthropists[19].

Tax reliefs are probably the most widely known aspect of government support for philanthropy. The UK has enjoyed a fiscal regime that encourages philanthropy since 1986 when the Conservative government introduced payroll giving and then set up the Gift Aid scheme in 1990 to refund the income tax paid on some donations. In 2000 the Labour government extended both the payroll giving and Gift Aid schemes by removing the lower and upper thresholds so that donations of all sizes became eligible for tax relief. In 2007/08 the public purse subsidised charitable giving with almost £1.4 billion in tax breaks, as shown in table 1.5.

Table 1.5 The type and value of charity tax reliefs in 2007/08 (all data from Pharoah 2009:58-60)

Type of charitable tax relief	Cost of tax relief
Gift Aid	£898m
Inheritance tax relief on legacies	£380m
Donations of property & shares	£70m
Payroll giving	£30m
All types of tax relief	£1,378m

The £1.4 billion of public expenditure that is spent on incentivising and encouraging philanthropy may be a large amount in absolute terms, but it is only a tiny fraction of total public spending of £560 billion. However, the value of philanthropy could be argued to lie less in the quantities of money involved than in the qualities that it represents. In market-driven societies, such as the UK, non-market driven actions are important and interesting because,

> *"[philanthropy] represent[s] a form of behaviour rather unlike anything else we observe in the economy... The act of giving money away appears on its face to be behaviour wholly out of character with the reputation of homo economicus, that calculating, utility-maximising actor portrayed in textbooks of economics"* (Clotfelter 2002:2-3).

The attention paid by economists to explaining philanthropy will be discussed further in section 1.4, but first the key terms involved in this thesis will be discussed and defined.

---

[16] The Giving Campaign ran from 2000-2004. After closing, a number of its initiatives continued, such as 'G-Nation', aimed at schoolchildren and now housed within the Citizenship Foundation.

[17] Strategic partners that have received government funding since 2006 are Philanthropy UK, the Community Foundation Network, the Institute of Fundraising, G-Nation and the Beacon Fellowship.

[18] For example, hosting the Beacon awards for philanthropy at Downing Street on 29/01/04

[19] People knighted for services to philanthropy include John Templeton, Christopher Ondaatje and Tom Hunter.

1.2 Definitions of philanthropy and how it differs from giving

Whilst it is relatively easy to point to evidence of philanthropic activity, it is more difficult to provide a precise definition of either 'philanthropy' or 'philanthropist'. It has been suggested that being philanthropic is innate or part of the *a priori* human experience (Payton 1984; Gurin and Til 1990:4), that philanthropy has existed in every historical period and been a feature of every culture (Ilchman, Katz et al. 1998:ix), and that it is *"as old as humanity itself; we can safely consider it universal"* (Payton and Moody 2008:14). Yet the suggestion that philanthropy is immanent in a Kantian sense sits uneasily within the sociological tradition, which emphasises that human knowledge and behaviours are socially derived (Durkheim 1897; Durkheim 1915; Morris 1987:115). Furthermore, studies of philanthropy in Antiquity and early Christianity conclude that the apparent continuity from pagan benevolence to Christian charity to modern philanthropy may be due to erroneous assumptions that its meaning has remained constant over time (Andrews 1950:31), leading Davis to warn against assuming that *"our contemporary vocabulary is sufficiently supple to capture the arguments and presumptions of our precursors"* (1996:4). That philanthropy varies in different eras and in different countries is evident in the frequency with which both Victorian and American philanthropy are contrasted with contemporary UK philanthropy, in an exercise which usually highlights the inadequacy of the latter (for example Prochaska 1990; McCarthy 2005; Handy 2006:2; McCully 2008). Differences relate to how the activity is viewed, as well as the enthusiasm with which it is undertaken. For example, one comparative transatlantic study points out that whilst 'philanthropy' is a popular term in the USA, *"for many in Britain it still carries disparaging connotations of Victorian 'do-gooderism' and is often seen as elitist, patronising, morally judgemental and ineffective"* (Wright 2002:7). Given this variation across time and place, any study of philanthropy must take account of the context in which it occurs because,

> *"each culture develops a distinctive philanthropic tradition that reflects other aspects of that society... To understand philanthropy in any culture, we have to understand the sources of the philanthropic tradition, both ancient and modern, and how these influenced philanthropic actions and meaning over time"*
> (Payton and Moody 2008:131).

Yet to claim that philanthropy is a socially and culturally embedded concept does little to advance the task of defining the key terms at the heart of this thesis, so we turn instead to etymology and dictionary definitions.

The root of both words is Greek, meaning 'love of' (philo) 'man' (anthropos). The dictionary defines 'philanthropy' as primarily an emotional disposition: *"love of humankind"* with a more concrete secondary definition: *"practical benevolence"*. The dictionary definition of 'philanthropist' is: *"a person who practices philanthropy"* and secondarily, *"a friend or lover of humankind"*[20]. Despite the positive connotations of these official definitions, more negative interpretations abound. For example, philanthropy is said to involve, *"people getting credit for giving back what their ancestors should never have taken in the first place"* (Panas 1984:49) and the philanthropist is said to be, *"fuzzy-minded, self-indulgent, too preoccupied with his own emotional satisfactions"* (Nightingale 1973:111). Derogatory definitions and embodiments also appear widely in popular culture, from the foolishly philanthropic Mrs Jellaby in Charles Dickens' 'Bleak House' who is blind to the needs in her own household, to Mrs Cheveley in Oscar Wilde's 'An Ideal Husband' who complains that, *"philanthropy seems to have become simply the refuge*

[20] The New Oxford English Dictionary (1993). Oxford, Clarendon Press, p.2185

of people who wish to annoy their fellow creatures". Clearly, neither etymology nor dictionary definitions satisfactorily accommodate the meaning of 'philanthropy' and 'philanthropist' in their common usage. This is because they are contested concepts and loaded terms which evoke ideological reactions (DiMaggio and Anheier 1990:153). Many commentators have noted the multiple and contested meaning of the term 'philanthropy'. It is said to be a *'polysemic term'* that has *'many shades of meaning'* (Til 1990b:23 & 19) and a *'protean word'* like 'society' or 'religion' (Payton 1984:3). It is said to be in need of clarification because its use is *"vague and often fuzzy"* (Fink 1990:135), *"used a bit too broadly"* (O'Connor 1987:122) and because its definition has changed over time (Davis 1996:4).

The task of defining philanthropy is aggravated by the existence of similar terms and concepts. Those who study this topic are said to have, *"described their subject matter as charitable, philanthropic or voluntary in a variety of overlapping and interlocking ways which are often only implicitly defined"* (Morris 2004:139). There is, therefore, a need to isolate 'philanthropy' from closely related concepts in order to explain how it is differentiated, not least because the proliferation of similar terms creates,

> *"a muddle and a mess. This manifests itself at every turn. Charity, caritas, agape, philanthropy, eleemosynary contributions, alms giving, benevolence, altruism – are they synonymous with giving or subtly different?"* (Halfpenny 1998:385).

Closely related concepts that are discussed in relation to philanthropy include 'benevolence' (Ditchfield 1998:194; Andreoni 2001:11369), 'giving' (McCarthy 2001:1) and 'sharing' (Ilchman, Katz et al. 1998:ix) but most often it is 'charity' that is confused and contrasted with 'philanthropy'. A common proposition is that 'philanthropy' is the broad concept referring to all types of giving and helping that improves the quality of life for all, whilst 'charity' is the subset of help given to the indigent (Bremner 1988:3; Wolpert 1989:380; Gurin and Til 1990:4; Ostrower 1995:4). The most frequently cited version of this formulation is Jencks' suggestion that, *"it seems best to use the term 'philanthropy' to describe gifts in general, and to reserve the word 'charity' for those gifts that are specifically aimed at the poor or the needy"* (1987:322).

Others reject the notion that 'charity' is a subset of 'philanthropy', perceiving them to be qualitatively different. For example, philanthropy is said to have a secular orientation in contrast to the religious inspiration and purpose of charity (Cunningham and Innes 1998:2), alternatively charity is said to be aimed at individuals whilst philanthropy is an organised effort to improve the socioeconomic conditions of a whole community (Hewa and Stapleton 2006:4). Payton's definition of philanthropy as *"the prudent sister of charity"* (1988:32) reflects a typically American preference for the word 'philanthropy' over 'charity' which, in that country, invokes notions of amateur and random almsgiving.

A common point of differentiation between 'charity' and 'philanthropy' suggests that charity exists to alleviate suffering whilst philanthropy is preventative (Andrews 1950:21; Frumkin 2006:5-6). In support of this position Frumkin cites the two people most widely recognised as the 'fathers of modern philanthropy': Andrew Carnegie whose 'Gospel of Wealth' argues that philanthropy should 'provide ladders for the aspiring to rise' (Carnegie 1899) and John D Rockefeller whose essay, 'The Difficult Art of Giving' states, *"if people can be educated to help themselves, we strike at the root of many evils of the world"* (cited in Frumkin 2006:8). Thus both Carnegie and Rockefeller appear to suggest that philanthropy is about preventing, rather than ameliorating the symptoms of, poverty.

The difficulties in drawing boundaries between related concepts such as charity, voluntarism, altruism and generosity lead some to conclude that it is *"futile"* to seek a precise definition of philanthropy (Martin 1994:8) because it is *"difficult or more probably incapable of strict definition"* (Gray 1905:viii), and "*many leading scholars in the field doubt that one can be developed"* (Gurin and Til 1990:3). However, some concur with Payton's advice that *"until a better word is found, 'philanthropy' will have to do"* (1984:3).

Amongst those prepared to offer definitions, the most widely cited is Payton's simple formulation that philanthropy is 'private action for the public good' (Payton 1988). Less elegantly phrased, though more substantive, suggestions include *"the voluntary transfer of economic goods or resources to an organisation or another individual"* (Knapp and Kendall 1991:1), *"the voluntary social relation of care by which donors respond directly to others in need"* (Havens, O'Herlihy et al. 2006:1) and the advancement of society, *"by providing necessary social, cultural and educational services which are not provided by the state or the market"* (Adam 2004:4).

There is greater agreement to be found in efforts to define 'philanthropist'. Common themes found in these definitions relate to the large financial value of the gift, the high status of the donor, the public nature of the donation and the scale of the impact achieved. For example, Owen defines philanthropists as *"men who gave away a large proportion of their fortune"* (1965:394), for Nightingale, *"a philanthropist to us, is a rich man, one whose gifts have been large enough to bring him to public notice*" (1973:128-9), Cunningham and Innes note that these donors are, *"from a superior social stratum to the recipients"* (1998:12) and Smith writes that their donations are of a "*magnitude that is in some way unusual. It makes a splash, it makes a notable difference"* (2003:114). However, the label of 'philanthropist' is not always acceptable to those to whom it is applied; some interviewees in a study of 'new philanthropists' rejected the label, *"feeling it still carries overtones of Victorian noblesse oblige, of paternalistic and interfering do-gooding"* (Handy 2006:9).

This review of definitions of the terms 'philanthropy' and 'philanthropist' reveals the need for greater clarification of the concepts involved and prompts the study presented in chapter 3, which investigates the distinctive features of significant contemporary UK philanthropists and develops a typology to capture the variety that exists within this 'circus tent term', which contains many disparate acts (Payton and Moody 2008:29).

In order to clarify the basis on which this thesis proceeds, I propose to use a definition that is grounded in the variety of propositions discussed above and that also captures the aspect of social life that I wish to examine in this thesis. I am aware that philanthropy can include the giving of time and other resources as well as money, and I do not believe that philanthropy is solely the preserve of extremely wealthy people, but the gap in the knowledge that I wish to fill concerns the donations of wealthy people in the UK and the meaning that this holds for both the donors and the wider society. Therefore the type of philanthropy that I focus on in this thesis is defined as follows:

'significant monetary gifts made by rich individuals to unknown others'.

This definition is operationalised in section 3.1, which presents four approaches to identifying all contemporary UK philanthropists who make significant monetary donations to unknown others. The role that rich people and their riches play in the debate about philanthropy will be discussed in the next section.

1.3 Philanthropy and the 'problem of riches'

The rise in the prominence of philanthropy is related to the recent rise of wealth amongst the richest part of society. The number of UK-based billionaires tripled between 2004 and 2007 and the combined wealth of Britain's 1,000 richest people rose from £99 billion in 1997, to £360 billion a decade later (all figures based on data in Beresford 2007). Despite the economic crisis of 2008/09, and the large financial losses experienced by many wealthy people, the collective net-worth of the 2009 Rich List still stood at £285 billion (Beresford 2009:4). Rising wealth amongst the richest members of society has been identified in a range of academic research. A report from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation finds that the percentage of total personal wealth held by the richest 1% of the UK population grew from 17% in 1991 to 24% in 2002, whilst the share of total personal wealth owned by the bottom 50% of the population fell from 8% to 6% over the same time period (Dorling, Rigby et al. 2007:4). Increases in wealth amongst the richest part of society in the past two decades has been described as,

> *"the most rapid and dramatic shift of income, assets and resources in favour of the very rich that has ever taken place in human history... We can see the rise of the 'super rich' in the 'old' capitalist nations, especially those such as the UK and USA, which have enthusiastically embraced neo-liberalism from the early 1980s. In both countries the top one or five percent of income earners have more or less doubled their share of total income since the early 1980s and we have now almost returned to pre-1914 levels of income inequality."*
> (Savage and Williams 2008:1)

As Savage and Williams note, this trend is not confined to one society. In the US the number of billionaires doubled between 2003 and 2008 and worldwide the number of 'ultra-rich' people, defined as those holding at least $30 million in financial assets, rose from 70,000 in 2003 to 95,000 by 2007 (Bishop and Green 2008:17).

One consequence of this rise in wealth is a rising interest in the wealthy. The contemporary rich may not differ significantly from their rich forebears, but the sociologist A H Halsey notes that the key difference, *"is that today the camera and the newspaper have developed new modes of intrusion into guarded privacies"* (1997). The public is therefore more aware of the behaviour of the rich, whose exposed position means they have more opportunity to exercise their influence on 21st century society. Despite wide public interest, the rich and their behaviour remains an under-researched topic in the social sciences (Orton and Rowlingson 2007) and such studies have been taken up more enthusiastically outside academic research in what is known as the 'grey literature'. Two recent, influential examples of what might be called 'rich-lit' will be discussed: Stewart Lansley's 'Rich Britain' (2006) and Polly Toynbee and David Walker's 'Unjust Rewards' (2008).

In the words of its sub-title, Lansley's 'Rich Britain' is a study of 'the rise and rise of the new super-wealthy'. It charts the recent 'explosion in wealth' (Lansley 2006:xii) evidenced by an eightfold rise in people earning millionaire incomes between 1995-2005, a fivefold increase in the number of people worth over £100 million since 1990 and a tripling of billionaires over the same time period (p.ix-x). Lansley argues that the new multi-millionaires are harmful to Britain and cause 'social polarisation' (p.231) because they are, *"wealthier, less embarrassed by their wealth and much happier to flaunt and trumpet it"* (p.xi). The newly enriched are accused of choosing 'voracious consumerism' – exemplified by the purchase of private islands, fast cars and items such as a £320,000 watch and a £15 million swimsuit 'dripping in diamonds' (p.x) – over philanthropy. Lansley derides the minimal amount of philanthropy that does occur as, *"little*

more than pocket money" (p.176) and claims it is driven by a desire to impress, rather than by altruism. For this reason, philanthropy is described as, *"the rich person's equivalent of a peacock's tail"* (p.175) because it makes the donor appear more attractive and helps them to win the approval and admiration of others. Comparisons are drawn between the philanthropy of today's British 'super-rich' and their historic and transatlantic counterparts, with the former found wanting. Lansley proposes that there exists a 'British philanthropic deficit' (p.164) and claims, *"There are no British equivalents of Carnegie, Rockefeller or Gates. The British have always been less generous than Americans and have a very different tradition of philanthropy"* (p.176).

Polly Toynbee and David Walker offer a similar thesis to Lansley, made equally explicit in the full title of their book: 'Unjust Rewards: Exposing greed and inequality in Britain today' (Toynbee and Walker 2008). Like Lansley, Toynbee and Walker set the scene for their exposé of contemporary, unequal British society with a list of exorbitantly priced luxury goods featured in a glossy magazine,

> *"Flick the pages and admire a Chanel garment with an £8,075 price tag, Casino Royale satin stilettos for £720 or a Dior python-skin handbag for £3,035. A Toutbillon wristwatch costs £200,000"* (Toynbee and Walker 2008:1).

Toynbee and Walker make extensive use of statistics to support their argument, including data on the rapid growth of income at the wealthiest end of society and stagnation at the bottom. They cite an Institute of Fiscal Studies report[21] which finds that the number of people declaring an income larger than £500,000 doubled between 2003 and 2005 (p.3) and that the income of the top 1% receive 13% of all income (Toynbee and Walker 2008:2) whilst the bottom 10% share just 2.6% of income between them (p.5). They also cite an *Economist*[22] report on inequality in modern Britain which finds the average salary of Chief Executive Officers of FTSE 100 companies increased from 17 times the average salary in 1988 to 75 times the average by 2006 (p.5). UK-based wealth is also shown to have expanded by the rise in number of people registered as non-domiciled in the UK (and therefore released from paying tax on any wealth kept outside the UK) which increased by 74% between 2002 and 2005, reaching 130,000 non-domiciled residents by 2007 (p.191). As with Lansley's book, the cumulative aim of presenting these statistics is to depict an unacceptable 'wealth explosion' that is harmful and unacceptable to the rest of society, a point underlined by citing the British Social Attitudes Survey of 2007-08 which finds 76% of people believe the gap between rich and poor is too high (p.8).

The data is also intended to prove there is now much greater capacity for philanthropic acts in the UK, yet Toynbee and Walker argue that this potential is not being fulfilled and suggest that, *"the same few names get recycled in the media, giving an erroneous impression that philanthropy is on the rise"* (p.181)[23]. Echoing Lansley, Toynbee and Walker also question the sincerity of the philanthropic acts that do occur. In a chapter entitled 'Philanthropy is no excuse', Toynbee and Walker describe charitable giving by the rich as *'mere ostentation'* (p.174), a *'passport to the in-crowd'* and *'another way of exerting power and control'* (both quotes p.177). They describe philanthropy as *"a way to fame and extra fortune... the ultimate door opening lifestyle accessory"* (p.177), which is devoid of any genuine interest in those they profess to help. The lack of nuance evident in these quotes highlights the subjectivity of Toynbee and Walker's argument: they do not differentiate between the philanthropic and non-philanthropic

---

[21] Institute of Fiscal Studies, *Racing Away?: Income equality and the evolution of high incomes*, Briefing Notes BN76, January 2008

[22] 'Britannia Redux', *The Economist* special report, 1/02/07

[23] This issue of the range of philanthropists that appear in UK media coverage is addressed in the media analysis presented in section 5.3 of this thesis.

rich, and they do not acknowledge any philanthropic motive beyond personal gain. They also repeat Lansley's logical flaw in assuming that a penchant for highly priced luxuries is both novel and incompatible with being philanthropic. The latter point will be discussed further in chapter 4, where 'authenticity' is identified as a key concern for philanthropists, but the suggestion that decadence amongst the rich is an unusual feature of contemporary society can be easily countered with reference to Thorsten Veblen's century-old analysis of conspicuous consumption.

First published in 1899, 'The Theory of the Leisure Class' (Veblen 1994), is a satirical and sociological account of the lives of the upper class at the end of the 19th century, whose habits of dress, leisure and manners are interpreted as public displays of wealth that are undertaken in order to win public esteem. One aspect of 'putting in evidence' their wealth (p.24) is philanthropy, which enables the donor to prove they have sufficient spare wealth to dispose of some of it in actions of 'conspicuous' or 'honorific' waste (p.187). Veblen's assumption that rich donors are motivated largely by self-interest is clear, and worth quoting at length:

> *"It is a matter of sufficient notoriety to have become a commonplace jest that extraneous motives are commonly present among the incentives to this class of work [charity] – motives of a self-regarding kind, and especially the motive of an invidious distinction. To such an extent is this true, that many ostensible works of disinterested public spirit are no doubt initiated and carried on with a view primarily to the enhanced repute, or even to the pecuniary gain, of their promoters... [The invidious motive] would hold true especially with respect to such works as lend distinction to their doer through large and conspicuous expenditure; as, for example, the foundation of a university or of a public library or museum... These serve to authenticate the pecuniary reputability of their members, as well as gratefully to keep them in mind of their superior status by pointing the contrast between themselves and the lower-lying humanity in whom the work of amelioration is to be wrought"* (p.208).

Veblen's description of the physical design of institutions funded by philanthropists of his age is also worth quoting at length as it underlines the fact that there is nothing new in accusations of 'donor benefit':

> *"Certain funds, for instance, may have been set apart as a foundation for a foundling asylum or a retreat for invalids. The diversion of expenditure to honorific waste in such cases is not uncommon enough to cause surprise or even to raise a smile. An appreciable share of the funds is spent in the construction of an edifice faced with some aesthetically objectionable but expensive stone, covered with grotesque and incongruous details, and designed, in its battlemented walls and turrets and its massive portals and strategic approaches, to suggest certain barbaric methods of warfare. The interior structure shows the same pervasive guidance of the canons of conspicuous waste and predatory exploit. The windows for instance, to go no farther into detail, are placed with a view to impress their pecuniary excellence upon the chance beholder from the outside, rather than with a view to effectiveness for their ostensible end in the convenience or comfort of the beneficiaries within"* (p.213).

If the broad parameters of the consumption habits of the rich have not changed in the past hundred years, then the reason for growing intolerance with their conduct, as exemplified by Lansley and by Toynbee and Walker, may lie less in the behaviour of rich people themselves and more in the growing confidence of the non-rich to censure that behaviour. In the mid-twentieth century, C. Wright Mills' thesis on the 'power elite' criticised society's unquestioning approval of the value of money and belief in the 'natural superiority' of those who make and hold it (1956), yet something of a reversal has occurred in the decades since his analysis was published. With very little prompting, people now routinely venture opinions, spread gossip, speculate, and castigate the actions and alleged motives of rich people. In much the way that poorer people used to be sub-divided into the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor according to judgements regarding their work ethic and life-style, Lansley has identified a new category of what he calls the 'undeserving rich', who are,

> *"those who simply live off or fritter away an inheritance, who become super-rich by... 'brute-luck' or who rig the system to enrich themselves by unfairly grabbing a larger slice of the cake at the expense of someone else"* (Lansley 2006:210).

Furthermore, the 'undeserving rich' are not only those whose lavish rewards are said to be disproportionate to their talents but also those whose charitable activities are dismissed as 'mean' (2006:180).

The suggestion that some people have made too much money, too quickly, and do not dispose of it 'well' enjoys wide resonance. But criticisms of the new 'super-rich' may also be due, in part, to the lack of clear guidance on 'how to be rich', not least because the standards against which people are judged are being constantly redefined. The difficulty in answering the question of 'how to be a good billionaire' is tackled in a book concerned with the contemporary merging of capitalism with philanthropy, hence the compound word of the title: 'Philanthrocapitalism: How the rich can save the world' (Bishop and Green 2008). This book suggests that philanthropy is a solution to the 'problem' of being rich and argues that philanthropy should become the basis of a new 'social contract' between the rich and the rest of the population. As indicated by the sub-title, this book is a polemic in praise of capitalism. The authors state that, *"golden ages of wealth creation give rise to golden ages of giving"* (p.21) and they argue that the current generation of philanthrocapitalists, "*are leading a revival and reinvention of an old tradition that has the potential to solve many of the biggest problems facing humanity today"* (p.2). Whilst Bishop and Green provide many examples of 'philanthrocapitalists' and their contribution to the public good, the polemical nature means that counter examples are absent and the reader is unable to contextualise the actions and outlooks of the donors that are discussed within the wider population of philanthropists.

Despite Bishop and Green's prescription of philanthropy as a solution to the 'problem of riches', there is a growing sense that the accumulation of wealth is inherently problematic, regardless of whether it is hoarded or philanthropically distributed. The great social upheaval of the 1960s has been identified as the turning point when economic power became more vigorously challenged and the rich began to feel the need to justify themselves to wider society (Schervish 1994:180). One aspect of the 'cultural turn' that occurred in the 1960s was a rejection of consumerism, despite the fundamental workings of the consumer society remaining intact. In the following decade, an analysis of the 'cultural contradictions of capitalism' highlighted the fact that people who live in market societies also pursue non-market goals, such as self-realisation, which may be more highly valued than economic success (Bell 1976:38). The contradictions involved in pursuing both market values and self-fulfilment, and the apparent greater enthusiasm for the latter, results in decreasing cultural affirmation for markets and the wealth they create. This

contradiction is possible because, despite the extended dominance of capitalism in contemporary market societies such as the UK, the workings of the market are largely uncelebrated and those who succeed in market economies often receive affirmation in spite of, rather than because of, their financial success. Although the UK was the 'cradle of capitalism', it is argued that we remain uncomfortable with money-making and unsure what status to accord rich people, especially the self-made (Wiener 1981). This 'problem of the rich' has gained momentum in recent years: the 'super-rich' have been depicted as robber barons, fat cats and casino capitalists[24]; people who made their fortune in the financial services industry have been branded as 'locusts' and accused of operating out of 'naked self interest'[25]; and in 2008 the Vatican identified 'accumulating wealth' as one of the modern 'seven deadly sins'.

On the basis of interviews with wealthy Americans, Schervish concludes that contemporary culture has ambivalent feelings about the rich because it worships money, but not the holders of money (Schervish 1994:177). He cites interviewees who express feelings of, *"a certain amount of shame"* at being rich, who feel, *"underprivileged by privilege"* (p.180) and view inheritances as, *"a burden that most people don't have"* (p.179). Schervish concludes that being philanthropic enables rich people to re-write their troubled biographies of wealth into 'moral biographies'; this instrumentalist depiction of philanthropy as an act focused on the donor more than recipients will be discussed further in the following chapters.

The suggestion that the rich in the US feel the need to justify their wealth through philanthropic acts is notable, as it is widely assumed that money is more valorised in that country than in the UK. Indeed, different attitudes to wealth and wealth-holders in the US and the UK has previously been posited as an explanatory factor behind the different levels of charitable giving found in these two countries:

> *"In the United States money is seen as a good thing. Wealth is considered a nearly universal measure of achievement and success. Philanthropy in particular has been a way to demonstrate both social leadership and significant personal wealth, and as such has often been used as a vehicle for entrance into elite circles…. Money is not clearly such a good thing in the UK. Financial success is viewed by some with admiration, by others with suspicion; they see it as unseemly, and very likely a result of the exploitation of others"* (Wright 2002:15-16).

Chapter 5 will explore public reactions to wealth and philanthropy in order to investigate these claims further.

Schervish's study of wealthy Americans concludes that there is a, *"highly charged cultural atmosphere surrounding wealth [which] often results in the tendency for commentators to either criticize or defend the ethical status of the wealthy"* (1994:169). The next section will consider the contested claims made about philanthropy and argue that this 'highly charged atmosphere' about wealth and philanthropy makes it a particularly suitable topic for sociological study.

[24] These phrases are in wide currency, all appear in Lansley 2006.

[25] 'The low key rise of the smart-trousered philanthropist', Sunday Telegraph, 22/10/06

1.4 The need for a sociological study of contemporary UK philanthropy

This chapter has described the social, political and economic significance of philanthropy and the rising public interest in philanthropists, and it has also documented the lack of substantive understanding of this activity. Philanthropy is widely discussed and yet its neglect within academic study means it is also grossly under-conceptualised. Nowhere is this neglect more surprising than in sociology.

Whilst Veblen is one of the few nineteenth century writers whose work is still commonly referenced by contemporary sociologists, his interest in conducting sociological studies of the rich was not followed by further similar studies in this discipline. The topic of philanthropy is curiously absent from the discipline of sociology and related social sciences. It receives no mention in the basic textbooks, has no meaningful existence in the journals and is not a primary area of enquiry of any leading academics in the UK. A key reason for the lack of sociological interest in the rich may be due to poverty being viewed as a far more significant social problem than wealth. Much of the theoretical and empirical output of sociologists and social policy academics derives from a common research focus on solving the problem of poverty and associated public sector issues, notably the welfare state. Consequently insufficient attention has been paid to the existence and associated problems of wealth, although recently Orton and Rowlingson (2007a) have argued that social policy's traditional concern with the poor should be broadened out to encompass the wealthy because, quoting Tawney,

> *"what thoughtful rich people call the problem of poverty, thoughtful poor people call with equal justice a problem of riches"*
> (cited in Orton and Rowlingson 2007a:59).

As noted above, difficulties in defining 'philanthropy' and 'philanthropists' are due, in part, to them being contested concepts that provoke ideological reactions, and this may also exacerbate the lack of interest in undertaking substantive studies of philanthropy. For example, the charge from the political left is that philanthropy is a means of advancing class interest and concealing exploitation by the dominant classes:

> *"Some critics, especially those of Marxist and Gramscian orientation, claim that the progressive image of philanthropy is a false façade – that both the donors' intentions and the effects of their philanthropies have been primarily to advance their own interests, those of their companies, or those of their socioeconomic class"*
> (Fleishman 2007:43).

Whilst obviously not all critics subscribe to a Marxist analysis, philanthropy is frequently criticised for being a form of disguised self interest (Osteen 2002:1) as explained by Gertrude Himmelfarb:

> *"the charge now is that philanthropy is all too often a self-serving exercise on the part of philanthropists at the expense of those whom they are ostensibly helping. Philanthropy stands condemned, not only as ineffectual, but as hypocritical and self-aggrandising. In place of 'the love of mankind', philanthropy is now identified with the love of self. It is seen as an occasion for social climbing, for joining committees and attending charity balls in the company of the rich and famous. Or as an opportunity to cultivate business and professional*

> *associations. Or as a way of enhancing one's self-esteem and self-approbation by basking in the esteem and approbation of others. Or as a method of exercising power over those in no position to challenge it. Or as a means (a relatively painless means) of atoning for a sense of guilt, perhaps for riches unethically acquired. Or as a passport to heaven, a record of good works and virtues to offset bad works and vices. Or (the most recent addition to this bill of indictment) as a form of 'voyeurism'"* (Himmelfarb 1995:160).

As well as promoting the interests of donors, it has been suggested that philanthropy can *"sustain privilege"* (Van Til 1990:24), *"endow the advantaged with legitimacy"* (Gouldner 1973:279) and reproduce patterns of inequality as philanthropists use tax-breaks to fund their own preferences (DiMaggio and Anheier 1990:151; Reich 2006). Other criticisms of philanthropy include the suggestion that it causes the postponement of necessary government intervention (Gray 1905; Whitaker 1974:221), which is harmful because it results in, *"holding out the mere pretence of alleviating the plight of the poor and thus impeding more meaningful change"* (Smith 2006:18). Concerns about the philanthropic activities of the rich are also related to worries about plutocracy (Bishop 2005:251) and a belief that those who dominate the economic sphere should not come to dominate the social sphere (Mulgan 2008).

In contrast, supporters of philanthropy claim that it, *"touches the lives of countless people"* every day because private donations make possible a range of public benefits including works of art, educational institutions and medical advances (Damon 2006:1). The extensive reach of philanthropy is also emphasised by advocates who insist that all members of society benefit in various ways from philanthropic acts:

> *"The good works of others, past and present, make our lives possible... for most of us, benefiting from philanthropy is not about our own hunger or homelessness but about benefiting from social change, stewardship, or the advancement of knowledge... People around the globe are the beneficiaries of scientific or medical discoveries funded by philanthropic research grants and endowments"*
> (Payton and Moody 2008:15).

Similarly, Fink claims that even critics of philanthropy should count themselves as recipients because, *"whether we approve or disapprove of philanthropy, the fact remains that it has been one of the principle methods of social advancement"* (Fink 1990:138).

The contested nature of philanthropy is widely understood, and perhaps even accepted as part of the process as, *"philanthropic interventions routinely delight, amuse and outrage those outside the relationship between giver and recipient"* (Frumkin 2006:3). These contested claims mean that the response to philanthropy is as sociologically interesting as philanthropy itself, which is why this thesis will study the meaning of philanthropy from the perspective of both the philanthropists and the public.

Two further explanations for the lack of sociological studies of philanthropy are anthropological elementarism and political economy (Cheal 1996:82). By 'anthropological elementarism', Cheal is referring to the greater enthusiasm found within the discipline of anthropology for studying all types of gift exchange, including philanthropic gifts. This literature – and its relevance to the study of contemporary UK philanthropy – will be discussed in the literature review in the next chapter.

By 'political economy' Cheal is highlighting the dominance of a set of economic theories based on assumptions regarding self-interest and profit-maximisation, which result in philanthropic acts being viewed as,

> *"one of the greatest puzzles for economics. A science based on precepts of self-interested behaviour does not easily accommodate behaviour that is so clearly unselfish"* (Andreoni 2006:1).

This activity has therefore attracted the attention of economists rather than sociologists, prompted by the puzzle of apparently non-selfish behaviour that challenges the tenets of their dominant neo-classical paradigm (Andreoni 2005:1). Despite one aim of sociology being to make intelligible those actions which at first sight appear non-logical or irrational (Boudon 1981:17-8), economists have dominated research into philanthropic giving (Hall 1992:131; Brilliant 2001:217) and the language of economics provides much of the vernacular available to explain philanthropy (Jencks 1987:322). In particular, donations are treated as transactions in which individuals rationally pursue their self-interest, so that altruism and generosity are redefined as strategic efforts to gain benefits such as power, status and control. Efforts to incorporate philanthropic donations into standard economistic models of behaviour underlie the main theoretical approaches to philanthropy. The 'public good theory of philanthropy' states that donors desire more of the service that is paid for by the gift (Weisbrod 1977) and the 'warm glow theory of philanthropy' claims that donors receive intrinsic benefits by making the gift, such as pleasure and satisfaction (Andreoni 1997; Andreoni 2001). The invention and debate of an immeasurable concept like 'warm glow' well exemplifies Halfpenny's observation that, *"Economists have been particularly inventive in identifying ways in which altruistic giving might be re-conceptualised as a form of exchange from which the donor gains utility"* (1999:211).

The successful imposition of the political economy approach to philanthropy, which insists on the existence of donor benefits, is evident in criticisms that emphasise the self-interested nature of the gift. However, there is widespread scepticism regarding the ability of abstract economic models to accurately capture philanthropic behaviour (Sugden 1982:350; Knapp and Kendall 1991:4; Frank 1996:130; Brown 1997:177; Halfpenny 1999:221). For example, Sugden examines the assumptions that lie behind the public good theory of philanthropy and finds them, *"paradoxical, implausible and inconsistent with the evidence"* (1982:350) and Knapp and Kendall reject narrow economic theories and note that *"homo economicus looks like a rather nasty figment of collective imagination"* (1991:4).

As Boudon's discussion of Dahrendorf's work explains, *Homo Sociologicus* is a very different creature to *Homo Economicus* because he follows habits and internalised values as well as preferences, he faces ambiguous situations in which 'best' choices are badly defined, his actions are shaped by a mix of individual preferences and social structures, he makes rationalisations based on available information and acts within the normative context of 'roles' (Boudon 1981:155-162). Furthermore, economic models are too narrow because they include only a small number of characteristics, such as income effects and the price of giving.

> *"Relatively little attention is paid, for example, to the questions of motivation, to the role of friendship, propinquity, power or social networks in giving, or to the possibly transforming effects of giving on the donors themselves"* (Clotfelter 2002:3).

Therefore, this thesis argues that philanthropy cannot be relinquished solely to the study of economists because it is social scientists that understand there is more to an individual's objectives in life than accumulation.

> *"'Economic man' is an absurdity. Nobody is activated only by motives of enlightened economic self-interest; there are always other, often more highly regarded, values involved. Veblen and later sociologists have made this amply clear for Western society"* (Beattie 1964:199).

Furthermore, philanthropy is an appropriate subject for sociological study because, as discussed above, it is embedded in daily life and is part of the taken-for-granted world that is the sociologists' milieu. As a majority of people make charitable donations, most of us have 'tacit knowledge' about philanthropy and it is, *"a daily experience within the sights of ordinary women and men"* (Bauman and May 2001:6), on which non-experts feel qualified to have an opinion. But this commonsensical knowledge is based on each individual's own 'life-world' and their own unrepresentative experience. Sociology can help to erect a 'critical distance' between this anecdotal view and the more objective reality. In particular, social scientific investigation is necessary because popular reactions to philanthropy range from fulsome praise to harsh criticism, demonstrating that philanthropy is far from a self-evident concept.

Despite the widely accepted need for a greater base of substantive, objective research rather than a casual acceptance of anecdotal evidence, and despite philanthropy being, *"a particularly tempting target for analysis and study – one that appears ripe for systematic thinking and reconceptualization"* (Frumkin 2006:4), British sociology has shown little interest in the subject of philanthropy and philanthropists. The result of this lack of meaningful sociological engagement with the topic of philanthropy is that,

> *"this field has been almost wholly devoid of serious analysis and scrutiny, or any assessment of impact. The majority of press coverage continues to be fawning; conferences celebrate; and most of the books that are published in this field are strings of uncritical anecdotes which wouldn't get past the mildest peer review"* (Mulgan 2008).

In a similar vein, Prewitt notes the shortage of analytical studies of philanthropy and states that this gap has been filled by books that are either, *"self-congratulatory, mostly boring, insider accounts"* or, *"shrill denunciations by outsiders"* (2009:vii). Whilst the literature review in the next chapter will examine the truth of Prewitt's claim, there is little doubt that the need for greater sociological study of philanthropy has become more urgent in the 21st century because society is changing in many ways that bear upon philanthropy:

> *"The emergence of new technologies, growing inequity, dramatic demographic shifts, and the security challenges of the post-Cold War world are a few of the trends that are combining to create a new reality that challenges many assumptions and practices in almost every sphere of life. Philanthropy is no exception"* (Fulton 2005:3).

This reiterates a point made almost four decades ago, that in contemporary society,

> *"nothing stands still in one place for very long. Old systems of thought are unhinged. The legitimacy of most forms of authority is being questioned... the institutions of philanthropy, like almost all other institutions, face a rising demand that they justify their inner life and their external affairs"* (Peterson 1970:11).

The failure of all types of social scientists, but most notably sociologists, to turn their analytical attention to the topic of philanthropy and grasp the potential that lies in studying this field (Prewitt 2009:vii) is perplexing and means that these important questions have been left largely unaddressed.

Conclusions

This introductory chapter has demonstrated that philanthropy is a significant part of contemporary daily life in the UK and, as such, is worthy of greater sociological attention than it has so far been accorded.

Despite the high profile of philanthropy, it is not a self-evident concept and research on this topic has only started to scratch the surface (Silber 1998:144). The literature that does exist is largely written by economists rather than sociologists and there is therefore a need for research that explores the non-economic properties of philanthropy (Vogel 2006:638). The dominance of American studies, discussed in the next chapter, means there is also a need for new research to identify what is distinctive about contemporary philanthropy in the UK. This thesis is therefore concerned with the non-economic properties of contemporary philanthropy in the UK. There is a manifold opportunity to present new data on an under-researched topic and to demonstrate that philanthropy is not an inconsequential activity of the rich, but rather a rich, and surprisingly untapped, area of enquiry for sociologists.

Before moving on to present and discuss the data, the next chapter presents a review of previous studies of philanthropy and philanthropists, drawing out the main themes that appear in this literature.

Chapter 2
Changing conceptions of philanthropy in the literature

The literature on contemporary UK philanthropy is sparse because philanthropy has not attracted the attention of many British academics. Aside from a scattering of historical and economical research, there has been minimal analysis of the role that philanthropy plays in contemporary UK society and no academic research has been published that addresses the meaning and purpose that the activity holds for philanthropists. However, there is an extensive sociological literature on the related topic of gift-giving and a small 'grey literature' on UK philanthropy. Researchers working in other countries, notably in the USA, have conducted many academic studies of philanthropy and philanthropists since the 1970s (Adam 2004:3) and this literature will also be reviewed in this chapter.

Much of the literature has a wider remit than a concern with the meaning of philanthropy, for example some academic studies explore the role of philanthropy within modern welfare states and some applied studies aim to produce findings that are useful for fundraisers and other practitioners who seek to raise money from wealthy people. These wider concerns are noted where relevant but this review foregrounds the central question that this thesis addresses: what does the literature say about the meaning of philanthropy in contemporary UK society? It begins with a discussion of the gift-giving literature, which is both the most obvious academic 'home' for sociological studies of philanthropy and the literature which first sparked the author's interest in this topic. There follows a discussion of the grey literature focused on philanthropy in the UK since the turn of the millennium, before widening the scope to discuss relevant literature that covers different time periods and different societies.

2.1 Philanthropy in the gift-giving literature

Attention to the role and impact of gift exchange in society was first sparked by Marcel Mauss' *Essay on the Gift* (Schrift 1997:4), which was originally published in 1950, and first translated into English in 1954, although its central idea – that supposedly voluntary gifts are in fact part of obligatory cycles of exchange – first appeared in a co-written article published decades earlier (Hubert and Mauss 1899). Mauss argues that gift exchange is the primary system for circulating goods and services in society, preceding both market- and state-based exchange, and that this system works because each gift always requires a return gift, *"in theory these (gift exchanges] are voluntary, in reality they are given and reciprocated obligatorily"* (Mauss 2002:3). The pervasive reality of the logic of the gift is illustrated with evidence, drawn from descriptions of kula exchange amongst the Trobriand Islanders and the North American Indian potlatch, that all members of pre-modern societies are drawn into a tri-partite pattern of giving, receiving and reciprocating.

Mauss was a student of Emile Durkheim and the *Essai* elaborates many of the themes and theoretical positions of his teacher, notably a belief that positivist methods could reveal objective information about how society functions, and in particular how social coherence is achieved (Douglas 2002). Given this sociological lineage, it is surprising that Mauss' insights were originally only taken seriously by anthropologists (Cheal 1988:1), although his extensive usage of ethnographic data may explain this disciplinary affinity. However, it is also likely to be a consequence of the restricted designation of the gift as a 'total social phenomenon' to pre-modern societies due to the social, economic, religious, jural and moral significance of gift exchange that was claimed to exist in such societies (Titmuss 1970:210). The notion of a radical break in the importance of gift exchange from the pre-modern to the modern world has been corrected by subsequent theorists (for example Titmuss 1970; Douglas 1996; Bourdieu 1997; Caille 1998; Godbout 1998; Douglas 2002) who argue that gift exchange remains relevant, albeit in different forms, in contemporary society. However this correction has not been widely acknowledged and there seems little general recognition of the presence of cycles of exchange, including those related to philanthropic gifts, that mean, *"[a]ny society, including our own, can be described as a total system of exchanges"* (Douglas 1996:126). The neglect of gift exchange in studies of modern societies is often attributed to the dominance of market exchange, which is assumed to have superseded the importance of the gift economy.

> *"The major barrier to the development of a sociology of gift practices has been the tendency to see them as archaic customs, whose influence on social life has been in decline for a long time"*
> (Cheal 1996:82).

A major task for contemporary gift theorists is to prove this is not so (Silber 1998:136), to demonstrate that gifts are not 'irrelevant frills' (Caille 1998:vii) and, with reference to the central focus of this thesis, to show that philanthropy, like all gifts, are social practices involving, *"profound existential and ethical dimensions"* (Caille 1998:viii).

Despite the immense impact of Mauss' *Essai* on anthropology, only two significant mid-twentieth century sociologists furthered the study of gifts, and for neither was it a central concern. Georg Simmel's work on the sociology of money included a concern with gifts of money, as he believed that gifts display,

> *"the greatest wealth of sociological constellations, because the attitudes and position of the giver and of the recipient are most diversely combined in all their individual nuances"*
> (1958:370, cited in Berking 1999:4).

Simmel's focus is on the meaning of money rather than on the meaning of giving it away, but his writing can be usefully applied to understanding both the general lack of cultural affirmation for philanthropy and its attraction to wealthy people. Simmel argues that the impersonal and essentially 'valueless' characteristics of money means that, *"a present of money is the lowest thing and the one which debases the personality the most"* (Simmel 1997:235). His observation that, *"people are willing to accept the greatest sacrifices of another person – life, suffering, honour and everything else – without damaging their honour. But not a present of money"* (Simmel 1997:239) is helpful in understanding why philanthropy – the gift of significant sums of money to unknown others – provokes such strong negative reactions in recipients and observers. Despite the difficulties that are widely experienced in accepting gifts of money, Simmel's writing on the role of money in modern culture usefully illuminates why some people still choose to make such gifts. He notes that the pursuit of money is a proximate goal, which is

expected to bring about a certain level of happiness. Once the goal of becoming rich is attained, without the concurrent attainment of wellbeing,

> *"money reveals itself in its true character as a mere means that becomes useless and unnecessary as soon as life is concentrated on it alone – it is only the bridge to definitive values, and one cannot live on a bridge"* (Simmel 1997:250).

The insight that money-making is not happiness-making, or meaning-making, is the key theme of much of the later literature on the purpose of philanthropy, discussed towards the end of this review.

The second mid-twentieth century sociologist to contribute to this debate was Alvin Gouldner, whose claim that there is a universal 'norm of reciprocity' which plays an important role in maintaining social cohesion (1960:171) owes a clear debt to Mauss. Despite arguing that reciprocity is a necessary and universal norm, Gouldner argues it is not sufficient and proposes that a second norm, of beneficence, is also required to maintain stability in the social system. The norm of beneficence is said to come about because of conditions of scarcity and disparities between those who have needs and those who can afford to meet the needs of others without requiring a return. Gouldner claims that *"Elites are defined – or define themselves – by reason of their giving something for nothing"* (Gouldner 1973:272) but then clarifies this by stating that they do not, in fact, get 'nothing' in return and that *"a reciprocity lurks in their benevolence"* (p.272). By appearing to give 'something for nothing' they transform their mundane economic superiority into something higher because,

> *"Charity legitimates the leadership positions of those who give and, by creating an 'outstanding obligation' of the lowly toward the high, it fortifies the position of those who are dominant... [charity] endows the advantaged with legitimacy"* (p.279).

Despite beneficence being necessary to maintain stability in unequal societies, it violates the more widely understood norm of reciprocity and therefore, Gouldner argues, it is not culturally valued. Giving and getting 'something for nothing' appears childlike, naïve and unrealistic, because they too closely resemble parent-child relations (p.271). Despite acknowledging the discomfort and resentment caused by non-reciprocable exchanges, Gouldner claims that those who give without demanding a return are *"heroes of social interaction"* (p.275), on the basis that, *"if it is reciprocity that holds the mundane world together, it is beneficence that transcends this world"* (p.277).

Neither Simmel nor Gouldner's interest in gifts and their consequences succeeded in drawing wider sociological interest to the topic for another decade. The first sociological study to focus exclusively on the role of gifts in the UK was Richard Titmuss' study of 'The Gift Relationship' (1970) in which the rather narrow subject matter of blood donations was selected as a measurable entity that enabled a study of the role of altruism in modern society. Titmuss concludes that the UK's voluntary blood donation system enables donors to make 'true gifts', and he argues that such opportunities to express altruism are an essential human right in free societies (p.13). Whilst Titmuss' ideas remain influential today, almost four decades later, his work did not immediately stimulate a significant body of further research into gift giving within UK sociology (Caille 1998:viii). There are also counter arguments that Titmuss exaggerated the extent and importance of impersonal giving and overlooked utilitarian reasons for apparently altruistic actions (Arrow 1972). For example, Offer suggests that unilateral or asymmetric transfers may occur when the giver is seeking 'regard' rather than an equivalent return gift;

whilst the market can only facilitate the exchange of goods, gifting can facilitate the exchange of both goods and regard (Offer 1997:452). Thus un-reciprocable or 'true' gifts occur when the giver hopes for 'regard', which includes acknowledgement, attention, acceptance, respect, reputation, status, power, intimacy, love friendship, kinship and sociability (p.451).
Gouldner, Arrow and Offer all argue that gifting creates additional benefits for the giver, and that asymmetric exchange, as exemplified in philanthropy, is a feature of inequality and, to some extent, a driver of social disintegration. An opposite view, promoted by Mauss and Titmuss, claims that gifts create and confirm social ties and constitute the 'glue' that holds society together. More recent theorists have sided with this Durkheimian position, suggesting that gifts are fundamental building blocks of society (Berking 1999), that gift theory is a theory of human solidarity (Douglas 2002:xiii) and that *"[g]ifts are the moral cement of culture and society"* (Komter 2005:112). The sociological literature on gift giving therefore includes two opposite interpretations: firstly, philanthropy as 'the godfather paradigm' due to its use of gifting as a means of acquiring and exercising power and secondly, philanthropy as the 'moral cement' of society due to its unifying effects (Osteen 2002:17-18). But there is another strand of sociological thought that does not seek to promote either of these interpretations, but instead seeks to explain how gifts – including philanthropic acts – occur and are interpreted. Two notable French theorists took up this approach to the theme of the gift: Jacques Derrida and Pierre Bourdieu.

Derrida's *Given Time* is a philosophical treatise, which argues that gifts themselves are impossible, because to fulfil the condition of being a gift they must not appear to be one. Once the giver is aware of making a gift, the intended 'self-less' gesture is cancelled out by the 'self-interested' receipt of praise and approval.

> *"For there to be a gift, there must be no reciprocity, return, exchange, counterfeit or debt. If the other gives me back, or owes me, or has to give me back what I give him or her, there will not have been a gift"* (Derrida 1992:12).

Derrida's extended deconstruction of Mauss' *Essai* argues that a 'true gift' should be aneconomic, creating no dependencies for either giver or receiver. He thus concludes that, *"the gift is the impossible. Not impossible but <u>the</u> impossible"* (Derrida 1992:7, emphasis in the original text).

Bourdieu picks up Derrida's challenge and seeks to resolve the alleged impossibility of the gift. His solution lies in what are described as individual and collective deceptions that enable all those involved in a gift exchange – the giver, the recipient and observing third parties – to pretend that the gift is devoid of self interest, and therefore a 'true gift' rather than simply an exchange. He writes,

> *"No one is really unaware of the logic of exchange... but no one fails to comply with the rule of the game which is to act as if one did not know the rule"* (Bourdieu 1997:232).

The existence of a norm dictating an appropriate time lag between gift and counter-gift is said to be the key factor in maintaining 'collective lies' about the truth of gift exchanges. If a gift were to be returned immediately it would become uncomfortably clear that the original gift had created a debt that required repaying. Whereas Derrida says the reality of the exchange annuls the gift, exposing it as "only a tit for a tat" (Derrida 1992:37), Bourdieu argues that the interval between the gift and counter gift makes possible a 'collective deception' such that the exchange can be 'misrecognised' as a gift.

> *"[The] structural truth is collectively repressed. The time interval can only be understood by hypothesising that the giver and the receiver collaborate, without knowing it, in a work of dissimulation tending to deny the truth of the exchange, the exchange of exact equivalents, which represents the destruction of the exchange of gifts"* (Bourdieu 1998:94-5).

Bourdieu takes a particular interest in understanding how people work singly and collectively to conceal the 'truth' about actions. For example, he claims that symbolic exchanges involve taboos about making things explicit, that *"practices always have double truths"* that are held together by collective self-deceptions which he calls 'misrecognition' and that *"[s]ilence about the truth of the exchange is a shared silence"* (Bourdieu 1998:95). These ideas will be used in later chapters to make sense of the data on how philanthropic acts are presented by philanthropists and perceived by the public.

It is important to note that much of the literature discussed in this section was about gift giving, rather than philanthropy and that, *"[s]urprisingly little attempt has been made to assess contemporary philanthropy from the point of view of a Maussian perspective on gift analysis"* (Silber 1998:135). Reasons for the general failure to apply gift-giving literature to philanthropy are three-fold: the demands of philanthropy-sector practitioners (such as fundraisers and grant-makers) who are more focused on practical organisational issues, ethics and social policy rather than on theoretical research; the domination of the academic study of philanthropy by economists rather than social scientists; and the fact that scholars with the greatest interest in Mauss tend to work in countries without a strong philanthropic tradition, notably France and Canada (Silber 1998).

Despite the lack of sociological concern with philanthropy, there is a practitioner-led literature, also known as the 'grey literature', which will be discussed next.

2.2 Philanthropy in the grey literature

The 'grey' literature about philanthropy is largely written and published within the sector that it purports to study. The closeness of ties between the funders and the object of study could at worst be viewed as a form of 'industry sponsorship' (Hall 1992:250) and at a minimum has led to a degree of confusion between *researching* philanthropy and *advocating* for philanthropy. Hall was writing about the US, where notable examples of this problem include the Carnegie Corporation's underwriting of the Foundation Centre in 1956, which remains one of the main centres of knowledge about US philanthropy, and John D. Rockefeller III's funding of the 1970s Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs (commonly known as the Filer Commission after its chair, John H Filer) which operated from the US Treasury and whose findings have had an enduring influence on public policy in this area (Payton and Moody 2008:46). But this situation is mirrored in the UK, where individuals or groups with explicit aims of promoting philanthropy have funded and written almost every report and book about philanthropy.

The first publication on UK philanthropy that was published in the 21st century was produced by a registered charity, the public policy think tank IPPR (Institute for Public Policy Research), with funding from the Robert Gavron Charitable Trust. 'A Bit Rich?: What the wealthy think about giving' (Edwards 2002) is based on interviews and focus groups with rich givers and non-givers. It draws on Stanley Cohen's work on 'States of Denial' (2001) to suggest that a denial of responsibility lies behind non-giving and concludes there is a need for heightened social pressure and the creation of more opportunities to enable the rich to *"make a contribution to society"* (Edwards 2002:9). This report assumes that philanthropy is *"good for society"* and takes place because *"[w]e have a shared responsibility for a common future"* and because *"a thriving society requires us to engage and involve ourselves and develop collective means of support"* (all quotes from Edwards 2002:13).

Similar assumptions regarding the outer-directed benefits of philanthropy are present in a book published two years later, which was also funded and written by pro-philanthropy organisations. 'Why Rich People Give' (Lloyd 2004) was published by Philanthropy UK[26], a voluntary organisation established in 2001 with the mission *"to promote new philanthropy, particularly among those with substantial resources"* and funded by three charitable foundations (the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, the Gatsby Charitable Foundation and the Lloyds TSB Foundation for England and Wales). The book records the findings of interviews with 76 major UK donors and 24 UK-based fundraisers and wealth advisers, that explore the attitudes of the rich to the creation, holding and philanthropic dispersal of wealth. Despite presenting original insights into the preferences and motivations of the rich donors who were willing to be interviewed, the absence of a rigorous sampling method means the findings cannot be viewed as representative, nor are the findings theorised. The book's unquestioning pro-philanthropy stance is encapsulated in the author's definition of philanthropy as acts by which rich people *"show their general goodwill to society... [and] express their humanitarian impulses"* (Lloyd 2004:27). Positive assumptions about philanthropy are also clear in the foreword, which describes the book as useful in, *"strengthening [rich people's] commitment to social engagement"* and in bringing about *"improvement to social welfare, education, health, the arts, the environment, overseas aid and development and the whole range of causes which underpin our society"* (both quotes from the foreword by Joffe 2004:4).

The third book on UK philanthropy published in the first decade of the 21st century was produced without industry sponsorship, however it shares the assumption found in Edwards' and Lloyd's books that the principle purpose of philanthropy is outer-directed, to create positive change in the wider world. 'The New Philanthropists' (Handy 2006) contains an essay on 'The New Generosity' plus profiles of 23 wealthy donors who are said to, *"use the money that they made by their business acumen to improve the lot of others"* (Handy 2006:10). Handy claims these contemporary or 'new' philanthropists are the first since the Victorian age to have both the capacity and the desire to, *"spend it well, on purposes and causes beyond themselves"* (p.10). The book begins with the statement, *"Generosity is fashionable again"* (p.1), and argues that these new philanthropists,

> *"are individuals, still in the prime of life, who have been successful in their chosen careers, made money, sometimes a lot of it, either in business or in their profession. Having made enough for their own needs they now want to use their money, their skills and their abilities to get things done to create something transparently useful in society. They talk of making a difference, of giving something back, but they*

[26] The author of this thesis has been a member of the editorial board of Philanthropy UK since 2005 and is currently publications editor of the Philanthropy UK Newsletter.

aren't satisfied by writing cheques to worthy causes, valuable though such charity can be. These people want to be in the driving seat because that's where they belong" (Handy 2006:8-9).

Handy's contentions that contemporary philanthropists are more generous than those of the twentieth century, that they are younger and more likely to be self-made and that their philanthropy is more impactful, will all be explored in chapter 6, which examines claims about the emergence of the alleged 'new philanthropy'. Despite its importance as the first widely read account of contemporary UK philanthropy, this book is flawed in its uncritical, verging on hagiographic, approach to donor profiles that appear to have been selected on the basis of access being granted rather than on their representative nature. Handy's central thesis is simply that of 'betterment': that contemporary philanthropists are better than those in the recent past, and that their alleged return to giving on the scale of the Victorians exceeds the achievements of that era due to the better impact of the 'new philanthropists'. Yet the evidence is based purely on the accounts given by interviewees, and there is no probing of the representations that the philanthropists give of themselves, nor any exploration of how their philanthropic acts are experienced and judged by the public, whose benefit they purport to promote.

Two commonalities link the recent grey literature on contemporary UK philanthropy. Firstly, their findings are all based on data gathered in interviews or focus groups and are therefore essentially self-reported accounts of the nature and drivers of philanthropic acts. Using such methodologies without reference to other data sources, such as charity accounts or impact assessments, raises questions about the reliability of the findings as, *"next to nothing is known about the accuracy of self-reports on philanthropy"* (Bekkers and Wiepking 2007:41); the studies presented in this thesis will use other methodologies to avoid replicating any errors inherent in this approach, as discussed fully in section 4.2. The second common theme is the shared, and explicitly stated, belief that philanthropy is fundamentally an act that is concerned with creating positive change in the wider world, as such they all promote the suggestion that philanthropy is outer-directed rather than inner-directed. This contrasts sharply with much of the historical literature, discussed in the next section, which frequently emphasises the benefits to donors above any benefits to the wider world.

2.3 Claims about philanthropy in the historical literature

In the historical literature, donor benefits are presented as typical and understood to be an integral element of philanthropic acts in previous centuries. A study of the earliest recorded philanthropy finds that donor benefits featured in Ancient Rome, when significant donors could demand character references for court cases and elections (Nightingale 1973:103). The earliest studies of philanthropy in the UK make similar claims. Rosenthal's study of aristocratic philanthropy in the 14th and 15th centuries finds that, *"Medieval charity was primarily aimed at the spiritual welfare of the donor, rather than at improving the worldly conditions of the recipients"* (1972:130). Belief in an after-life and the ability to influence the length of time spent in purgatory by purchasing prayers for one's soul meant the pursuit of salvation is described as the over-riding motivation for philanthropists during this period (p.10). For example, sizeable gifts to churches were rewarded with dedicated altars (chantries) and the right to burial in that place (p.125). A typical illustration concerns the charitable donations of *"Joan Holland [who] maintained three priests whose only duty was to celebrate for the soul of her late husband, the Earl of Kent"* (p.15). When philanthropists of this period made gifts that did involve benefits for others, such as founding almshouses or endowing a hospital, it was understood that they, *"were built for the glory of God and the soul of the founder"* (p.57) and donors gained a variety of

benefits, from having daily prayers said in their name to the right to dictate the daily routine and conditions of residents, including their clothing and meals (p.73).

Religious beliefs and the pursuit of salvation continued to be a primary driver of philanthropy in the following centuries. Jordan's history of philanthropy in England from 1480-1660 charts the changing attitudes that accompanied the Reformation, especially the rise of Protestant individualism, to which he attributes the increased willingness to create and steward money for the glory of god. Even those who failed to leave behind a tangible monument to their generosity aspired to receive a favourable funeral sermon relating the extent of their good deeds in life. The publications of such sermons, elegies and epitaphs, preached by Puritan clergymen, helped to make some philanthropists famous and are considered a major driver of giving during that period (Gray 1905:87; Jordan 1959:215).

Owen's history of English philanthropy, which takes up where Jordan leaves off and covers the period from 1660-1960, also cites piety as one of the major motivations for philanthropy, notably Puritan ideals regarding diligence in accumulating money and prudence in spending it (Owen 1965:13). The religious motivation for philanthropy is obviously especially compelling for those *"for whom heaven and hell were realities"* (Prochaska 1990:379), who saw philanthropy as a *"hedge against hell"* (Davis 1996:17) and a means of guaranteeing salvation in the next life (Andrews 1950:19; Rosenthal 1972:11; Williams 1989:9). Even for those who did not take such a mechanistic approach to purchasing salvation through philanthropy, religious formulations regarding the blessed state of poverty (Rodgers 1949:1-2) and the incompatibility of riches and redemption (Whitaker 1974:44) meant donations were widely viewed as a soul-saving opportunity for redemption (Davis 1996:17) or *"a fire-escape to heaven for the rich"* (Whitaker 1974:32). Inter-denominational religious debate is also claimed to have been an impetus for philanthropy (Ditchfield 1998) with dissenters, Catholics, Protestants and other denominations keen, at different times in history, to illustrate the superiority of their version of faith (Jordan 1959:230). Such competition extended to using philanthropy as a recruiting tool, for example, charity schools were described as a project, *"to check the progress of papery"* (Owen 1965:28).

Benefits other than religious salvation are also found to be historically typical. In the pre-welfare state era when the funding of healthcare was left entirely to private individuals, those who provided financial support to hospitals received significant donor benefit in the form of voting rights whereby donors could nominate and elect applicants for relief (Prochaska 1990:374). This benefit was a strong inducement as gaining admittance for relatives or employees in need of medical care could save the donor a greater expense (Gray 1905:130-1; Owen 1965:46; Waddington 1996:195). It was also, as Florence Nightingale observed, *"the best method for electing the least eligible"* (cited in Owen 1965:48). A case study of philanthropy and hospital finances in late-Victorian England demonstrates that hospital appeals in that era promised an array of material, social and medical benefits to donors (Waddington 1996). Hospital governors' instinctive understanding of their patrons' motivations is said to have enabled them to manipulate what they believed would stimulate charity (p.182). Such stimulation included the more benign attractions of annual balls and the more insidious appeal for financial support on the grounds that hospitals, *"provided the training ground for doctors who could use the techniques perfected on the poor to aid the wealthy"* (p.186-7).

Owen also identifies a further form of donor benefit generated by the philanthropy of this period: that of 'riot insurance'. The twin shocks of the Industrial and French Revolutions are frequently cited as drivers behind the expansion of English philanthropy, for example the chains of soup kitchens that emerged in the last decade of the 18th century were, *"a means of keeping the populace, if not contented, at least reasonably submissive"* (Owen 1965:97). The emergence of new forms of poverty created by the Industrial Revolution, such as unemployment and slum dwellings, are claimed to have spurred philanthropists because,

> *"the new poor were often not just impoverished but masterless. Owing no social obligations, they were outside the hierarchy of Tudor society and were seen as a common threat to stability"* (Williams 1989:9).

Rodgers describes the post-Revolution period as the turning point at which philanthropy became oppressive and more concerned with ensuring beneficiaries accepted authority and 'knew their place' (1949:13). The writings of a philanthropist from this time, Sarah Trimmer, confirm this view as she recommends that English women visit the poor in their own homes as a means of averting social unrest (1801:57-9). Trimmer and her contemporary Robert Raikes, founder of the Sunday Schools movement, also believed that education for the poor would counteract the revolutionary tendencies of the time (Rodgers 1949:128). Across the Atlantic, American philanthropists took a similar position, for example Henry Lee Higginson, benefactor of Harvard University, wrote, *"Educate and save ourselves and our families and our money from mobs"* (cited in Whitaker 1974:53).

From this perspective, a major function of philanthropy is to apply social control by the benefactor upon the beneficiaries, enabling the worst consequences of economic modernisation to be diminished without the economic leaders relinquishing control over society (Lassig 2004:210). Thus the philanthropist is conceived not as a generous donor but as an imposer of hegemonic bourgeois values upon the working class in order to prevent popular revolt and preserve the institutions of capitalism (see, for example, McGann 1977; Jones 1981). However, the most crude social control theories are now considered rather reductionist and an over-simplification of the philanthropic motive, which fails to acknowledge that philanthropy involves some degree of interdependence between rich and poor (Leeuwen 1994; Daunton 1996; Ross 1996). Prochaska mounts an attack on the central thesis of social control by suggesting,

> *"If fear of domestic revolution was a crucial consideration, the ruling classes could have done a more effective job of controlling their social inferiors by passing general statutes. To rely on the chaos of ad hoc charitable institutions, many of which were rivals and at cross purposes, was not a very efficient form of subduing the disaffected"* (1990:371).

Although Owen discusses the role of philanthropy in personal religious salvation and as a means of social control, he also charts the rise of an approach to philanthropy that is more focused on creating change in the wider world than in protecting the personal interests of the donor. Owen describes the emergence of benevolent humanitarianism during the 17th and 18th centuries, defined as *"hopefulness about mankind and the improvability of society"* (Owen 1965:13), as being embodied in much of the philanthropy of that era. The Poor Law of 1601 is cited as a pivotal moment, which led to,

> *"a dramatic acceptance of social responsibility by numbers of private citizens, many of them affluent and successful... [they] contributed to the fashioning of an ethic of social responsibility which was to be the hallmark of the liberal society"* (p.2).

The 1601 Poor Law created a parish-based system of poor relief that formalized the notion that the main burden for caring for others should be borne by benevolent citizens (Owen 1965:2). This other-regarding impulse behind philanthropic acts became more urgent as, *"[r]apid population growth and burgeoning industrial urbanization... brought human problems not easily solvable by traditional rural paternalism"* (Humphreys 1995:1). Urbanization and the development of crowded living environments, with rich and poor living close together, led to a, *"broader willingness amongst the better-off to appreciate the worsening plight of the poor in difficult times"* (Humphreys 1995:3).

The significant social and political changes brought about in the Age of Reform, including the establishment of parliamentary democracy and a professional civil service, the decline of aristocracy and the rise of science, secularism and free expression, affected the chosen methods and beneficiaries of philanthropy. For example the growth of empiricism saw a move away from random alms-giving to more efficient, 'scientific charity', such as that based on case work and knowledge of the conditions of individual poor families (Tompson 1979:37). The author of 'The New Philanthropy', published long before the contemporary identification of this breed of donor, also identifies a mix of factors that promoted the philanthropic spirit in this era:

> *"The rigid methods of the reformed Poor Law, post-war depression, a growing humanitarian spirit, combined with the revival of corporate life... were doubtless responsible for the welter of charitable schemes which came into being in the first half of the nineteenth century"* (Macadam 1934:43).

The 19th century rise of liberalism also encouraged charity and acts of philanthropy because of its belief that the well-being of individuals could not be left to unrestricted market mechanisms. The growing popularity of liberalism combined with the national confidence engendered by England's reign as undisputed world power during this century, is said to have found expression in the development of municipal philanthropy, such as Chamberlain's projects in Birmingham (Humphreys 1995:4).

Despite the hopefulness of 19th century philanthropists, a number of historians suggest that private philanthropy was an ambitious but ultimately unsatisfactory attempt to provide welfare services to the 'deserving poor', which was inevitably supplanted by a tax-funded universal welfare state. Owen writes of philanthropy's 'ultimate inadequacy' and the realisation that services such as education and healthcare *"were too vital to be left to the hit-or-miss operation of private charity"* (1965:36).This teleological version of history is also advanced by the Fabian historian Gray who describes the financial exhaustion amongst philanthropists at the end of the alleged 'golden era of philanthropy' when excessive hopefulness turned to dissatisfaction and whose *"unsuccessful efforts to relieve poverty brought this matter in all its serious significance to the attention of the state"* (1905:34). Yet it is easy to overstate the 'exhaustion' felt by philanthropists,

> *"Though there were changes over time in the ways philanthropists spent their money, neither David Lloyd George's extension of the income tax nor the general expansion of state services in the early twentieth century diminished the British enthusiasm for philanthropy"* (Ross 1996:181).

Eventually, with the creation of the welfare state in the mid-twentieth century, the state took over many of the functions of philanthropy, including the funding and running of hospitals and schools and the provision of a wide array of welfare services. When these new institutions were created, public opinion overwhelmingly predicted they would make philanthropy superfluous[27]. However, private philanthropy was not beaten into retreat by public spending (Prochaska 1990; Cunningham and Innes 1998:1) and it has continued to feature as a form of expenditure[28] and an aspect of upper class life for the duration of the twentieth century and into the start of the twenty first century.

In addition to seeking salvation, material benefits and social control, a further donor benefit frequently discussed in the historical literature is the role of philanthropy in propelling social mobility. The expectation that members of the elite will be philanthropic was identified in a study of medieval philanthropy, which concludes that benevolent actions were often undertaken because the elite of that period were *"subtly subject to the pressures of a culture which regards such actions as worthy"* (Jordan 1959:144). Widespread expectation that those in possession of wealth would make philanthropic gifts means that philanthropy in the medieval period is often depicted as a norm to be complied with, rather than as an impulse from within. However, it is during the Victorian era that philanthropy is most often depicted as a key mechanism behind social mobility and is described as providing an opportunity for 'new money' to buy the status required to be integrated into the elite by exchanging money for social capital. Indeed, it is often depicted as obligatory in this era when, *"those who wished to rise in the world of society had best exhibit a decent interest in good works"* (Owen 1965:165). Prochaska notes that this impetus applied to people of all classes as, *"whatever one's station, contributions to philanthropic causes were a sign of that much sought after status, respectability"* (1990:366). In addition to contributing to elevated personal status, philanthropy is said to have provided opportunities for the creation and maintenance of elite culture, due largely to the opportunities it created for socialising and conviviality, and the association of charity with fashionable causes. As well as entry into elite society, philanthropy provided ongoing opportunities to meet and build relationships with the noble and the famous (Waddington 1996:187). Charity was highly fashionable in Victorian society, in part due to the influence of popular culture, as disseminated in novels such as Oliver Twist (Rodgers 1949:19) and in part due to the development of fundraising techniques centred on celebratory dinners, balls and anniversary events where charity and conviviality coalesced (Owen 1965:48; Waddington 1996:186; Lloyd 2002:27). Prominent eighteenth century philanthropic ventures capitalised on the increasingly symbiotic relationship between philanthropy and elite culture (Lloyd 2002:29). For example, supporters of the Foundling Hospital in London included the artist William Hogarth, whose paintings hung on the institution's walls, and the composer George Frederick Handel, who raised funds with annual performances of his composition 'The Messiah'. The association with such prominent supporters meant the Foundling Hospital became, *"a popular rendezvous for London society"* because it combined *"that rare trinity, Art, Charity and Fashion; to be able on the same occasion*

---

[27] According to a 1948 survey reported by Chesterman (1979), as cited in Kendall and Knapp 1996.

[28] For example, private fundraising for hospitals continued after the establishment of the NHS due to *"local enthusiasm and pride, as well as gratitude for treatment"* (I. Williams (1989) *The Alms Trade: Charities Past, Present and Future*. London: Unwin Hyman Ltd, p.102). Indeed, the compatibility of private and public funding continues to be evident more than 50 years after the founding of the welfare state, as sixteen hospitals were listed in the top 500 biggest fundraising organisations (C. Pharoah, C. Walker et al (2006) in Charity Trends 2006. London: CAF/Caritas Data, p.46). Furthermore, charitable income accounts for over 10% of three of the UK's best known hospitals: Guys Hospital, Great Ormond Street Hospital and Christie Hospital (J. Mohan and M. Gorsky (2001) *Don't Look Back? Voluntary and charitable finance of hospitals in Britain, past and present*. London: Office of Health Economics and Association of Chartered Certified Accountants, p.98.

to visit the orphans, discuss a modern picture and parade the latest costume" (both quotes from Rodgers 1949:34).

A further example of the juxtaposition of philanthropy with fashion in that period is the anti-slave trade movement, which gained cachet and greater public awareness when the pottery manufacturer Josiah Wedgewood produced cameos depicting slaves. Like an early version of the charity ribbons and wristbands that became a popular means of expressing support for causes towards the end of the twentieth century, Wedgewood's designs, *"were soon to be found throughout the country and were used for the lids of snuff boxes, as hair pins and bracelets"* (Gray 1905:195).

Of course, historical accounts do not suggest that philanthropists were driven solely by their own needs and took no account of the wider social context. Indeed, there is a strong strain of historical materialism in accounts of the ways in which philanthropic solutions arose to meet new needs. For example the 18th century philanthropist Jonas Hanway is said to have established the Marine Society in order to solve the twin problems of saving destitute boys from the streets and boosting naval recruitment (Owen 1965:59), the spread of medical and dispensary charities is said to have occurred soon after outbreaks of the plague (Gray 1905:132) and, in a European example of demand-led philanthropy, it is claimed that *"the frequent falling of the Dutch into their numerous canals led to the formation of a society in Holland for the care and restoration of the partially drowned"* (Gray 1905:168). However, Jones claims that a supply-side conceptualisation of philanthropy offers a more convincing account than the 'extraordinary behaviourism' apparent in demand-driven accounts of philanthropy (1996:55). Understanding philanthropy as fundamentally supply-driven can help, for example, to explain why the rich citizens in Victorian Liverpool spent their largesse on art galleries, museums and parks whilst their poor neighbours lived in extreme squalor (Williams 1989:46). As Tompson notes, *"the interests of the recipients were rarely considered... The good of the poor – or the deserving poor – was determined by donors"* (1979:71).

A particularly useful study relating to this claim that philanthropy is supply-driven concerns an examination of the geographical location of almshouses in the UK. The study concludes that the provision of such residential institutions does not relate to the geographical distribution of need but is rather the product of 'sentimental space', reflecting the philanthropist's own attachment to particular places (Bryson, McGuiness et al. 2002). The spatial lottery of almshouses is a good example of Salamon's concept of 'philanthropic particularism', which notes the discriminatory provision of nonprofit goods and services due to their supply depending on donor enthusiasm rather than objective assessments of need (Salamon 1992). Whilst this claim may appear counterintuitive, it is an unsurprising consequence of the legal status of philanthropy. Unlike democratically accountable public spending by governments, philanthropic spending priorities are determined solely by the possessors of wealth, meaning that, *"philanthropists do not rely upon what individuals want at any given moment, but upon what philanthropists think those people need"* (Gillespie (1986) cited in Til 1990b:27).

This review of historical accounts demonstrates that for many centuries philanthropy was primarily understood to be about saving rich donors' souls and protecting the upper class from social unrest, but it became more outer-directed and concerned with saving the poor from destitution during the 18th and 19th centuries. However, whilst the emphasis may have largely shifted from donor-focused philanthropy up to the 18th century, to cause-focused philanthropy in the 19th and 20th century and then back to donor-focused philanthropy in the 21st century (as discussed in the following section), there have been competing currents in every period. For example, Cavallo identifies the turn of the eighteenth century as the point at which philanthropy became focused on the magnanimity of the giver rather than on the needs of recipients

(1998:120). She claims this change was tied up with the process of emerging city-states, when elites sought to dominate city life by making donations as part of a competitive strategy to distinguish themselves from their rich peers. Such ostentatious displays of generosity, primarily concerned with demonstrating personal prestige, meant that recipients of charity disappeared from public view (p.119).

Whilst clearly there are competing currents and motivations in every era, this review of the literature does identify broad shifts in emphasis from the donor to the cause and back again. The growing popularity of liberal political philosophy and belief in interventionism resulted in the twentieth century creation of a welfare state, which raised question about the ongoing role for private philanthropy. As the cause-focused aspects of philanthropy appeared to be made redundant by a system that promised to care for every citizen from cradle to grave, the donor-focused aspects of philanthropy have re-emerged as an important driver of philanthropy. This review turns now to the literature produced in more recent years to discuss the representation of philanthropy and philanthropists in the contemporary period.

2.4 Claims about philanthropy in the contemporary literature

It is important to note that much of the contemporary academic literature on philanthropy and philanthropists is produced in the US and is based on data collected in that society; therefore findings cannot necessarily be transferred unproblematically to other societies, including the UK. However, in the absence of any significant academic interest in this country, the themes in this literature are identified and discussed insofar as they relate to the research question of this thesis regarding the social meaning of contemporary UK philanthropy.

Most contemporary studies argue that philanthropy is not just an economic transaction that seeks to fund changes in the world but is also – perhaps primarily – a moral and social act, which contains meaning for the philanthropist. All three of the most influential studies on philanthropy that were produced at the end of the twentieth century promote this view.

The first to be discussed is a series of studies rather than a single publication. Paul Schervish has been studying wealth and philanthropy amongst American millionaires for over twenty years and has published the outcomes of his research in a number of publications, occasionally with a co-author (Schervish and Herman 1988; Ostrander and Schervish 1990; Schervish 1992; Schervish 1994; Schervish and Havens 1995; Schervish and Havens 2001). On the basis of interviews with 130 millionaires in ten American metropolitan areas he concludes that *"[p]hilanthropy, along with the entire range of financial engagements, is for the wealthy inextricably linked to the dynamics of self-construction"* (1992:332). Greater possibilities for self-construction are identified as a primary attribute of the wealthy whose resources give them, *"the ability to construct rather than merely live (even well) within one's social environment"* (1992:329). Schervish coins the term 'hyperagency' to describe this enhanced capacity of the wealthy which enables them to establish and substantially control the conditions under which they and others live (Schervish 2000b:20). Whereas non-wealthy people exist within the confines of limited resources and can, at best, hope to join with others in an effort to influence the world, the wealthy can set their own agenda and accomplish their desired consequences single-handedly (Schervish 2001:6-7; Schervish 2005:64). Schervish questions Marx's famous dictum that people make history but not under the circumstances of their own choosing, by noting that in fact the wealthy can *"make more history than others"* (2005:62). Schervish also argues that everyone – rich or otherwise – creates a story with themselves at its centre, yet normative expectations of wealth holders mean they are obliged to formulate more elaborate

self-justifications about the direction their lives have taken. He therefore concludes that philanthropy is part of the efforts undertaken by rich people to write their 'moral biographies', by which he means the *"narrative procedures they [use to] explain how it is possible for them to be rich and good at the same time"* (1994:167). These biographies are not necessarily entirely accurate, *"[t]hey are constructed and sometimes even contrived stories in which the personal quest for riches is told as a quest for a richer life"* (1994:168).

This idea of philanthropy as a vehicle for transforming 'riches' into a 'richer life' is one that recurs in the more recent US literature, but donor benefit is the dominant theme in the two other significant studies published in the 1990s: 'Charity begins at Home' by Theresa Odendahl (1990) and 'Why the Wealthy Give' by Francie Ostrower (1995). Both studies are based on interviews with wealthy US donors and both conclude that the prime purposes of philanthropy are to support elite culture, to fund elite institutions and to create bonding social capital within the upper classes (Odendahl 1990; Ostrower 1995).

Odendahl's research, based on interviews with 140 millionaire philanthropists, finds that charitable giving by the wealthy primarily supports upper-class institutions such as Ivy League Universities and that, *"[e]lite American philanthropy serves the interests of the rich to a greater extent than it does the interests of the poor, disadvantaged or disabled"* (Odendahl 1990:3). She therefore concludes that philanthropic culture is about breeding, taste, influence and power: *"Philanthropy is essential to the maintenance and perpetuation of the upper class in the United States...non-profit activities are the nexus of a modern power elite"* (p.4). Odendahl describes her interviewees as 'conspicuous contributors' whose philanthropic activity, *"engages them, giving them a sense of identity and meaning"* (1990:5). The echo of the century-old notion of 'conspicuous consumption' (Veblen 1994) is no doubt intentional as she describes philanthropic acts as a means of acquiring status both within and outside of their class (Odendahl 1990:4).

The claim that philanthropy is closely connected to attaining and maintaining elite status and culture is made with equal force by Ostrower in her study based on interviews with 99 wealthy donors in New York city. Like Odendahl, Ostrower also notes philanthropists' preference for funding elite institutions, such as Ivy League universities and arts institutions, rather than pro-poor welfare services, and she attributes this to philanthropy being primarily an arena for status competition amongst the elite (1995:28). Ostrower suggests that donations to alma maters are inspired by loyalty, identification with other alumni and indebtedness to the philanthropy supplied by earlier generations, yet she also finds that the more prestigious the school, the more likely their alumni are to support it and she therefore concludes that, *"donors derive personal prestige from association with institutions that are prestigious in the eyes of their peers"* (p.90). The other popular cause amongst the rich – the arts – is found to be at an advantage in attracting philanthropic support because it is integrated into the lives and interests of elite donors, for example wealthy couples support cultural organisations because it offers a shared activity (p.92). Association with elite arts institutions is also useful for status building, as network density (percentage of donors knowing each other socially) is highest for cultural organisations (p.95). Ostrower concludes that philanthropy is central to upper class life and identity formation because it *"comes to function as a mark of class status that is connected to elite identity"* (p.25).

The major studies of philanthropy that were published in the 1990s, discussed above, are all primarily focused on the effect that philanthropy has on the donor, although its 'world-changing' aspects were not entirely overlooked in that decade, for example Gurin and Til describe philanthropy as a *"social safety net that compassionately responds to society's otherwise neglected needs"* (1990:8). Despite the focus of late-twentieth century studies on the ways in which philanthropy transforms the donor rather than the world, there has been something of a shift in emphasis back towards the outer-directed benefits of philanthropy in the literature that has been produced so far in the 21st century.

Damon and Verducci's edited volume, 'Taking Philanthropy Seriously' (2006) emphasises the change that philanthropic acts make in the wider world. The introductory chapter begins with a laudatory statement regarding the achievements and potential for philanthropy to improve society:

> *"Philanthropic gifts have filled the world with knowledge, art, healing, and enduring cultural institutions dedicated to the betterment of society. Every day, all over the world, philanthropy touches the lives of countless people, bringing them education, improved health, intellectual and spiritual elevation, and relief from misfortune. Moreover, philanthropy's full potential for improving the human condition no doubt extends beyond any contribution that has yet been realised"* (Damon 2006:1).

Despite emphasising the outer-directed benefits, it is acknowledged that philanthropy *"carries with it the idiosyncratic stamp of that donor's intent... [because they] give from a spirit of passionate concern about something meaningful to them"* (p.3). However, the presence of donor benefits is downplayed in this book which insists that, *"altruism [is] at the center of the philanthropic mission"* (p.10).

The subtitle of Peter Frumkin's book 'Strategic Giving: the art and science of philanthropy' expresses his belief that philanthropy combines both inner and outer-directed aspects: the 'art' of philanthropy being the opportunity for donors to express their values and the 'science' being its effectiveness in making an impact on the world (2006:xi). Frumkin identifies five functions of philanthropy: creating social and political change (p.11); locating and supporting important social innovations (p.14); achieving *"a modest measure of economic equity"* through redistribution (p.16); an affirmation of pluralism as a civic value, counterbalancing the tendency of government towards bureaucratization (p.17); and *"meeting the psychic and social needs of donors"* by enabling philanthropists to find meaning and purpose in their lives (p.18). The first four of these functions concern philanthropy's impact on the wider world and the fifth concerns its impact on the donor but Frumkin alleges the importance of this fifth function is now neglected. He claims that, *"the private values and commitments of donors have been squeezed out"* (p.102) and wider public benefits are being pursued at the expense of donors' private values (p.90). However, this review of the literature shows that any such shift is a recent phenomenon as donor benefit has been foregrounded throughout much of history, up to and including the end of the twentieth century.

Frumkin's argument is that philanthropy, *"has both public and private functions, enabling communities to solve problems and allowing individuals to express and enact their values"* (p.21). This formulation moves beyond the infertile dichotomies discussed in the introductory chapter, which involve viewing philanthropy as either purely altruistic or purely egoistic and instead embraces both the outward and inward looking aspects of philanthropic acts. Yet Frumkin acknowledges that, *"the strange, and at times jarring, interaction of public needs and private choices that giving promotes"* (p.21) can make philanthropy perplexing to observers. The need to embrace the existence and importance of both public and private benefits is due to the latter being not an irrelevance or an unintended side-effect, but a crucial element,

> *"It is impossible to talk about the functions or purposes of philanthropy without recognising that it has an important impact on the giver that must be considered part of the core rationale for philanthropy"* (Frumkin 2006:19)

Instead of retreating from acknowledging the private benefits of philanthropy, as it is alleged has happened in recent years, Frumkin suggests that the 'core challenge' of philanthropy is, *"finding causes that connect [philanthropists] to their values and passions and that intervene effectively in the world to produce significant public benefits"* (p.53, emphasis added).

As with the previous book, the subtitle of the next publication to be discussed reveals its focus on the outer-directed aspects of philanthropy. Joel Fleishman's 'The Foundation, A Great American Secret: How private wealth is changing the world' argues that since, *"the great age of American philanthropy was born, the biggest donors made explicit their desire to use their giving to influence society"* (Fleishman 2007:41). Fleishman's focus is on philanthropy conducted through private foundations rather than by individuals but, as discussed in the methodology section of chapter 4, this is a reasonable proxy as a majority of major donors choose a foundation as the vehicle for their giving. Based on interviews with 112 foundation staff, trustees and donors, Fleishman identifies three roles of foundation philanthropy: as a driver of social change, as a funding partner to nonprofit organisations and as a catalyst for innovation (p.3-4). He further identifies the drivers of contemporary philanthropy as greater awareness of immense global problems, growing impatience with governmental efforts to solve or ameliorate these problems and the accumulation of wealth in the hands of individuals who are willing, and in their view able, to tackle them (p.274). The rise of a class of donors who have the capacity and the desire to be 'world changing' agents is supported by Ottinger's study of individuals who are said to be 'beyond success' because they enjoy complete financial security, and have therefore moved to a higher level of personal introspection related to their life's purpose and calling (2008:32).

Despite his strong emphasis on the 'world changing' functions of philanthropy, Fleishman endorses Frumkin's distinction between expressive and instrumental giving and notes that, *"[r]easons for making large donations... vary from the purely altruistic to the self-serving, and include a large grey area where the two blend"* (p.35). He also acknowledges that, *"[s]elf- or dynasty-promotion has always been understood, accepted and even lauded as perhaps the primary driver of perpetual foundations"* (p.xi). But he insists that *"one overarching motivation remains paramount for most donors: the desire to create a vehicle for promoting large-scale, lasting social change"* (p.39).

The final book on contemporary philanthropy to be discussed is Robert Payton and Michael Moody's 'Understanding Philanthropy: Its meaning and mission' (2008). Despite stating that philanthropy involves both values and actions, the authors identify five roles for philanthropy, all of which emphasise actions: providing services, advocating for reform, preserving cultural traditions, building community and funding social innovation (Payton and Moody 2008:34-5). The authors do not dwell on any of the inner-directed aspects of philanthropy as their concern is largely with distinguishing the contribution of philanthropy from that of government and business. Whilst acknowledging that these other sectors can contribute to the public good (p.87), the enduring existence of philanthropy in every era and every culture (p.131) is attributed to the human response to living *"in a less than perfect world"* (p.65) and the shared belief of philanthropists is said to be, *"that the world can be made better through rightly directed human efforts"* (p.122). Therefore Payton and Moody promote the view that philanthropy is primarily, if not exclusively, an outer-directed activity.

2.5 Discussion of the literature on philanthropy

The limited academic interest in the topic of philanthropy has a number of implications. Philanthropy in the UK has not attracted specific sociological attention, and the related field of gift-giving has rarely been applied to the types of gifts that are the focus of this study, which are significant monetary gifts made by rich individuals to unknown others. Secondly, as economists and historians have thus far dominated the study of philanthropy, their disciplinary biases have influenced the nature of the field (Brilliant 2001:217). The assumptions and methods of disciplines other than sociology have therefore shaped the approach to studying, and our subsequent understanding of, philanthropy. Thirdly, the non-economic and non-historical research into UK philanthropy comprises a 'grey literature', which has been undertaken by non-academic researchers, often funded from within the philanthropic sector, and primarily intended for an audience of fundraisers who are concerned with learning how to raise money from wealthy people. It therefore often fails to meet the basic criteria expected of research, including robust sampling and theoretical reflection. Fourthly, the domination of the field by academics working in the USA means that key concepts are shaped by the history and cultural norms of that country and the data upon which theories are built is based on the behaviour and attitudes of that population. It is essential to bear in mind all these limitations of the published literature, not least because they help to indicate where new research can most fruitfully add to the knowledge about philanthropy.

This literature review has discussed the persistent interest in addressing the question of 'who benefits from philanthropy?' and the ongoing concern to establish whether the meaning of philanthropy is primarily about changing the donor or changing the world. The most recent literature on US philanthropy, published since the start of the 21st century, has emphasised its outer-directed benefits, as does the most recent study of UK philanthropists (Handy 2006). Yet throughout history, up to and including the end of the twentieth century, philanthropy has been largely understood as an activity that generates significant donor benefits. The strategic use of philanthropy as a way to implement donors' preferences and values, to assert their class interests and to pursue their personal search for meaning and purpose in life, have all been dominant themes in the literature.

The suggestion that philanthropy creates significant benefits for the donor appears to contradict the public understanding of philanthropy as a vehicle by which the more advantaged in society meet the needs of the poor and marginalised (Odendahl 1990; Ortmann 1996; Wagner 2000), yet as this review shows, the presence of benefits is both historically typical and widely accepted as an essential motivating factor behind the voluntary dispersal of private resources for the public good. However, there is also a substantial strand within the literature, including those gift-giving theorists who describe gifts as the 'moral cement' of society as well as the most recent, early 21st century writers, who emphasise the outer-directed benefits of philanthropy.

It is patently true that the extent of the resources that significant philanthropists command, and their 'hyperagency', means that they are able to exchange money for the realization of their own values and to impose those values on others (Til 1990b:29; Schervish and Havens 2001:96). Yet it is equally clear that some philanthropic acts correct asymmetries in the human condition and create a fairer distribution of resources (Fink 1990:157; Payton and Moody 2008). This thesis will therefore explore the extent to which contemporary UK philanthropists emphasise inner- and outer-directed benefits, and what perspective the observing public takes on their philanthropic acts.

Of course, it is perfectly possible that private and public benefits co-exist. The suggestion that philanthropy typically involves benefits for both donors and recipient is supported by a research review of twenty studies of both donating and volunteering[29] which finds that mixed benefits are the norm and concludes that *"motivational multiplicity is the usual pattern"* (Til 1988:25). This finding supports the suggestion that philanthropy is simultaneously private and public, a personal act as well as a social and collective reality (Payton 2001:481). As Hustinx and Lammertyn argue, contemporary individuals engaging in philanthropic acts are *"oscillating between collective and reflexive biographical sources of determination"*, such that the same act brings benefits to both the self and the community (2003:170). A philosophical investigation of philanthropy deems the presence of mixed benefits, *"morally acceptable, even desirable insofar as it strengthens the overall pursuit of good ends"* (Martin 1994:123). Viewing philanthropy as either *"a purely productive tool for meeting pressing public needs"* (Frumkin 2006:368) or as solely about philanthropists' *"search for meaning"* (Ritzenhein 2000:54) fails to appreciate the dual role that philanthropy can play in creating change in the donor's life as well as creating change in the wider world. Therefore, the opposition of private values and public purposes is likely to be a false dichotomy which, *"overlooks the fact that the majority of donors ultimately want to produce both private and public benefits"* (Frumkin 2006:370). The simultaneous fulfilment of private and public needs is one of the themes identified by those authors who claim that a 'new philanthropy' has recently emerged. 'New philanthropists' are said to be seeking to fulfil their own needs for meaning whilst also achieving a significant impact on society (see, for example, Handy 2006; Bishop and Green 2008; Mackenzie 2008). The extent to which there is anything distinctly 'new' about early 21st century philanthropists will also be explored in this thesis.

[29] All twenty studies were published in the Journal of Voluntary Action Research, which was subsequently re-named the Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly.

This literature review has reflected many of the paradoxes about philanthropy such as the simultaneous pursuit of private and public benefits and the fact that philanthropic dispersals of wealth can only occur as a result of the pursuit of self-interest. Whilst donor benefits are typical, and possibly even necessary, they are not necessarily acceptable to the public. It is not within the scope of this thesis to assess whether philanthropy is successful in creating change in the world, but rather to assess whether the meaning of contemporary UK philanthropy is about causing external transformation in the world or whether, in common with much of the literature reviewed here, it is found to be more about the transformation of the donor.

Conclusions and structure of the remainder of thesis

This review of the literature highlights the lack of sociological interest in the topic of philanthropy and the lack of empirical findings based on UK data. This thesis therefore has a two-fold opportunity to add to knowledge by offering a sociological analysis of philanthropy in the UK.

The introductory chapter and this literature review both show that philanthropy in the UK is an emerging and contested idea. It is not a major focus of interest in either the popular media or the academic literature, but when it does receive attention, diverse claims are made about what philanthropy is and why philanthropic acts occur. The differences between these perspectives creates tensions and misunderstanding, such that even the basic terminology used to describe philanthropic activities are loaded and evoke ideological reactions; these are not simple definitional problems but integral to the central questions and arguments about the meaning and purpose of contemporary philanthropy in the UK.

Both the introductory chapter and this literature review have shown that the study of philanthropy, insofar as it exists, has focused primarily on questions regarding 'how much' and 'why', with minimal focus on 'to what' and 'for what purpose'. Questions about quantities and motivations are important, but so too are questions about the destination and purpose of philanthropic activity. This thesis is therefore more concerned with the meaning of philanthropy, for both philanthropists and the wider society, than with questions about quantities and individual motivations.

The specific research questions that emerge from the introductory chapter and this literature review, to be explored in this thesis are:

1. What are the distinctive features of contemporary UK philanthropy?
2. What is the meaning and purpose of philanthropy from the perspective of both donors and the wider society?
3. Is there a new philanthropy?

These questions are addressed in the remainder of this thesis, which is comprised of four data chapters and a concluding discussion. The first of the data chapters identifies the most significant philanthropists operating in the UK in 2006 (the most recent year for which data was available at the time of data collection) and discerns systemic patterns within their aggregate behaviour in order to create a new typology of contemporary philanthropists. The next two data chapters examine different perspectives on the meaning of philanthropy, firstly as it is experienced by philanthropists and secondly as it is experienced by the public. Both perspectives are examined because, as this review has shown, givers and observers often differ in their interpretation of the meaning of philanthropy; gaps between these perspectives may be fruitfully explored to identify the source of conflicting interpretations of this activity. The

fourth data chapter focuses on the evidence of the emergence of a 'new philanthropy'. Within each of the data chapters the methodology used for that part of the study will be explained and defended, further relevant literature will be described and the discussion of the findings of each chapter will draw on relevant sociological theory. The final chapter will draw together the findings of all parts of the study in order to arrive at answers to the research questions that drive this study; it will also reflect on the methodological issues raised in this thesis and will look ahead to potential future research in this area.

Chapter Three
A new typology of contemporary UK philanthropists

As the introduction and literature review have demonstrated, there is a lack of empirical knowledge about contemporary UK philanthropy, and also a lack of clarity about what this activity entails and signifies. This chapter begins to fill both gaps by presenting the findings of a study to identify the most significant philanthropists operating in the UK in the year 2006 and by presenting a new typology: the 'Eight Logics' of philanthropy, which classifies different approaches to undertaking philanthropy and identifies emerging trends in contemporary UK philanthropy.

3.1 Creating a sample of significant UK philanthropists

The biggest obstacle facing anyone wishing to study UK philanthropy is that there is no pre-existing list of UK philanthropists to refer to, and there is not even consensus about what criteria should be used to define membership of such a list. This deficiency has to be rectified before any further exploration of contemporary UK philanthropy can take place. Therefore, the first step for this thesis is to define the criteria and create a sample of significant philanthropists that can be used as the focus for the rest of this study.

Four separate sources were used to identify the most significant philanthropists operating in the UK in 2006, which was the most recent year for which complete datasets (such as financial reports and accounts) were available during the data collection phase. The four sources used in compiling the sample are as follows:

1. The donors that funded the 100 biggest private and family charitable foundations in existence in 2006[30]; this source generated 97 names[31].
2. The members of the Sunday Times Rich List 2006 who are named in that year's 'Giving Index', on the basis of their charitable donations constituting the largest percentage of their net worth[32]; this source generated 30 names.
3. The people who are identified on at least two occasions as philanthropists within major national[33] newspaper stories about philanthropy in 2006; this source generated 53 names[34].

---

[30] As identified in *Charity Trends 2006* (Pharoah, Walker et al 2006).

[31] This resulted in 97 names donating to 99 foundations because two donors (Charles Wolfson and Timothy Sainsbury) use more than one foundation as a vehicle for their giving, and one foundation was excluded (The Kulika Charitable Trust) as it fundraises from the general public rather than processes donations from the founder. In 2006, the largest of these foundations (David Sainsbury's Gatsby Charitable Foundation) distributed £40 million and the smallest (the Alliance Family Foundation) distributed £0.6 million.

[32] The Rich List and the Giving Index are both published within the same annual report, the Sunday Times Rich List. The Giving Index is a measure of relative generosity because it identifies the 30 members of the Rich List who gave most in that year, relative to their wealth, rather than those who made the largest donations in absolute terms.

[33] Restricting this filter to national newspapers proved necessary due to the enthusiasm amongst local and regional press for describing people as 'philanthropists' when they made quite limited donations, or simply had a kindly demeanour. The sixteen national newspapers searched were the daily and Sunday editions of The Times, Telegraph, Guardian, Independent, Express, Mail, Mirror and the Sun; these newspapers were chosen on the basis that they appear in the LexisNexis database, which is an online, searchable archive of the full content of most UK newspapers.

4. The people identified as having made single charitable donations worth at least £1 million in 2006[35]; this source generated 66 names.

These four sources generated a total of 246 names, 45 of which appeared in two of the sources, twelve of which appeared in three of the sources and two of which featured in all four sources[36]. Once duplications were removed, 170 names remained in the sample. Appendix A contains the list of these 170 names and key characteristics regarding their wealth and philanthropic acts.

The approach used to create the sample cannot guarantee to have identified every significant philanthropist operating in the UK in 2006 as each source of data has some weaknesses. For example, the Giving Index only identifies philanthropists who are amongst the 1,000 names on the Rich List, as the entry level to appear on this list in 2006 was £60 million it does not include philanthropists whose net-worth is £59 million or less. Furthermore, philanthropists who made significant donations before 2006 may not appear in the 'Giving Index' for that year, but if they 'banked' it in a charitable foundation rather than made immediate donations it will continue to be available for philanthropic distribution in 2006 and beyond[37]. There is also a risk that the chosen approach misses anyone who gave both anonymously and directly (i.e. who sent an anonymous sum of money directly to a charity rather than through a method that creates some sort of paper trail) *and* who has avoided media coverage *and* whose single donations of £1 million or more have not appeared in any public record. But a donor would have to fall through all four nets to avoid being caught in this sample, and in the absence of any other viable means of identifying the intended subjects, this method was considered the most viable option for assembling a robust sample required to achieve the research objectives.

Having created a list of the most significant philanthropists operating in the UK in 2006, a wide range of sources of data were consulted for each person in the sample, as shown in table 3.1.

---

[34] Three people described as 'philanthropists' in multiple media reports were excluded for the following reasons: Jeffrey Archer is a fundraiser, rather than a donor of his own money (see, for example, 'Jeffrey Archer: Why I just get on with life' in the Times, 11/10/08 which reports his success in raising £2.2m for 50 charities in 2007); Brookes Mileson is described as 'philanthropic' in the sense of routine generosity of spirit, rather than as a maker of major donations (see, for example, 'Gretna's Field of Dream', Sunday Times 5/03/06); and Michael Brown did not fulfil his philanthropic pledges and was later convicted of fraud (as, for example, reported in the Independent on 28/11/08, 'Absent Liberal Democrat donor convicted of fraud').

[35] These names were identified during the research for a project on Million Pound Donors, undertaken by the author as part of her paid work at the University of Kent. Names were identified from secondary sources, notably charity annual reports and media coverage and by primary research contacting donors, charities and the Institute of Fundraising.

[36] The two names that appeared in all four sources are David Sainsbury and Peter Vardy.

[37] As, for example John Lancaster, who topped the first Giving Index in 2003 as a result of giving £6.6m to his Lancaster Foundation but has not since appeared on the Giving Index.

Table 3.1: Data sources for creating a sample of significant UK philanthropists

	Proportion of sample for which data was available		
Data source	**Almost all (>80%)**	**Most (50-80%)**	**Less than half (<50%)**
Charity Commission register of charities	X		
Foundation Annual Report for 2006	X		
Foundation governing document		X	
Foundation Summary Information Return for 2006		X	
Sunday Times Rich List 2006		X	
Website of their charitable foundation			X
Print media coverage in 2006			X
Online biographical sources, e.g. Know UK			X

An SPSS database was created to hold all the information that was gathered about each philanthropist, including their age, gender, location, source of wealth and religion, plus information on the ten largest donations they made in 2006. For each of these ten donations, three pieces of information was collected: the value of the donation, the name of the recipient organisation and the charitable sub-sector of the recipient[38]; the list of charitable sub-sectors is given in Appendix B. Restricting the data collection to the ten biggest donations is clearly an arbitrary figure, but the time and resources available to produce a thesis mean that limitations are inevitably imposed on the scope of the study. However, once the data collection was underway, it became apparent that almost half (42%) of significant philanthropists made fewer than ten donations in the year under study, as shown in Table 3.4.

During the data collection phase of the research, new variables were added to this database as the importance of their inclusion became apparent or a new source of data became available, for example access to the Know UK database enabled the inclusion of extra biographical details. A maximum of 113 variables were collected for each case and a list of these variables is provided in Appendix C.

A Philanthropic Text database was also created to hold larger pieces of qualitative data, including the text of foundation charitable objects, direct quotes made by philanthropists (for example in speeches and profiles), references to the philanthropists in media coverage and any further notes accumulated during the research.

[38] For example the first donation of case 1 was found to be: £2 million to Brighton City Academy, sub-sector Education.

3.2 Characteristics of contemporary UK philanthropists

Age

It was possible to establish the date of birth of 127 members of the sample (75%). The mean age of significant philanthropists in 2006 was 69; the oldest was 90 (Kirby Laing) and the youngest was 31 (Zac Goldsmith).

Gender

It was possible to identify the gender of all significant philanthropists: 146 are male (86%) and 25 are female (14%). This adds up to 171 philanthropists, as a married couple made a joint legacy worth over £1 million, which is treated as a single case in the rest of the analysis.

Mortality

Due to the opportunity for making major philanthropic acts within legacies and the unique nature of charitable foundations as the only organisational form which can be established to exist 'in perpetuity', not all of the philanthropists identified in this study were still alive by the end of 2006. 50 members of the sample (30%) are known to be dead[39], of whom half died recently (between 1996-2006) and half died prior to 1996. Whilst the presence of dead individuals in the sample had not been anticipated, the use of legacies and foundations as a vehicle for philanthropic acts means that death does not constitute a bar to exerting influence on the ongoing distribution of philanthropic spending.

Wealth

Despite widespread assumptions that philanthropists are either equivalent to, or a sub-set of, the super-rich, 39% of the living philanthropists in this sample do not appear on the Sunday Times Rich List 2006, which describes the 1,000 wealthiest UK-based individuals and families[40]. Furthermore, as shown in table 3.2, those that do appear in the Rich List are not only in the upper echelons of the list; just a fifth of the richest 100 members of the Rich List are identified as significant philanthropists and more than half (57%) of those who are identified as significant philanthropists for this study appear in the Rich List at position 201 or below.

Source of wealth

It was possible to identify the source of wealth of 155 of the sample of significant philanthropists. The Sunday Times Rich List 2006 finds that 767 of the UK's richest 1,000 people (i.e. 77%) are self-made (Beresford 2006:10). In figures that closely mirror the composition of the contemporary rich, 72% of the members of the sample discussed in this thesis are self-made, as shown in table 3.13.

[39] 4 members of the sample are so secretive that it is not even possible to establish if they are alive or dead, see discussion of 'Secret Operators' later in this chapter.

[40] This equates to 76 entries on the Rich List as four appear as family groups: siblings Roger & Peter De Haan; the Laing family, the Moores family and siblings Ann Gloag and Brian Souter.

Table 3.2: The number and placing of significant philanthropists in the 2006 Rich List

Position in the Rich List	Number of significant philanthropists in this position	Of those significant philanthropists that appear anywhere on the Rich List, the percentage that appear in this position
Top 100	20	26%
101-200	14	18%
201-300	8	11%
301-400	6	8%
401-500	7	9%
501-600	5	7%
601-700	3	4%
701-800	3	4%
801-900	3	4%
901-1000	6	8%

Amount of giving

Total identifiable charitable assets held by the 170 philanthropists in 2006 amounted to £9.8 billion, and in that year, an identifiable £955 million was distributed and spent on charitable activity. This can be calculated as a percentage of total wealth, but with the caveats that only the wealth of those philanthropists that appear in the Sunday Times Rich List is known, and that these figures are often disputed. The total known wealth of the sample is £48.9 billion, and their £955 million of known philanthropic donations represent 2% of total wealth. This figure is twice as big as the 0.9% of income given away by the general population, as discussed in section 1.1, however, taking account of the unknown wealth may substantially reduce this differential.

Methods of giving

The majority of the sample (82%) conduct their philanthropy through a personal or family foundation, as shown in table 3.3. Of the rest, six (4%) left a legacy to a named charity (as opposed to leaving a legacy to set up a foundation) and twenty-three (14%) made donations directly to operating charities.

Table 3.3: Breakdown of sample by main method of giving in 2006

Method of giving	Number of cases
Legacy	6 (4%)
Irregular gifts during life	23 (14%)
Charitable foundation	141 (82%)

Quantity of donations

The number of donations made by each philanthropist during 2006 varies widely, as shown in table 3.4. A sizeable minority (15%) made only one identifiable donation in that year, although the majority (58%) made ten or more donations.

Table 3.4: Number of known donations made by each philanthropist in 2006

Number of donations	Number of philanthropists	Percent of philanthropists[41]
1	26	15%
2	11	6%
3	12	7%
4	9	5%
5	4	2%
6	2	1%
7	0	–
8	1	1%
9	4	2%
10 or more	98	58%
Unknown	3	2%

[41] This column adds up to 99%, due to rounding errors.

Destination of donations

Significant philanthropists make donations to every charitable sub-sector, as shown in table 3.5.

Table 3.5: Percentage of largest and 10th largest donations going to charitable sub-sectors

Charitable sub-sector	Percentage of total number of donations given to this sub-sector	Percentage of largest donations given to this sub-sector	Percentage of 10th largest donations given to this sub-sector
Education	18	24	13
Arts & Recreation	15	18	13
Medical	15	13	10
Religious	15	10	15
International development	9	11	5
Welfare	8	9	14
Environment	6	5	8
Other/Don't know	14	10	22

Despite all charitable sub-sectors being the recipient of some donations by significant philanthropists, the sub-sectors traditionally viewed as most 'elite' (for example by Odendahl 1990; Ostrower 1995) – education[42] and the arts – receive a disproportionate share. Together these two sub-sectors receive a third of the total number of donations (33%), which is nearly twice what the most 'pro-poor' sub-sectors – international development and welfare – receive, at just 17% of total donations.

This distributional pattern is exacerbated by the uneven spread of donation size across the ten biggest donations, which is shown in table 3.6. Instead of a steady decline in value from the 1st to the 10th donation, the first donation tends to be particularly large, with a sudden drop in size from the 2nd donation onwards. This is partly affected by the 26 philanthropists who are known to make only one donation, and therefore concentrate all their philanthropic resources in one gift, but even in those cases where donors make multiple donations, they tend to give one or two that are much larger than the others. This distributional pattern can be exemplified by comparing the median[43] largest gift, at £588,000 with the median size of the 10th largest gift, which at £21,000 is almost 30 times smaller.

[42] Clearly, donations to 'education' charities are not necessarily elitist, for example they could include support for organisations providing educational opportunities for disadvantaged children, but this sub-sectoral classification contains many donations to two types of organisations widely viewed as elitist: independent (private) schools and universities.

[43] Due to the extremely big variety in size of largest donation, which ranges from £3,850 to £55,000,000, giving a standard deviation of 5208842, the median is used to indicate average donation size. The mean, which is affected by these outliers, is £1.9m, and the mode, at £2m, is affected by the frequency of donations to City Academies which carried a fixed 'price' of £2m in 2006. City Academies are UK schools that are directly funded by central government, are independent of local government control and may receive additional financial support from personal or corporate sponsors; the fee to be a private academy sponsor was set at £2m until 2009 (see 'Labour scraps £2m fee for academy sponors' in The Guardian, 7/09/09).

Referring back to table 3.5, the sub-sectoral destination of this uneven spread of donations can also be seen to favour elite causes, which receive a larger proportion of total donations, plus a greater proportion of the biggest donations, whilst welfare charities receive less overall and a larger proportion of the smallest donations. However, this table should be read with care, as donations that are 'smaller' are not necessarily 'small': the 10th donation made by somebody distributing many millions could still result in a large absolute gift to a non-elite cause. The figures presented in table 3.6, showing the minimum, maximum, mean, median, mode and standard deviation of the sample's ten largest donations, are provided to help illustrate the data.

Table 3.6: Statistical information on the size of the ten largest donations made by significant philanthropists (in £000)

Donation	N	Mean	Median	Mode	Standard Deviation	Min	Max
1	151	1,906	588	2,000	521	3.9	55,000
2	124	396	100	100	792	1	5,800
3	112	248	77	50	501	1.6	3,000
4	107	164	50	50	367	1	2,800
5	106	118	40	50	253	1	1,800
6	104	114	34	25	258	.347	1,500
7	102	92	27	20	204	.500	1,400
8	102	82	25	20	195	.500	1,300
9	101	66	23	20	165	.250	1,300
10	98	61	21	10	151	.600	1,000

Conclusion on characteristics of the sample

Describing key features of the sample begins to create a picture of the characteristics of significant philanthropists and highlights some interesting findings regarding the size and destination of donations, but it only brings a limited degree of clarity to our understanding of contemporary UK philanthropy because it is not possible to discern broader patterns that cut across these characteristics or to identify any clusters of features that might indicate the existence of sub-categories of philanthropists.

As the introduction and literature review have demonstrated, philanthropy is neither an obvious nor a straightforward idea: it is socially constructed and context-specific. A particular aspect of inadequacy in our understanding of philanthropy is rooted in the use of generalisations, which mask significant internal diversification. There is great diversity within the single label of 'philanthropist' that is widely used to describe people undertaking a wide variety of dissimilar acts. People can use their private wealth to fund public benefit in a wide range of activities, including support for arts and cultural activities, humanitarian work and the promotion of animal welfare. Yet the same moniker of 'philanthropist' is applied to people undertaking acts as diverse as preserving Old Master paintings, feeding the starving and caring for old donkeys. Therefore, learning that someone is 'a philanthropist' tells us little about the nature of the actor's behaviour and their intentions. The concept of 'philanthropist' has lost its explanatory power because it is over-stretched and a more precise understanding of the meaning and purpose of

philanthropy requires greater refinement of what is currently a vague and ambiguous realm of activity. The rest of this chapter therefore explores the possibility and usefulness of creating a set of 'ideal types' of philanthropists in order to introduce some nuance to the concept under study.

3.3 The role of ideal types in sociological analysis and prior typologies of philanthropists

The concept of using 'ideal-types' in sociological analysis was pioneered by Max Weber, who considered them a basic building block of social scientific enquiry and employed them within his writing on bureaucracy and status groups, and his delineation of types of authority (McIntosh 1997:142). However, Weber was merely refining a practice familiar to political scientists and historians who had long been using such 'ideal typical' terms as 'feudalism', 'capitalism' and 'economic man'. This practice is also apparent in some of the most influential early sociological accounts, for example, Tönnies' famous distinction between *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* involves two ideal types that were never intended as accurate descriptions of any particular society (McIntosh 1997:3).

Weber considered ideal types to be analytical constructs, implying no evaluation or ethical standard but simply referring to the construction of certain elements of social reality in a logically precise conception. As such they are 'one-sided' abstractions that serve as a device for understanding and analysis (Morris 1987:61). As Weber wrote,

> *"Ideal types are heuristic devices, they fulfil their logical purpose when they lead to a more precise understanding of components of society, help to clarify characteristics and significance"*
> (Weber 1949 cited in Eldridge 1970:227).

Whilst ideal types are conceptual models that are intended to be helpful in describing and analysing reality, they should not be thought of as empirically valid or real.

> *"Ideal types are conceptual models that help us to understand the real world... they are analytical devices that are constructed by social scientists in order to understand the more complex reality that actually exists"* (Fulcher and Scott 2003:41).

Perhaps anticipating future critiques of this approach, Weber warned against confusing reality with ideal types, noting that this conceptual tool becomes pernicious *"as soon as they are thought of as empirically valid or real"* (Weber 1949 cited in Eldridge 1970:228). Ideal types are never found in reality, as Coser notes with reference to some of the ideal types created by Weber: *"[t]here has never been a full empirical embodiment of the Protestant Ethic, of the 'charismatic leader' or of the 'exemplary prophet'"* (1977:224). But the absence of tangible equivalents does not prevent the ideal type from being a useful means of clarifying, making comparisons and drawing conclusions about empirical reality. For example, justifying his own creation of three 'ideal types' of authority, Weber argues that,

> *"...the kind of classifications and terminology set forth above has in no sense the aim – indeed it could not have it – to be exhaustive or to confine the whole of historical reality in a rigid scheme. Its usefulness is derived from the fact that, in a given case, it is possible to distinguish what aspects of a given organized group can legitimately be identified as falling under or approximating to one or another of these categories. For certain purposes this is unquestionably an advantage."* (Weber 1949:383).

Ideal types can be (and sometimes are) dismissed as grotesquely simplified caricatures of complex realities, but the typology in this thesis is offered in the Weberian sense of seeking to offer a more precise understanding of a concept – philanthropy – that is in need of clarification.

Previous attempts to establish typologies of philanthropists

The literature contains a number of efforts to break down the generalised category of 'philanthropy' into sub-types. A discussion of each of the previously published typologies follows, including the key respects in which they differ from the new typology presented in this thesis.

The academic study of philanthropy was only established in the 1970s, but by the mid-1990s, three typologies had been published: Schervish's five 'Strategies' and sixteen 'Logics' by which the wealthy carry out their philanthropy (Schervish and Herman 1988; Schervish 1992), Odendahl's four types of philanthropist (1990), and Prince and File's 'Seven Faces of Philanthropy' (1994). No further typologies appeared for over a decade until the publication of Rooney and Frederick's 'Portraits of Donors' (2007), which identifies twelve 'archetypes' of philanthropists. All four of these typologies are discussed in detail below, but it is important to note that they are all based on US data. The 'ideal types' presented in this thesis therefore constitute the first typology of contemporary UK philanthropists.

Paul Schervish's extensive contribution to the sociology of philanthropy is largely based on findings from his study on Wealth and Philanthropy, which involved 130 interviews with individuals holding a net worth of at least $1,000,000 or having a gross annual income in excess of $100,000. The final report of this study (Schervish and Herman 1988) contains a typology of five different 'strategies' of giving by the wealthy, which are said to be manifested in sixteen different 'logics' of giving as summarised in Table 3.7.

Table 3.7: Five 'strategies' and 16 'logics' by which the wealthy carry out their philanthropy (adapted from Schervish 1992:329-30)

Strategy	Definition of strategy	Manifestations of this strategy in a 'logic' of giving
Personal engagement	Direct personal contact and exchange of information between donors and beneficiaries with priority given to recipient needs.	1. Consumption – Donors materially benefit from the organisations to which they contribute.
		2. Empowerment – Donors seek simultaneously to enhance their own sense of self-empowerment and to give over some active organisational control to beneficiaries.
		3. Adoptive – Donors attend personally to recipient needs in an ongoing and multifaceted relationship.
Mediated engagement	Contact between donors and recipients is mediated by organisations or other individuals, although knowledge and concern for recipient needs may be high.	4. Contributory – Donor gives to a cause and has no direct contact with recipient.
		5. Brokering – Donors solicit other key donors in their own network.
		6. Catalytic – Organisers donate time to mobilise large number of other donors in a mass appeal.
Donor-oriented engagement	Donors governed and mobilised by their own circumstances rather than by those of recipients.	7. Exchange – Giving is propelled by mutual obligations within a network of donors.
		8. Derivative – Giving is based on obligations associated with job expectations or family responsibility.
		9. Noblesse oblige – Philanthropy grows out of decisions to designate part of family money for social involvement.
Organizational engagement	Donors focus on using or improving the organisational aspects of philanthropy.	10. Managerial – Efforts focus on improving the organisational effectiveness of philanthropic groups.
		11. Investment – Philanthropy is viewed as raising and applying economic and human capital to achieve discernible outcomes.
		12. Entrepreneurial – Hands-on efforts apply innovative logics to fulfilling needs.
		13. Productive – Above-market business relations with employers, suppliers, or consumers, are viewed as philanthropy.
Outpost engagement	Philanthropy as a personal extension of the donor's family or ideology.	14. Memorial – Philanthropic endeavours create outposts or enduring presences of one's self or others.
		15. Programmatic – Conscious effort unites giving activities in order to achieve a coherent programme of outcomes.
		16. Missionary – Active educational efforts aim to achieve social change through individual transformation.

Schervish bases his typology on strategies rather than motivations, because claims regarding motives are said to involve fundamentally irresolvable *"philosophical debates over selfishness and selflessness"* (Schervish 1992:331). He also argues that a focus on normative orientations rather than ethical motivations sits more comfortably within the Durkheimian and Weberian tradition. Schervish does not claim that his typology is either exhaustive or exclusive; indeed he notes that many of his millionaire donor interviewees were engaged in a number of different philanthropic strategies. But he does argue that one particular logic tends to dominate each individual's approach to philanthropy and that it is, therefore, possible to talk about mutually exclusive 'types' of philanthropists. This thesis follows Schervish in both respects, believing that a focus on behaviour is more appropriate and feasible than a focus on motivations, and agreeing that donors exhibit a range of behaviours, but it is possible to identify a primary logic behind their philanthropic acts.

A more reductionist approach to typologising is offered by Odendahl (1990) who identifies just four types of philanthropist as a result of interviewing 140 millionaire philanthropists in the USA. Odendahl justifies the use of a typology on the grounds that it allows *"a closer look at patterns and nuances of beliefs and behaviours"* (p.79). Four distinct types, or 'composite characters', are identified on the basis of personal characteristics of donors, notably their gender, religion and source of wealth, as summarised in table 3.8.

Table 3.8: Typology of millionaire US philanthropists, adapted from (Odendahl 1990)

Types of millionaire US philanthropists	Description
Dynasty	People who attribute their philanthropic values to being raised within a strong family tradition of giving and religious training. Dynasts are active members of upper-class life, e.g. they attend elite private schools and elite cultural functions. Having inherited money, they experience self-doubt and feel a greater need to demonstrate their accomplishments. Philanthropy helps to assuage the personal internal conflict of rich inheritees and provides an ideological rationale for wealth holding.
Lady Bountiful	Women who do not need to do paid work because they inherited or married money. These women have status due to their class membership but lack power due to their gender. Whilst philanthropy is one option among many for her husband, it is her only option, so she is trained to assume her cultural duties early in life and is likely to be a life-long volunteer. The idea of 'making herself' refers to successfully administering philanthropy rather than having a career. Her success in the philanthropic field will help her children to be accepted into elite networks.
First Generation Men	Self-made, often older white men who created wealth in high technology industries, real estate, oil, retail or manufacturing. 'Behaving appropriately' with money, including being philanthropic, is a way of securing entry to 'high society'. They become more comfortable about charitable giving as they get older and face their own mortality. Are often anti-government and opposed to leaving too big an inheritance to children; philanthropy is therefore partially a default option for spending surplus.
Elite Jews	Having faced historical oppression, persecution and ostracism, Jews are keenly motivated to provide for their own and to enter established society. Jews comprise 4% of the American population but have formed 19% of all private grant-making foundations. Jews wish to maintain their distinctive identity and to be accepted into the dominant elite, they use philanthropy to get to the top of both Jewish and white Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) worlds.

Each of the four types identified by Odendahl is said to demonstrate different logics with regards to giving, and to occupy different status positions within the hierarchy of elite philanthropic culture (Odendahl 1990:xiii).

The third typology is arguably the best known and most widely cited. Described by Prince and File in their book, 'The Seven Faces of Philanthropy: a new approach to cultivating major donors' (1994), the sub-title makes clear that the book is aimed at fundraising practitioners rather than the academic community. Despite the applied nature of their work, the authors are both trained social scientists and they explicitly locate the approach taken in 'Seven Faces' within the tradition of generating ideal types:

> *"we were aware of many instances in which developing a typology or framework, to describe types of human behavior has been useful in moving a field forward"* (Prince and File 1994:x).

The seven types of philanthropists identified by Prince and File, are based on conducting surveys and interviews with affluent individual donors, defined as those who have committed at least $1 million to a giving vehicle, such as a private foundation, and who have distributed at least $50,000 to a single non-profit within the previous two years (that is, the early 1990s). Cluster analysis of data on donor motivations results in the seven types described in Table 3.9.

Table 3.9: The Seven Faces of Philanthropy (adapted from Prince and File 1994)

'Face' of Philanthropy	Percentage of US philanthropists represented by this type	Summary of type
Communitarians	26%	'Doing good makes sense'
Devout	21%	'Doing good is God's will'
Investors	15%	'Doing good is good business'
Socialites	11%	'Doing good is fun'
Repayers	10%	'Doing good in return'
Altruists	9%	'Doing good feels right'
Dynasts	8%	'Doing good is a family tradition'

The most recently published typology is based on the behaviour of high net-worth philanthropists in the USA (Rooney and Frederick 2007). Twelve 'portraits' of donors, summarised in Table 3.10, are based on statistical differences identified in a survey of charitable giving of 30,000 randomly selected households in high net-worth neighbourhoods across the US, defined as areas with an average household net worth of $1,000,000 or individual incomes of over $200,000 a year. The types were created as a result of analysing cross tabulations of giving and identifying statistically significantly differences from the rest of the sample, with a further criteria that the types make 'intuitive sense' (Rooney and Frederick 2007:5).

Table 3.10: The Twelve Portraits of donors, (adapted from Rooney and Frederick 2007:6)

'Portrait' of donor	Definition of this type of donor	Characteristics of this type of donor
The Very Wealthy	Households with a net worth of $50 million or more.	On average, give 10 times as much to charity as other wealthy households. Most likely to create a foundation or donor-advised fund, which receive 34.4% of all giving by this type of donor. Next most popular causes are health (20%), education (15%), arts and culture (11%) and religion (10%), least popular causes are disaster funds (2.9%) and those serving basic needs (2%).
The Bequeather	Households that report having a provision in their will where they will leave 25% or more to charity.	On average, give 4.5 times as much to charity than non-bequeathing households. Have both more income and more wealth than non-bequeathing households. More likely to feel financially secure, donate stock, set up foundations or donor-advised funds and volunteer more than 200 hours a year.
The Devout Donor	Households attending religious services weekly (or more often) and donating to religious causes.	The average (mean) devout donor gives less to charity than the average secular donor but the median devout donation is higher. Predictably, religious beliefs are a prime motivation and 29.9% of donations go to religious causes. Devout donors are more likely to volunteer than secular donors.
The Secular Donor	Households that do not attend religious services and do not give to religious causes.	Give 43.5% of donations to foundations. Give 23.5% to health causes, far higher than the 4% given to health by devout donors.
The Entrepreneur	Households with 50% or more of their net worth in entrepreneurial assets.	Giving is more diversified across the range of subsectors than non-entrepreneurial households. On average, give more to education, the environment and international causes. More likely to be motivated by desire to set an example for their children.
The Dynast	Households that give their children money, which the children use to donate to charity.	On average, give more to organisations meeting basic needs and to arts & culture organisations than other high net-worth households. More likely to be high frequency volunteers and over half are also bequeathers.
The Metropolitan	Households whose primary residence is in a city with a population of 500,000 or more.	On average, give more to arts & culture but less to foundations; relatively low levels of giving to religious causes (7.9%). Slightly higher educated and more likely to be childless than average.
The High Frequency Volunteer	Donors who reported volunteering more than 200 hours per year.	On average, more likely to support disaster relief, arts & culture, international and environmental causes. More likely to regularly attend religious services than other high net-worth households.
The Strategic Donor	Households that have created foundations and/or donor-advised funds and that give to relatively few charitable subsectors.	Make larger charitable donations than non-strategic households. On average, more likely to donate to foundations, basic needs, education and arts & culture. More likely to leave a charitable legacy than transactional donors.
The Transactional Donor	Also known as 'chequebook donors', who give to many or all of the charitable subsectors and who have not created a foundation or donor-advised fund.	Give less to all types of causes than strategic households, except to disaster relief. More likely to volunteer than strategic donors. Less likely to include children in their philanthropy than strategic donors.
The Altruistic Donor	Households that report being motivated by a sense that *'one should help meet critical needs in society'* or that *'those with more should help those with less'*.	More likely to volunteer than financially pragmatic donors. More likely to have children than financially pragmatic donors. Give a larger percentage to health (35%) than to any other subsector and the relatively low proportion of 8% to education.
The Financially Pragmatic Donor	Households that reported being concerned about the *'return on their financial investments'* and *'feeling more financially secure'*.	Give less to charity than altruistic donors, in particular give less to organisations meeting basic needs. Give largest slice to education (27.6%) and just 3.6% to health.

It is important to note that Rooney and Frederick's data is based on a low response rate (4.6%) and the possibility that those replying did so because they had a 'good story' to tell is also likely to affect the representativeness of their findings. Furthermore, unlike the other typologies discussed above, the 'Twelve Portraits' are not exclusive types: philanthropists are assigned to multiple 'types' rather than identifying the 'best fit', as the authors state:

> *"Individual respondents can be in one or more archetypes, as many people wear multiple hats and have multiple values in their real lives"* (Rooney and Frederick 2007:4).

However, it is arguable that allocating the same donor to multiple categories weakens – perhaps even wipes out – the explanatory power of a typology and its valency as a heuristic device. Non-exclusive types fail to fulfil the core purpose of a typology: to make clear distinctions between significant characteristics. Therefore, Rooney and Frederick's 'portraits' are more a checklist of explanations for charitable giving than an analytical device capable of clarifying the complex reality contained within the concept of philanthropy.

Discussion of previously published typologies

The basic features and organising principles of previous typologies are summarised in table 3.11.

Table 3.11: Summary of typologies of philanthropists in the extant literature

Typology	Author	Date published	Organising principle	Country
Five Strategies and Sixteen Logics of Philanthropy	Schervish	1988	Philanthropists' style of engagement with donors	USA
Four Types of Elite Philanthropists	Odendhal	1990	Donors' ascribed and achieved characteristics	USA
The Seven Faces of Philanthropy	Prince and File	1994	Philanthropic motivations	USA
Twelve Portraits of Donors	Rooney and Frederick	2007	Explanatory factors for philanthropic acts	USA

Having reviewed all existing typologies, it was concluded that a new typology was needed to address the gaps and weaknesses identified in prior models, and to capture the distinctive characteristics of types of philanthropists operating in contemporary UK society. In addition to being based on UK data, the new typology differs and improves upon previous typologies in the literature in four ways. Unlike Odendahl's four types, the Eight Logics are based on the donors' philanthropic transactions rather than their personal characteristics. Unlike Rooney and Frederick's twelve portraits, each of the Eight Logics is an exclusive category with no overlaps to muddy the conceptual model. Unlike Prince and File, the Eight Logics refer to classifiable philanthropic acts (the size and destination of donations) rather than imputed motivations. Finally, unlike all the other typologies under discussion that gather data from interviews and surveys, and therefore risk, respectively, subjective accounts of behaviour and low response rates, the methodology behind the creation of the Eight Logics typology is based on secondary analysis, enabling data collection on the full sample.

Methodology to create the Eight Logics typology

The new typology is based on an inductive analysis of a dataset containing extensive information on 170 significant UK philanthropists, as described in the first part of this chapter. All the data collected on these significant philanthropists (to a maximum of 113 variables per philanthropist) was reviewed, but the key variables used to create the typology are those that record the value and destination of each philanthropist's ten largest donations. As noted above, this information was largely gathered from official documents, notably foundation annual reports and accounts, and other documents filed with the Charity Commission, and these sources were supplemented by data from media reports of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006, gathered for the analysis presented in chapter 5.

The focus in this study on just one year (2006) has a number of limitations that must be acknowledged upfront. Firstly, it may be an untypical year – indeed the fact that Warren Buffett's multi-billion dollar donation to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation happened in June 2006 means it was certainly an unusual year for global philanthropy, although any knock-on effect in terms of encouraging UK philanthropists to follow suit would probably not have taken effect until 2007. Perhaps more significant was the impact of giving in response to the Asian tsunami which occurred on 26th December 2004. This disaster prompted a larger response than to any preceding disaster appeal and had an unquantified effect on both levels and direction of giving (Pharoah, Walker et al. 2006:2). As donations made in early 2005 would appear in accounts published in 2006 (which were used for this study), it is possible that the data overstates the level of concern for international aid and that such donations temporarily displaced donations to other causes. The cross-sectional nature of the study (being just a 'snapshot' of 2006) means that it fails to isolate such contingent, time-specific, factors. Having a focus on just one calendar year also means it is unable to capture dynamic changes in philanthropic identities that develop over time: some of the significant philanthropists that appear in the database may have dramatically reassessed the scale or the direction of their giving in subsequent years. The only way to rectify disadvantages in cross-sectional studies is to incorporate longitudinal elements, which was not possible within the time and resource constraints of writing this thesis, although it may be possible in future follow-up studies, as discussed in chapter 7.

It is also important to note that the study involves a reliance on published data, which means it is restricted by what is reported in the sources used, and that these sources may be subject to biases. The main precaution taken to guard against such bias was the decision to use four different approaches to define 'significant philanthropists' (to recap, these are: people who made donations worth £1 million or more, appeared in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index, ran one of the 100 biggest charitable foundations and/or appeared multiple times in national media reports about philanthropy). As noted in section 3.1 above, this approach is not perfect but it was considered the most viable option for creating a robust and comprehensive sample. Furthermore, using a multi-source approach should maximise the chance of capturing different types of significance in terms of the scale of donations and their impact on the public consciousness, and different types of donors, including those who undertake their philanthropy with and without attendant publicity. The decision to include every identified significant philanthropist (as defined in this study) was also intended to ensure that the findings were more robust than previous studies involving self-selecting samples (notably Lloyd 2004; Handy 2006).

Once all the available information was collected and cleaned, the dataset was examined to inductively identify patterns within the data. These patterns, which originally included over twenty sets of characteristics, were then refined and reduced into the more manageable number of eight ideal types of philanthropist and a coding system was used to assign individual philanthropists to one of the ideal types. The process of qualitative coding clearly creates potential for bias as coding decisions are affected to some degree by subjective interpretations of the purpose of each gift and the collective logic behind groups of gifts. Coding of donations was further complicated by the fact that some recipient organisations straddle multiple charity sub-sectors, for example a religious organisation may also deliver domestic welfare or international aid and theological colleges are simultaneously religious and educational. When confronted with these coding decisions, any problematic donations were evaluated in the context of the donor's wider philanthropic acts. For example, if a donor predominantly funded other religious or other international development organisations then that wider context influenced the specific coding decision. Similarly, when coding the types of donor, there were some cases where a number of alternative coding decisions could be justified, for example where a philanthropist appeared to follow a number of logics. Where further information was required to make a final coding decision, some weight was given to information relating to the individual's personal and professional biography[44]. Following Schervish and Herman (1988), it is acknowledged that individual donors exhibit behaviours that potentially fit into multiple categories, but allocation to an exclusive type was achieved by giving greatest weight to the most significant donations, enabling a 'best fit' approach to be taken. To acknowledge the overlaps that clearly exist between the types, each philanthropist was also assigned to a type representing the 'second best fit'; these secondary types are also presented and discussed below.

Whilst the assigned codes may or may not resonate with the individual donors concerned (and some donors are likely to reject the category to which they are assigned[45]), this does not undermine the validity of the coding because the aim is to establish the empirical regularity of giving rather than to explain individual motives. However, efforts were undertaken to ensure the objectivity of coding decisions through consultations with academic colleagues with expertise in qualitative methods and with practitioner colleagues who study philanthropic giving; minor modifications in coding were subsequently made as a result of feedback from this process.

[44] For example, information about the philanthropists' place of birth or the location of their company helped to determine whether a donor was a 'Big Fish', as this type is defined by a preference for supporting causes connected to their place of birth, where they were raised or live now, or where their company is, or was, located.

[45] The Eight Logics typology was presented at the Community Foundation Network conference in Liverpool, 20th September 2007, which was attended by a large number of philanthropists. Whilst the typology was broadly welcomed as a useful scheme that reflects the reality of contemporary UK philanthropy, two points were raised. Firstly, donors recognised the accuracy of the types in describing other philanthropists but felt uneasy about being classified themself. Secondly, the 'Big Fish' was recognised as an accurate description of a type, but was felt to be a pejorative label, however there was no agreement regarding an alternative name for this type.

3.4 Findings: 'The Eight Logics': a new typology of contemporary UK philanthropists

A new typology of ideal types of contemporary UK philanthropists is presented in table 3.12, along with the percentage of donors that fit each category and a description of the philanthropic behaviour that it typifies.

Table 3.12: The Eight Logics: a new typology of contemporary UK philanthropists

The Eight Logics	Percentage of sample	Philanthropic behaviour of this type of philanthropist
Agenda Setter	17%	Predominantly fund projects abroad, usually humanitarian, human rights and environmental projects.
Big Fish	17%	Have a strong local dimension to their giving, with a preference for supporting projects where they live or where their business is based.
Salvation Seeker	17%	Give primarily to projects that benefit members of their own religion.
Kindred Spirit	15%	Support projects that benefit 'people like me' such that donors share a similar class background, life experience or trade with their beneficiaries.
Patriot & Player	14%	Give to establishment institutions, especially historic national organisations and causes favoured by members of the royal family.
Culture Vulture	10%	The major focus of their grants is the cultural sector, including visual arts, performing arts and museums.
Big Brand	5%	No pattern of giving is discernable beyond recipients being primarily well known or 'big brand' charities.
Secret Operator	5%	Provide the minimum legally required information and avoid media coverage, making it difficult to identify the nature of their giving.

Supplementary statistical information on each type including age, gender, assets and size of donations is shown in table 3.13.

Table 3.13: Statistical profiles of the 'Eight Logics' of contemporary UK philanthropists

Type (Eight Logics)	N	% that are female	Average age in 2006	Average date foundation was established[46]	Percentage Self-made	Median size of charitable endowment	Median size of largest donation	Median size of 10th largest donation	Ratio of largest: tenth largest donation
Whole dataset	170	14%	69	1981	72%	£23.8m	£587,604	£20,750	1:28
Agenda Setter	28	18%	55	1987	71%	£41.4m	£894,388	£69,400	1:13
Big Fish	29	14%	70	1983	84%	£23.7m	£514,945	£13,500	1:38
Salvation Seeker	29	24%	78	1976	70%	£21.7m	£529,798	£20,000	1:26
Kindred Spirit	26	8%	69	1981	79%	£16.2m	£500,000	£19,357	1:26
Patriot & Player	24	4%	80	1974	64%	£42.6m	£1m	£29,014	1:34
Culture Vulture	17	29%	68	1987	47%	£30.7m	£719,113	£32,640	1:22
Big Brand	9	0	73	1980	75%	£39.9m	£200,000	£31,000	1:6
Secret Operator[47]	8	0	56	1981	88%	£5.9m	–	–	–

Profiles of the Eight Logics

The types of philanthropists identified in the 'Eight Logics' typology will now be described and exemplified, drawing on the findings presented in tables 3.12 and 3.13. In order to paint the clearest possible picture of each type, these profiles also draw on data gathered for the documentary and media analyses, which are described and discussed in subsequent chapters.

Agenda Setters

Agenda Setters are one of the three largest types of philanthropist identified in the dataset, constituting 17% of the sample. They predominantly fund humanitarian, human rights and environmental projects in developing countries, and tend to prefer to design their own solutions to social problems by setting up and funding their own projects, rather than funding pre-existing charitable organisations.

Agenda Setters are also distinctive by their youth and the size of their giving. They have the youngest average age, 55, this type includes ten individuals born in the 1960s and two born in the 1970s and their foundations are, on average, amongst the most recently established. Their charitable assets and average donation size are second only to one other type (Patriots & Players) and they make the biggest, single donations. Their average largest donation is almost twice the size given by any other type; this disparity remains, but is considerably diminished, by excluding outliers[48] from the calculation. Agenda Setters have one of the most even spreads of donations; their 10th largest gift is only 13 times smaller than their biggest donation. Finally, women are slightly over-represented in this type: 18% of Agenda Setters are female compared to the average of 14%.

[46] This column refers to the 82% of cases where philanthropists conduct their giving through a foundation.

[47] The lack of publicly available information on the donations made by Secret Operators means the final three columns of this table are intentionally blank.

[48] Such as Tom Hunter's donation of £55 million which is the largest donation in the dataset.

Agenda Setters typically present themselves as influential individuals capable of creating large-scale change. For example, Tom Hunter, who supports projects to develop entrepreneurship and leadership in Scotland and in 2006 funded a £55 million collaboration with former US President Bill Clinton to alleviate poverty in Africa, says,

> *"Our aim is to act as a catalyst for change by investing in pilot programmes with strategic partners and often alongside government that, if proven, are adopted by government or the community for embedding nationally where possible."*[49]

One of many profiles of Hunter confirms his status as a well-connected, influential Agenda Setter,

> *"He's got Bill Clinton on speed-dial, a private jet on standby and hundreds of millions in the bank. But sportswear tycoon Tom Hunter isn't content to live the life of the idle rich, and has pledged to use his fortune for the benefit of mankind."*[50]

The aims of another Agenda Setter, Richard Branson, are described in his 2006 annual report as,

> *"to deliver entrepreneurial solutions to social and environmental issues... to build sustainable solutions to some of the toughest challenges facing the world today."*[51]

Media comment on Branson's philanthropy refers to his impatient, ambitious agenda,

> *"Branson is wondering, in other words, whether an entrepreneur could not sort out the world's problems better than politicians."*[52]

A final example of an Agenda Setter is Johan Eliasch, founder of sports goods company Head, whose £20 million purchase of 400,000 acres of Brazilian Amazon to protect it from illegal loggers was one of the biggest single philanthropic acts in 2006.

Big Fish

Big Fish philanthropists have a strong local dimension to their giving, with a preference for supporting projects where they live or where their business is located; their beneficiaries often have little in common beyond a shared geographical location.

Big Fish are amongst the most likely to be self-made: 84% are self-made, against an average of 72%. Their age and gender profile, respectively 70 years and 14% female, are typical within the sample. Their donations are slightly smaller than the average and have the most uneven spread across their donations: their 10th largest gift is 38 times smaller than their largest donation.

An example of a Big Fish is John Zochonis, a Manchester businessman whose donations to a wide range of causes including the Lowry art gallery, marriage counselling and local schools, are linked by their physical location within the Greater Manchester area.

---

[49] 'Hey buddy, can you spare a million?' The Observer, 15/07/07

[50] 'Tom Hunter – Meet Britain's most generous tycoon' The Independent, 17/07/06

[51] The Virgin Foundation report and financial statements for the year ended 31 March 2006, p.4.

[52] 'Losing his virginity?' Daily Mail, 21/08/06

Gulam Noon also fits the profile of a Big Fish, describing his donation of £200,000 to fund bursaries for students attending courses run by Birkbeck University in Stratford, in terms that clearly indicate it is an investment in a geographical region, as well as in a specific institution:

> *"We are pleased and proud to invest in Birkbeck Stratford's students, and thereby the people of East London, as they gain new qualifications and improve their careers."*[53]

Noon's philanthropy, which in 2006 also included medical projects in India and disaster relief to the Asian subcontinent, makes him a Big Fish in both his native India and his current home in the UK[54].

A final example of a Big Fish is Roger De Haan whose family business and philanthropy are both firmly rooted in the county of Kent. His father, Sidney, owned a hotel in Folkestone and then established the company Saga, headquartered in the same town, which provides leisure and insurance services to older people. Both Sidney De Haan's sons, Peter and Roger, are prominent philanthropists. Roger De Haan funds the Creative Foundation to drive regeneration in Folkestone, plus two City Academies in the town as well as supporting a range of Kent charities including the Kent Air Ambulance and Kent Sinfonia. He also established the Sidney De Haan research centre for arts and health at Canterbury Christ Church University, which is named after his father who continued to enjoy music whilst suffering from dementia. This latter act is more typical of a Kindred Spirit (discussed below), but the extent of Roger De Haan's commitment to Kent causes means he is coded as a 'Big Fish', with a secondary coding of 'Kindred Spirit'.

Salvation Seekers

Salvation Seekers give primarily to projects that benefit members of their own religion. However, there are some differences within this category as Jewish donors tend to support organisations in Israel and the welfare of other Jewish people, through charities such as Jewish Care and Norwood, whilst Christian donors tend to fund evangelical and missionary activities, for example Albert Dicken's funding of GodTV and Robert Edmiston's funding of schools that teach creationism.

The statistical portrait of Salvation Seekers, as summarised in table 3.13, shows that they are amongst the oldest and most established philanthropists and that women and inheritees are over-represented compared to the whole dataset: their average age is 78, a quarter (24%) are female and 70% are self-made. The size of their charitable assets, donations and spread of their donations are all similar to that found in the dataset as a whole.

An example of a Salvation Seeker is Philip Richards who made his fortune in the financial sector, largely in hedge funds, and gave away £7.7 million in 2006 on projects including his largest donation to The Gateway, a Christian youth centre in Tonbridge, Kent. A publicly committed Christian, he is on record as saying,

> *"There is a dynamic where God blesses people who give. A lot of the men of God in the Bible were pretty prosperous."*[55]

---

[53] http://www.birkbeckstratford.ac.uk/news/20112007, viewed 9/8/08

[54] On receiving the International Punjabi society award for 2004 for his entrepreneurship, philanthropy and vision, his contributions to both societies were celebrated and the media reported: *'From humble beginnings in Mumbai, Sir Gulam has become a formidable business figure in the UK'* ('Punjabi award for industrialist Noon'. The Tribune India, 6/11/04).

The annual report of the foundation established by another philanthropist who is coded as a Salvation Seeker, Mrs L.D. Rope, notes that eleven members of the founder's family were priests or nuns and therefore, *"The Founder and the Trustees come to their work with a specifically Christian bias"*[56]. The annual report ends by stating that,

> *"the founder of this charity died just three years ago, her obituary card ended with this quotation from St Paul: 'Bear one another's burdens and so fulfil Christ's command'. The fundamental purpose of this Charity should be to make some contribution to bearing the burdens of others"*[57].

A final example of this type is John Studzinski who has often spoken publicly about the direct impact of his faith on his philanthropy, for example:

> *"I often think that if somebody comes out of the blue and asks you for something, that could be God asking you for something... It's pretty dangerous for you to turn around and say, 'Oh, I'm not going to talk to them."*[58]

Kindred Spirits

Kindred Spirits support projects that benefit people they identify with, so this type of philanthropist shares achieved or ascribed characteristics with their beneficiaries, including class background, life experiences or involvement in a trade.

In relation to the whole dataset, Kindred Spirits are of average age and duration; both their average age in 2006 (69) and the average start date for their organised philanthropy (1981) are the same as the averages for the dataset as a whole. They are more likely to be self-made and less likely to be female: 79% made their own fortune compared to an average of 72%, and only 8% of Kindred Spirits are female compared to 14% in the whole dataset. Their charitable assets and donations are slightly below the average but the spread of their giving is slightly more even.

An example of a Kindred Spirit is the musician Eric Clapton, who recovered from drug addiction and now funds the Crossroads rehabilitation centre in Antigua. In a letter posted on the Crossroads website Clapton describes himself as *"a recovering addict and alcoholic"*[59], and describes his personal connection to the Caribbean island where the centre is situated:

> *"Antigua has always been a special refuge – a safe place, a serene place where one can begin the process of healing from even the most devastating events and life situations."*[60]

Another example of a Kindred Spirit is Jack Petchey, who experienced a deprived childhood in the East End of London before making a fortune in the financial services industry. The Petchey Foundation website describes how the founder was,

> *"brought up in the East End of London with few luxuries. At 14 he left school to work in an office for twelve shillings and six pence a week"*[61].

---

[55] 'Hey buddy, can you spare a million', The Observer 15/07/07

[56] The Mrs L. D. Rope Third Charitable Settlement, Trustes Annual Report for the financial year ending 5th April 2006, p.6

[57] Op cit, p.23

[58] Bloomberg.com 2/10/07, viewed 9/08/08

[59] http://crossroadsantigua.org/history_letter.aspx, viewed 4/11/09

[60] ibid

As a philanthropist, Petchey uses his wealth for the benefit of those experiencing similarly deprived childhoods by funding youth clubs and other activities for children growing up in deprived parts of London.

A final example of a Kindred Spirit is H. J. Joel, who made his fortune in horse breeding and whose foundation made its largest donations in 2006 in support of racing welfare, Newmarket and the Thoroughbred Breeders Association.

Patriots and Players

Patriots and Players predominantly give to establishment causes, especially national institutions and charities favoured by members of the royal family. They are keen supporters of organisations such as The Princes Trust and the British Museum, significant religious buildings and historic royal palaces.

Patriots and Players are almost exclusively male (96%), they are the oldest philanthropists (average age 80) and have the longest established foundations (average date of establishment 1974). They are more likely to have inherited their wealth than the average contemporary UK philanthropist, as only 64% are self-made against an average of 72%. Their donations are the second most unevenly spread: the median size of their largest donations, at £1 million, is the largest of any type, but the median size of their 10th largest donation is smaller than those made by three other types.

Ronald Hobson and Donald Gosling, who made their fortunes together in National Car Parks (NCP), are examples of Patriots and Players. They both support The Prince's Trust, the Royal Historic Palaces and various benevolent funds for ex-service personnel. Gosling's largest donation, £1.2 million, went to Trafalgar 200, an organisation established to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the Battle of Trafalgar and the death of Lord Nelson. Hobson and Gosling were also revealed as the 'mystery benefactors' who funded a private firework display for the Queen to mark her 80th birthday and as leading campaigners for a privately funded Royal Yacht[62].

The grandson of travel agent Thomas Cook is also an example of a Patriot and Player. Ernest Cook's foundation, established with his inheritance, is a major benefactor of the National Trust and his extensive collection of paintings was bequeathed to the National Art Collection Fund. The objects of the Ernest Cook foundation are described in patriotic and class-conscious tones as,

> *"rooted in the conservation and management of the countryside in the best traditions of the great estates of England"*[63].

[61] http://www.jackpetcheyfoundation.org.uk/?about_us/who-is-jack-petchey.html (viewed 3/7/09)

[62] 'Queen's secret admirers', Sunday Express 23/04/06

[63] www.ernestcooktrust.org.uk/ [viewed 1/11/09]

Culture Vultures

As the name suggests, the major focus of donations made by Culture Vultures is the cultural sector, notably the visual arts, performing arts and museums.

Unlike all the other types, a majority of Culture Vultures (53%) have inherited their money rather than created their own wealth, running counter to the trend of contemporary philanthropy being dominated by the self-made. They are of average age (68) and contain the highest percentage of female philanthropists, at 29% compared to 14% across the dataset. Their foundations are amongst the most recently established and their charitable donations are above average size.

A well-known Culture Vulture philanthropist in the UK is Vivien Duffield, who inherited her father's (Charles Clore) business and philanthropic empire. In 2006 the Clore Duffield Foundation funded many of the most prominent arts institutions in the UK including the South Bank, the Royal Opera House and the National Galleries of Scotland. Exemplifying the trend for giving both money and time, Duffield is also a governor of the Royal Ballet.

Another Culture Vulture is Louise T. Blouin MacBain, who has both business and philanthropic interests in the arts and is touted as 'the Queen of Arts'[64] and 'a new Peggy Guggenheim'[65]. The mission statement of her foundation expresses a belief in, *"the unique power of culture and creativity to be catalysts for positive change"*[66]and her foundation website states:

> *"The Foundation reflects Mrs MacBain's hopes and dreams through its work across the world to promote culture and creativity and their role in making societies stronger"*[67].

A final example of a Culture Vulture is Carol Vogel, a high profile supporter of the Edinburgh International Festival. The objects of Hogel's foundation, the Dunard Fund, are:

> *"the training and performance of classical music at the highest standard and the education and display of visual arts at an international standard"*[68].

Hogel has reproached her wealthy peers for their lack of support for cultural activities,

> *"Not enough people are prepared to get involved in the arts... They spend their money on expensive hobbies like yachts and football teams. This is my expensive hobby, but it is much more rewarding. To see great works put on the stage is so satisfying."*[69]

[64] 'Queen of Arts', Daily Telegraph, 26/03/06

[65] 'The Lady Vanishes', Daily Telegraph 26/03/06

[66] http://www.ltbfoundation.org/ (viewed 3/07/09)

[67] http://www.ltbfoundation.org/who_we_are.htm (viewed 3/07/09)

[68] The Dunard Fund Trustee Report and Annual Accounts 2006, p.2

[69] Chicago Sun-Times 17/12/06

Big Brands

This type includes a small number of philanthropists in the sample who show no discernable pattern within their giving beyond their recipients being mostly large, well-known charities such as the NSPCC (National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children), Cancer Research UK and the Royal National Lifeboat Institution.

All nine philanthropists coded as 'Big Brands' are male and slightly older than average (73 years). Despite having amongst the largest charitable assets of any type (£39.9m), this type makes smaller but more evenly spread donations: their average largest donation (at £200,000) is only a third of the size of the average within the dataset but their tenth largest donation (at £31,000) is 50% bigger than the dataset average. This may indicate that the absence of a specific personal passion for a cause or organisation results in lower levels of giving, although further research is needed to substantiate that suggestion. The average date that their charitable foundations were established (1980) and the percent that are self-made (75%) are both close to the average.

Big Brands include people who wish to support charity as a generic concept, but who appear not to have a passion for any particular cause, such as the footballer, Alan Shearer, who explained his decision to donate the proceeds of his testimonial game 'to charity and worthy causes':

> *"It is a great honour and privilege to have a testimonial game at this wonderful club. I hope that by pledging the money from my testimonial game to charity and worthy causes, that people less fortunate than myself will also benefit in some way from my football career."*[70]

Subsequently it was reported that the £1.64 million raised by Shearer's testimonial was donated to a range of children's charities, including well-known organisations such as the NSPCC[71].

A further example of a Big Brand philanthropist is Chris Ingrams, the media entrepreneur, whose ten largest donations went to many of the charities that regularly feature in the annual lists of organisations that receive the widest public support[72], including WWF (World Wildlife Fund), Shelter, Action Aid and the NSPCC.

Secret Operators

The final ideal type comprises those philanthropists who both give anonymously and live anonymously. These eight individuals provide the minimum legally required information about their philanthropic activities and are successful in avoiding media coverage. It was extremely difficult to obtain any information on their basic biographical details or on the size and destination of their philanthropic acts. On the basis of the information that could be gathered it appears that Secret Operators tend to be male, younger and more likely to be self-made than the average, but even this minimal information should be treated with caution, given the amount of missing data.

---

[70] Newcastle United Football Club website www.nufc.com, viewed 2/09/07

[71] http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/england/tyne/6090200.stm, viewed 9/08/08

[72] Details of the top 500 fundraising charities in the UK are published annually by the Charities Aid Foundation in a reference book entitled *Charity Trends*.

This group includes those who see anonymity as a virtue, those who object to complying with the bureaucratic procedures demanded by the Charity Commission and those who do not acknowledge the public nature of philanthropy and accept that getting charitable tax breaks requires, in return, a degree of transparency about how money boosted by the public purse is spent. An example of a refusal to publish detailed information occurs in the Annual Report produced by the Reuben brothers' foundation, which claims that,

> *"The charity considers that to disclose details of the recipients of grants would seriously prejudice the furtherance of the purpose of the charity. Full details of the grants payable have been provided to the regulatory body"*[73].

Some donors seek a low profile because they are wary of the media and fearful of public reaction to their giving. Although Ann Gloag is coded as a 'Salvation Seeker', she has been more secretive in the past and refers to that period when she notes,

> *"For years we've given and we didn't say a thing. Even now we're very cautious. You are in a no-win situation. You give and people say, 'So what, that's nothing' or 'Is that all?'... It's easy to feel there is no point, to wonder if it is really worth all the hassle... People do suspect your motives."*[74]

Similarly, Tom Farmer is coded as a 'Big Fish' but acknowledges the attraction of giving anonymously when he notes,

> *"It's all to easy for people to suspect your motives if it is made public and I can't be bothered with that."*[75]

Unwillingness to disclose information about donations and wariness of publicity are unlikely to be the only rationales held by Secret Operators, but the recondite nature of this type of philanthropy makes it, by definition, difficult to illustrate.

Secondary Ideal Types

The Eight Logics typology allocates each philanthropist to one exclusive type in order to maximise the heuristic usefulness of the typology and to avoid the situation created by Rooney and Frederick (2007) where a typology becomes an undifferentiated list of characteristics. However, some philanthropists undoubtedly exhibit characteristics that fit more than one type, for example where the destination of their ten largest donations is divided between cultural and national institutions (therefore could be coded both Culture Vulture and Patriots and Players) or their beneficiaries are all religious organisations but within a geographical area relevant to the donor's biography (therefore could be coded both Salvation Seekers and Big Fish). In order to more accurately reflect this reality, all 170 significant philanthropists were coded to indicate their secondary 'ideal type'. Where the types were evenly split, the deciding factor between coding as a primary or secondary type was based on the size of donations. The distribution of secondary ideal types is shown in table 3.14.

---

[73] Reuben Foundation and its subsidiaries (formerly Reuben Brothers' Foundation) Trustees Report and Accounts for the year ending 31st December 2006, p.12

[74] 'The New Carnegies', Sunday Times 11/04/99

[75] ibid

Table 3.14: Primary and Secondary 'ideal types'

Eight Logics	Primary type	Secondary type
Agenda Setter	17%	12%
Big Fish	17%	21%
Salvation Seeker	17%	4%
Kindred Spirit	15%	26%
Patriot & Player	14%	16%
Culture Vulture	10%	8%
Big Brand	5%	8%
Secret Operator	5%	5%

Eleven philanthropists had no identifiable second type because they were either originally coded as a 'Secret Operator' (and there was, by implication, no additional information on which to base a second classification) or the restricted nature of their philanthropic acts (for example leaving a legacy to one named charity) meant there was no basis to record a second type that differed from their initial coding.

The creation of secondary ideal types was originally undertaken to ameliorate potential problems with singular coding, but once this secondary coding was complete it became apparent that the results also offer further insights into the pattern of philanthropic activities. Whereas table 3.14 describes the philanthropic logics of the whole sample, the cross-tabulations shown in table 3.15 provide insights into the relationships between the logics pursued by individual donors.

Examining these cross tabulations adds much to the understanding of contemporary UK philanthropists. For example, the decrease in Salvation Seekers from 17% (primary type) to 4% (secondary type) indicates that religion is either a significant factor or barely registers, whereas the rise in percentages of both Kindred Spirits and Big Fish shows that personal and geographical connections to beneficiaries are the most significant factors behind contemporary UK philanthropy: together they underlie the primary approach of a third of the sample (32%) and almost a half (47%) of the secondary logics. More than half of those whose primary approach is Agenda Setter have a secondary coding of Kindred Spirit and no primary Agenda Setters have a secondary coding of either Salvation Seekers or Secret Operators. This indicates that people seeking to set agendas on the world stage do so within the context of their personal interests, that religion plays no explicit part in their philanthropic decisions and that they are willing to 'go public' with their philanthropy. Almost two thirds of Culture Vultures are coded Patriots and Players as their secondary type, and no Culture Vultures have a secondary coding as Salvation Seekers, Secret Operators or Big Brands. This demonstrates that people who chose to support the cultural sector are also closely aligned to establishment causes, that religion and charity brand awareness do not affect their choice of beneficiaries and that they are also open about their giving. A final example is that the only identifiable secondary approach of Secret Operators is Salvation Seekers, indicating that religious-inspired beliefs in the virtue of anonymity are an important factor behind some secretive philanthropy.

Table 3.15: Cross-tabulation of primary types (rows) and secondary types (columns)

Types	Agenda Setter	Big Fish	Salvation Seekers	Kindred Spirits	Patriot & Player	Culture Vulture	Big Brand	Secret Operator	Total
Agenda Setter	2	4	0	15	3	0	3	1	**28**
Big Fish	4	3	2	10	4	3	3	0	**29**
Salvation Seeker	5	12	1	4	1	0	3	3	**29**
Kindred Spirit	4	9	1	3	7	1	1	0	**26**
Patriot & Player	0	7	1	4	1	7	4	0	**24**
Culture Vulture	1	2	0	4	10	0	0	0	**17**
Big Brand	3	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	**9**
Secret Operator	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	**8**
Total	**19**	**37**	**8**	**44**	**26**	**13**	**14**	**9**	**170**

Overlaps between types occur in most typologies, even if they are excluded from the final presentation of findings for the sake of clarity. The existence of such overlaps should not be considered a fatal flaw in the concept of typologies. Indeed, as the discussion above shows, exploration of these overlaps can yield further useful information about the patterns of philanthropic activity.

Dynamic trends in the typology

Although the Eight Logics is based on a 'snap shot' of philanthropic activity during the year 2006, it is possible to introduce a dynamic element by re-analysing the sample in terms of the age of donors and of the foundations they have established. As table 3.13 shows, the youngest type of philanthropist are Agenda Setters, with an average age of 55, fifteen years younger than the average Patriot & Player. One interpretation of this age profile is that it reflects changing priorities from more ambitious global concerns in youth to supporting the arts and national institutions in older age. However, this is not supported by the data presented in table 3.16, which breaks the sample down by the date the foundations were established. The foundations established before 1960 are dominated by Patriots & Players, who are exclusively male and only half of whom created their own wealth. This profile contrasts with the foundations established since the turn of the millennium, which are dominated by Agenda Setters, who are far more likely to be self-made and female. Therefore the shift in ideal types and their attendant characteristics does appear to be a cohort, rather than a generational effect.

Table 3.16: Analysis of sample by date foundation established

Year foundation established	Number of foundations established in this period	Percentage established by female philanthropists	Percentage self-made	Dominant ideal type during this time period
Pre 1960s	15	0	50	Patriot & Players
1960s	31	3	57	Salvation Seekers
1970s	16	6	60	Big Fish
1980s	26	19	76	Salvation Seekers
1990s	27	22	80	Kindred Spirits
2000s[76]	24	29	84	Agenda Setters
All years	139	14	73[77]	–

The growing feminisation of philanthropy is also clearly demonstrated in table 3.16. The oldest foundations, established prior to 1960, are all run by men, and in the subsequent two decades the number of female-founded philanthropic foundations is still a negligible 3% and 6%. It is not until the 1980s that women became a significant presence in the philanthropic world, establishing almost 20% of the foundations in that period. By the start of the 21st century almost a third (29%) of the foundations in this sample are being established and led by women. The data presented in this chapter therefore demonstrates significant shifts in both the approaches to conducting philanthropy and in the characteristics of philanthropists. Assuming that these trajectories continue, the future of UK philanthropy is likely to be younger and more female, dominated by those who have created their own wealth and who seek to conduct agenda-setting philanthropy. These findings raise questions regarding the alleged emergence of a 'new philanthropy', which will be referred to in the discussion below and dealt with more fully in chapter 6.

3.5 Discussion of 'The Eight Logics' typology

The Eight Logics differs from previously published typologies in being based on classifiable acts undertaken by contemporary UK philanthropist, and it also builds on the knowledge base and insights found in previous typologies and in the wider literature in a number of ways.

Agenda Setters share many commonalities with the idea of 'new philanthropists' and 'philanthrocapitalists', as discussed in the introduction and literature review. To recap, 'new philanthropists' are said to be younger, richer, more likely to be self-made and living a cosmopolitan lifestyle; they support emerging issues such as global health problems and the environmental crisis (Handy 2006). Philanthrocapitalists share many of these features but are also said to be distinctive in the ways they conduct their giving by applying skills developed in the for-profit world, using their power to leverage money from other funders, and paying far greater attention to the impact of their philanthropic spending by demanding targets, performance indicators and measurable outcomes (Bishop and Green 2008). Many of the Agenda Setters that appear in the dataset compiled for this thesis have appeared in books and

[76] This row only covers the years 2000-2006.

[77] This figure is 1% higher than the percentage of self-made philanthropists that appears in table 3.13 because the samples are slightly different. This table, 3.16, includes only those who have established a foundation.

newspaper articles about 'the new philanthropy', most notably Tom Hunter, whose disproportionate presence in media coverage is discussed in chapter 5.

Whilst Agenda Setters represent a recent development in philanthropy, the philanthropic logic demonstrated by Big Fish is historically typical. Rosenthal's study of gift giving by 14-15th century aristocracy identifies many forebears of this type, including people leaving money in their wills *"for the poor of my county"* (Rosenthal 1972:109), and an observation that profuse almsgiving to the local poor derived from, *"an obvious desire to be the open-handed Lord of the county"* (Rosenthal:125). Whilst some philanthropic nobles chose to make their name in big cities, especially London, medieval Big Fish chose instead to support local churches and chapels, in hope of gaining the right to be buried there, because,

> *"The noblemen often preferred to be the major figure, in death as in life, within a small world revolving around himself, his family and his immediate circle. The local church or chapel was overwhelmed by his eternal presence, as the [big city] cathedral or conventual church was not"* (Rosenthal 1972:85).

Schervish's contemporary US studies also describe philanthropy that is focused on people with whom one has a geographical relationship, and he argues that the key to understanding this type of philanthropist, *"is to note how they emotionally transpose heretofore anonymous citizens of their country, city and community into members of their family"* (Schervish 1992:341). In less poetic terms, and exhibiting a more instrumental interpretation of philanthropic behaviour, Odendahl also notes the importance of place in choosing beneficiaries. Whilst her types are based on donors' personal characteristics, she also concludes that geographical factors can affect philanthropic decisions such that an industrialist might fund a university in a town where his or her business is located (Odendahl 1989:422).

The philanthropic logic of 'Salvation Seekers' is also historically precedented, as discussed in the review of the historical literature presented in section 2.3. Many donors in the past have sought to implement the instructions of their chosen religious text in order to win salvation in the next life, for example, medieval almsgivers undertaking *"an act of piety"* (Jordan 1959:146) are early incarnations of Salvation Seekers. The church dominated the organisation and distribution of charitable donations for many centuries until the Dissolution prevented monasteries playing an ongoing pivotal role in administering philanthropic funds and the more recent secularisation of society reduced the role of religious belief in motivating philanthropy. However, every major religion continues to encourage philanthropy as *"a pre-eminent source of rules and principles for the living of lives"* (Ilchman, Katz et al. 1998:xi), which makes 'salvation seeking' philanthropy simply religious ideology in practice and an opportunity to translate values into action (Wood and Houghland 1990:103).

The philanthropic logic of Kindred Spirits has also been identified in the extant literature, which suggests that people often prefer to offer assistance to those with whom they share characteristics, and that perceived similarities result in increased giving behaviour (Coliazzi et al cited in Sargeant and Woodliffe 2007:284). This suggestion is encapsulated in the notion of 'philanthropic particularism', which refers to the tendency of voluntary initiatives to favour those with whom one most identifies (Salamon 1987). Processes of globalisation and cosmopolitan lifestyles may cause an increase in this philanthropic logic as they multiply the number of potential connections that an individual might have with other people, which *"creates new possibilities and exigencies for solidarity"* (Komter 2005:171). There is a large degree of commonality between the idea of Kindred Spirits and the concept of 'adoption philanthropy' (Schervish and Herman 1988; Schervish 1992). In both cases, the choice of beneficiaries emerges from a wish to associate with others with whom one identifies or in whom aspects of oneself are recognised, such that the donor can envision aspects of their own biographies in their recipient's lives (Schervish 1992:343). Empathy is said to be the moral disposition at the heart of this approach to philanthropy, because being empathic,

> *"serves in a special way to mobilise and solidify the bonds of support, especially when the donors see aspects of their own lives recapitulated in the fortunes of those whom they target for assistance"* (Schervish 1992:343).

The philanthropic logic of both Culture Vultures and Patriots and Players exemplifies a key finding from the literature: that a primary purpose of elite philanthropy is to support elite culture and the establishment. As discussed in the literature review, since the earliest recorded giving there has been an obvious link between philanthropy and the elite as it delineates members of that class, provides opportunities for networking between class members and creates opportunities for elite social occasions (Rodgers 1949; Nightingale 1973; Prochaska 1990; Waddington 1996; Lloyd 2002). The attraction of this logic is spelt out in Owen's study of the Victorian period which concludes that, *"those who wished to rise in the world of society had best exhibit a decent interest in good works"* (Owen 1965:165). Unlike Salvation Seekers, this philanthropic logic is not diminished in modern, secular societies, as two recent studies have identified. The first, based on interviews with rich donors in New York concludes that,

> *"donors derive personal prestige from association with institutions that are prestigious in the eyes of their peers"* (Ostrower 1995:90).

And a second study of US philanthropy finds,

> *"The general tendency of the wealthy to contribute to upper-class specific programs and institutions... A West Coast millionaire told me, 'I only give to the things that I like... I give to the ballet, the opera, the symphony. I give to hospitals, I give to universities"... everything he mentioned benefits the elite more than others"* (Odendahl 1990:16).

The logic behind 'Big Brand' philanthropy is difficult to grasp, as there is no discernable pattern to these acts, beyond recipients being largely major, well-known charities. It is possible that these philanthropists are motivated more by the desire to 'be philanthropic' than by a passion for a particular cause, and that well-known charity brands generate higher levels of trust in donors who lack confidence in the wider charity sector. A further potential hypothesis is that such donations are the result of philanthropic exchange between peers. A study of philanthropy in the US argues that, *"[t]he world of elite philanthropy is characterised by a system of exchange"* (Ostrower 1995:31) such that rich people are obliged to support the favoured causes of family and friends, who in turn are obliged to reciprocate. The sociological literature on gift-giving and reciprocity is clearly applicable here, as discussed in section 2.1 of the literature review. Clearly, donors could simply donate to their own causes instead of funding their peers' causes in a circuitous fashion, but this system of reciprocity helps to create and maintain solidarity within the philanthropic elite because.

> *"In the asking, giving and exclusive interacting, corporate heads and rich people establish greater solidarity among themselves, their spouses and within their class" (Odendahl 1990:42).*

The logic of 'Secret Operator' philanthropy involves moral questions about the merits of anonymous giving, which have been discussed in the extant literature (notably by Schervish 1994) but the logic of philanthropists who pursue anonymity has not. Other researchers may have viewed secretive donors primarily as a problem because they are often responsible for 'missing data', but it is possible instead to view them as a distinctive, coherent type. Donors who try to conceal information about their giving and whose giving follows no discernable pattern clearly do create problems for data collection and analysis. Whist this lack of information and insight is undoubtedly problematic for a research project, by allocating these donors to a type, rather than trying to pretend they do not exist, the Eight Logics seeks to be a fully comprehensive account of contemporary UK philanthropy.

Conclusions

This chapter began by noting the absence of an available database of UK philanthropists and proposed the need for a study to fill that gap. Drawing on all available data regarding philanthropic acts in the year 2006, 170 significant philanthropists were identified as operating in that year, and the characteristics of this group of people were presented and discussed.

This chapter then focused on a particular problem in understanding contemporary UK philanthropy, which is rooted in the reductionist approaches that have dominated discussions about philanthropy. The problem is the great diversity that lies behind the single term 'philanthropist': the 170 individuals in the dataset undertake a wide variety of acts, including support for many different causes, in diverse geographical regions, driven by a variety of motivations and undertaken using a range of different approaches, yet all this variety is reduced to the one overarching concept of 'philanthropy'. It was therefore argued that this term has lost its explanatory power because it is over-stretched, and that a more precise understanding of the meaning and purpose of different types of philanthropy is required to bring greater clarity to what is currently a vague and ambiguous realm of activity. A new typology, drawing attention to the presence of internal variation, was proposed as a solution to this problem.

The role of 'ideal types' in sociological analyses was discussed and found to be a useful conceptual model for clarifying, making comparisons and drawing conclusions about empirical reality. Existing typologies of philanthropy and philanthropists were then described and discussed. They were found to be exclusively based on data from the US and to contain various weaknesses including the presence of excessive numbers of types, the concurrence of non-exclusive categories, the primacy given to non-observable motivations and ascribed characteristics and low sample sizes. The review of existing typologies informed the decision to create a new typology of UK philanthropists, using a methodology based on an inductive analysis of the size and destination of the ten biggest philanthropic acts undertaken by the 170 significant philanthropists discussed in the first part of the chapter. Eight types of philanthropist were identified in this process and the resulting typology – the 'Eight Logics' – was presented, including a statistical and descriptive profile of each type. Whilst it is accepted that this typology will not resonate with every individual donor, the aim was to establish the empirical regularity of giving rather than to explain individual motives. A discussion of the secondary allocation of ideal types and cross-tabulation of primary and secondary types was shown to offer further insights into the pattern of philanthropic activities in contemporary UK society. The data was re-analysed to illustrate chronological developments in UK philanthropy and to highlight the emergence of a philanthropic logic, which is being led by younger, self-made, less male-dominated, more global, and 'agenda setting' philanthropists. Finally, the new typology was contextualised within prior knowledge about philanthropy and philanthropists, and shown to be a development of many of the existing concepts and findings in the extant literature.

The merits of the Eight Logics typology can be judged with reference to the definitions given at the start of this chapter. Weber asserted that typologies should be,

> *"heuristic devices [that]... lead to a more precise understanding of components of society [and] help to clarify characteristics and significance"* (Weber 1949 cited in Eldridge 1970:227).

And Fulcher and Scott defined typologies as,

> *"conceptual models that help us to understand the real world... analytical devices that are constructed by social scientists in order to understand the more complex reality that exists"*
> (Fulcher and Scott 2003:41).

Following these definitions, the success of the Eight Logics relies on passing three tests: Is philanthropy a 'complex area' of social life that requires greater clarity? Does the typology lead to a more 'precise understanding' of philanthropy and are the Eight Logics heuristically useful?

Firstly, as established in the introductory chapter, contemporary UK philanthropy is indeed a complex, area of social life that is in need of greater clarity. It is over-conceptualised yet under-theorised and where it has been the subject of study, such studies have largely involved reductionist approaches that fail to account for its highly diverse manifestations, hence the need for a conceptual model that can account for multiple dimensions of internal variation.

Secondly, the identification of Eight Logics does bring greater precision to the concept of philanthropy, which this thesis argues is over-stretched. The ambiguity inherent in the generalised concept of philanthropy can be rectified, at least to some degree, by indicating the more specific philanthropic logics undertaken by individual donors. The typology highlights the fact that philanthropists give to causes that mean something to them and that relate to their personal vision of the public good. This could be promoting their religion (Salvation Seekers), helping people in a particular geographical area (Big Fish) or sharing particular personal characteristics (Kindred Spirits). It could involve expressing patriotic values (Patriots and Players), supporting the cultural life of the nation (Culture Vultures) tackling pressing global problems (Agenda Setters) or simply supporting the most popular charities (Big Brands). Sometimes the meaning and purpose of their philanthropic acts will not be evident to an observer, as is the case with Secret Operators, because of a lack of information in the public domain about the size and destination of their gifts.

Finally, the typology is heuristic: the number of types (8) is more manageable than two of the existing typologies – Schervish (16 types) and Rooney and Frederick (12 types); the types are exclusive and therefore have more explanatory power than Rooney and Frederick; and the Eight Logics has been tested with a non-academic audience[78] and found to make intuitive sense, which bodes well for its usefulness to practitioners, such as fundraisers, who can use it to inform and modify their approach to prospective donors.

However robust and heuristic the Eight Logics is judged to be, it is important to emphasise that creating a typology of philanthropists is not a straightforward matter. As Jordan found, *"British philanthropists turn out to be remarkably resistant to generalisation"* (1959:472) and Owen writes, with a note of scepticism about the usefulness of the enterprise, *"[g]eneralisations about modern English philanthropists as a class do not come readily and are admittedly suspect"* (1965:4). The 170 significant contemporary philanthropists that are the focus of this thesis are no more susceptible to generalisations than their predecessors. Accusations of gross simplification can no doubt be levelled with some justification and it is important to remember that,

> *"[t]here is no single answer to the question of what purpose philanthropy fulfils. Philanthropy is a complex and sprawling concept that has many meanings and whose significance has shifted against the broader political and social backdrop against which it has played itself out. In reality private giving represents an at times confusing assortment of purposes, each with its own logic and rationale"* (Frumkin 2006:11).

But, following Weber, I believe the advantages of this conceptual tool outweigh the disadvantages. The Eight Logics typology is a useful addition to understanding because it brings clarity to the description and analysis of a complex activity, because it introduces precision to an over-stretched concept and because it goes beyond individual explanations of specific donations in order to identify systemic patterns within classifiable acts undertaken by contemporary UK philanthropists. Given the apparently idiosyncratic nature of philanthropy, where the size and destination of each gift is often explained with reference to its own unique logic, it is important to organise data in a way that draws out these broader patterns.

[78] At the Community Foundation Network conference, Liverpool, 20th September 2007.

A further benefit of creating this new typology is the opportunity to test ideas about the changing role of philanthropy in society and to identify newly emerging distinctive features. Pierre Bourdieu's writing has been a particular influence on my thinking about philanthropy, particularly his notion of distinction as a driver of social action (consciously or otherwise) in order to attain and maintain a privileged position in social space (1984:56). Philanthropy has historically been understood as an activity that helps individuals to attain distinction and privileged status but given the existence of different types of philanthropic activity, it is worth exploring whether the eight logics of philanthropy are accessible to different types of people, and if they result in different types of distinction.

In order to pursue these questions, the key variable is the source of the philanthropists' wealth because, as Savage notes, Bourdieu's work calls attention to *"the necessary role of embodied dispositions deriving from one's background"* (Savage and Williams 2008:694). Bourdieu presents a statistical analysis of the prevalence of different cultural practices and finds that they are the products of upbringing and education (1984:1). The choices made by philanthropists about what causes to support corresponds to some extent to what Bourdieu identifies as *"different distances from necessity"* (1984:6), such that, for example, poorer people have a preference for meals that are nourishing rather than meals that are aesthetically served. This insight leads to the conclusion that people with the greatest interest in cultural consumption will tend to have,

> *"a general disposition towards the world which is the paradoxical product of conditioning by negative economic necessities – a life of ease – that tends to induce an active distance from necessity"* (Bourdieu 1984:5)(p.5)

Whilst all of the philanthropists included in this study are extremely rich, they were not all born into wealthy families; indeed, as will be discussed in chapter 5, some were raised in markedly deprived circumstances. It is now commonly observed that the rich of the 21st century are more likely to be self-made than inheritees: in 1989 75% of the Sunday Times Rich List had inherited their wealth and 25% were self-made but by 2005 that ratio had reversed[79]. In line with these figures, table 3.13 shows that 28% of significant philanthropists inherited their wealth whilst 72% are self-made, but it is important to note that these averages are not consistent across the different types. The majority of Culture Vultures (53%) were born into wealthy families and hence a 'life of ease'; their lack of first-hand experience of need may explain why their philanthropic preferences prioritise the arts over human welfare. Furthermore, the processes of socialisation experienced by those born into wealth results in the acquisition of higher levels of cultural capital which can be used as a strategy to create and reproduce social inequalities, as aesthetic taste is *"a distinctive expression of a privileged position in social space"* (Bourdieu 1984:56). Certain types of charitable giving can be used as a means to display refined cultural tastes (Ostrower 1995) but those who did not acquire cultural capital in early life may find this an inaccessible route to gaining distinction (Bourdieu 1984:78). The difference in origins between people *born* into a class and those who *move* into a class, for example who join the elite as a result of creating their own fortune, affects decisions regarding the investment of time, money and energies in acquiring cultural capital. Bourdieu's insight that,

[79] This point was originally made by the editor of the Sunday Times Rich List, Philip Beresford, in the 2005 edition, and has since been mentioned in numerous books and articles about 'new philanthropy' such as Susan Mackenzie (2005) A Guide to Giving. Philanthropy UK/Association of Charitable Foundations: London and 'Forget Rich List if you're down to last £70m', Daily Telegraph 19/04/07.

> *"[t]hose who, not having acquired legitimate culture in the legitimate manner (i.e. through early familiarization), maintain an uneasy relationship with it, subjectively or objectively or both"* (1984:87),

is useful for explaining why the self-made demonstrate a taste for a different kind of philanthropy than that chosen by inheritees, who are dominant amongst the Culture Vultures. Those lacking what Bourdieu called 'embodied capital' may be able to afford to buy paintings but they will not possess the ability to appreciate them 'properly', therefore they can own but not consume the painting (Bourdieu 1986:245). As the ranks of the rich become dominated by the self-made, those who lack embodied cultural capital may of necessity turn to alternative models of philanthropy to spend their newly acquired wealth, hence the move away from cultural philanthropy and towards philanthropy rooted in personal beliefs, connections and aspirations.

Despite cultural philanthropy being the most recognizable embodiment of elite philanthropy, table 3.16 shows that the recent emergence of Agenda Setters occurred at the expense of Patriot & Players who were the dominant type amongst foundations established before the 1960s. However, Patriots & Players have the second highest concentration of inheritees (36%), and therefore possess large quantities of embodied cultural capital, which helps to elucidate their preference for philanthropy directed at 'non-necessities' such as historic and religious buildings.

The data presented in this chapter provides a comprehensive account of the characteristics of contemporary UK philanthropists and sheds light on emerging trends, notably the diminishing dominance of male inheritees with ingrained elite tastes over the course of the second half of the twentieth century and the emergence of a dominant logic of philanthropy at the start of the 21st century that is pursued by younger, more self-made, less male-dominated philanthropists. This chapter gave an account of the objective characteristics of contemporary UK philanthropists and presented a new typology based on that data. The next chapter explores the subjective accounts given by contemporary UK philanthropists in discussing their acts of philanthropy and describing their identities as philanthropists.

Chapter Four
Philanthropy in the philanthropist's imagination

The preceding chapter sought to fill the vacuum of empirical information regarding contemporary UK philanthropy by identifying the characteristics of the 170 most significant philanthropists in a recent year, and using that dataset to create a new typology of contemporary UK philanthropists. The next chapter will examine the depiction of significant philanthropists and philanthropy in the public imagination, as represented by media coverage and the final data chapter (chapter 6) will explore the suggestion that a 'new philanthropy' has recently emerged.

This chapter is concerned with the representation of philanthropy in the philanthropist's imagination, and will explore the self-conscious ways that significant contemporary UK philanthropists represent themselves. It examines the rhetoric they use to describe their philanthropic acts and their identities as philanthropists in a range of publicly available data, including the governing documents, annual reports and websites of charitable foundations as well as in speeches and interviews. This chapter focuses on the role that philanthropy plays in the creation and maintenance of identity by exploring the extent to which it presents opportunities to make statements about the self. It begins with a review of identity theory before presenting the findings, discussion and conclusions.

4.1 Identity theory and philanthropic activity

Identity is now a widely discussed concept in the social sciences, yet it only emerged as a topic of study in the mid-twentieth century and was not discussed by the classical sociologists. Despite only recently becoming a focus of academic attention, identity has always mattered because as Hegel first noted, we need other people to recognise us, to be our 'mirrors'. Our self-consciousness exists through our identity being recognised and acknowledged by others (Moore 2007:2).

In the past, identity was a fixed and inherited notion and a person's identity was anchored in the social class into which they were born,

> *"the old system tended to produce clearly demarcated social identities which left little room for social fantasy, but were comfortable and reassuring even in the unconditional renunciation which they demanded"* (Bourdieu 1984:156).

The task of self-identification in earlier stages of modernity involved conforming to set norms in order to *"fit into the allocated niche by behaving as the other occupants did"* (Bauman 2001:xvi). But in the late modern period, identity is generally understood to have become less stable and more multi-faceted, not least because social and geographic mobility have created opportunities for a wider range of factors to play a greater role in people's sense of identity. As Giddens explains,

> *"In today's world we have unprecedented opportunities to make ourselves and to create our own identities. We are our own best resources in defining who we are, where we have come from and where we are going. Now that the traditional signposts have become less essential, the social world confronts us with a dizzying array of choices about who to be, how to live and what to do – without offering much guidance about which selections to make. The decisions we take in our everyday lives – about what to wear, how to behave and how to spend our time – help to make us who we are. The modern world forces us to find ourselves. Through our capacity as self-conscious, self-aware human beings, we constantly create and recreate our identities"* (2001:30).

This quote represents the dominant view regarding identity in contemporary sociology: that identity has no enduring essence, but rather is 'invented' and 'constructed' on a daily basis as a result of the efforts made by individuals and the interpretation of those efforts by others. This process of ongoing, unending identity work, means that identity is now a life narrative as opposed to a fixed image of the self (Sennett 2004:175).

The development of this theoretical position began with the work of Erving Goffman, who introduced the concept of identity management in 'The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life' (1959), although his emphasis is on the efforts people make to maintain a coherent and consistent identity. Goffman analyses the structure of social encounters and the techniques that people use to control and sustain the impressions they make on others and concludes that people are simultaneously trying to express themselves and to make an impression on other people. These expressions and impressions are said to be 'idealised' in an attempt to meet ideal values, *"when the individual presents himself before others, his performance will tend to incorporate and exemplify the officially accredited values of the society"* (Goffman 1959:44). There is an expectation of consistency in other people's 'social front' and any inconsistencies stimulate our attention because we expect performances to have an 'expressive coherence' (p.63). A harsh view is taken of people whose inconsistencies, or 'masquerades', are exposed because it is felt that individuals have misrepresented themselves for private psychological gain (p.67). As Goffman explains,

> *"A false impression maintained by an individual in any one of his routines may be a threat to the whole relationship or role of which the routine is only one part, for a discreditable disclosure in one area of an individual's activity will throw doubt on the many areas of activity in which he will have nothing to conceal"* (p.71).

In order to minimise the risk of 'false fronts' being exposed, Goffman notes that performers try to keep their audiences separate because,

> *"when audience segregation fails and an outsider happens upon a performance that was not meant for him, difficult problems in impression management arise"* (Goffman 1959:138-9).

In an increasingly inter-connected world, with fast communications and an unprecedented degree of surveillance of the actions and words of influential people, including philanthropists, the ability to segregate audiences declines and the potential for exposing apparently contradictory behaviour increases.

Goffman does not explicitly discuss philanthropy but he does assign gifts a role as 'sign vehicles', which are able to, *"convey information about a person's socio-economic status, competence, trustworthiness, conception of self etc."* (Goffman 1959:13). He also notes that performances by the wealthy can include the 'playing down' of wealth, *"in order to foster the impression that standards regarding birth, culture or moral earnestness are the ones that prevail"* (Goffman 1959:46-7). The attempts made by philanthropists to 'express and impress' themselves through giving, the difficulties faced by rich donors in maintaining a culturally-approved masquerade and the consequence of apparent 'false fronts' for the reputations of philanthropists are discussed further below.

Almost a decade after Goffman's ideas were published, a discussion of the social psychology of the gift develops some of his ideas, claiming that gifts act as generators of identity for both givers and receivers because they transmit ideas about how the giver wishes to be seen and shed light on how the giver perceives the recipient. With reference to philanthropic giving, it is suggested that, *"the charity potlatch is an important mode of the public presentation of self"* (Schwartz 1967:70). Three decades on, Berking's study of gift giving also draws heavily on Goffman's concepts, arguing that,

> *"Given the premises of self-objectification and self-reference, gift giving is itself a kind of identity politics, 'impression management', self-reflexive and never entirely free of strategic implications"* (Berking 1999:6).

More recently, theorists have also suggested a link between philanthropy and identity work, for example Silber describes philanthropy as a, *"vehicle for donors' identity and a mechanism for its self definition and expression"* (1998:143).

The idea of self-definition derives from a broader body of theoretical work on individualization, which is defined as,

> *"a concept which describes a structural, sociological transformation of social institutions and the relationship of the individual to society"* (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001:202).

Beck and Beck-Gernsheim describe a process of transformation that has taken place within the modern era in which people have been freed from historically inscribed roles, religious authority has been undermined and new forms of social commitment have been created. The growth of 'reflexive modernisation' (a term coined to describe the period after the 'simple modernity' of industrialisation) is said to have undermined social bonds and exposed individuals to the anxieties involved in making their own choices. Since the 1950s, attachments to social class, family and neighbourhood have all weakened, jobs and the workplace are no longer the prime source of identity, and lifestyles and self-conceptions have replaced class solidarities. As a result of these changes, people living in late modernity are said to spend more time reflecting on their experiences and who they are. The concept of individualization is used to explore how people deal with these transformations in terms of their identity and consciousness and also how their life situations and biographical patterns are changed (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001:202).

A significant impact of these transformations on identity work is that the onus of creating and maintaining a given identity now falls on the individual, rather than being ascribed at birth or bestowed as an immutable part of one's social role. As Bauman states,

> *"'individualisation' consists in transforming human 'identity' from a 'given' into a 'task' – and charging the actors with the responsibility for performing that task and for the consequences (also the side-effects) of their performance: in other words it consists in establishing a de jure autonomy (although not necessarily a de facto one). No more are human beings 'born into' their identities; as Jean-Paul Sartre famously put it: it is not enough to be born a bourgeois, one must live one's life as a bourgeois... Needing to become what one is, is the hallmark of modern living... Modernity replaces determination of social standing with compulsive and obligatory self-determination"* (2001:xv).

According to this account, membership of any class of peoples (including philanthropists) has to be proven anew and reconfirmed on a daily basis because individuals in late modernity are not 'embedded' in social roles but must constantly re-embed themselves as a result of pro-active identity work. An individual cannot expect to be identified as a philanthropist as a consequence of passive or isolated philanthropic acts, such as inheriting a family foundation or making occasional donations. Contemporary philanthropists must actively and continually create and sustain their identity as philanthropists; they must 'live their life as philanthropists' in order to become one.

Identity work is time consuming and hard work because, *"agents are endlessly occupied in the negotiation of their own identity"* (Bourdieu 1990:134). Being the agent of their own identity, self-reflexive modern individuals must,

> *"become active, inventive, resourceful, to develop ideas of one's own, to be faster, nimbler and more creative – not just on one occasion, but constantly, day after day. Individuals become actors, builders, jugglers, stage managers of their own biographies and identities"* (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001:23).

Obviously, philanthropic activities are only one part, possibly a minor part, of an individual's daily life. Foucault's work on discourses introduced the idea that individuals inhabit multiple identities and different versions of the self (Marshall 2005:288). Yet people must 'stage manage' their philanthropic identity alongside all other aspects of their biographies without exposing 'gaps' in their performance or revealing apparent contradictions that might invite criticism from the observing public. There is clearly potential for philanthropy to be viewed as an inconsistent act on the part of people known to be wealthy, as accumulation and distribution are not obviously compatible and there exist suspicions regarding the authenticity of redistributive acts by people who have demonstrated success in the accumulation of wealth; this is discussed further below.

The concept of individualisation appears to imply, at least in English-speaking countries, a description of a deeply egotistical society, incompatible with a philanthropic outlook. However, its authors defend the notion against this interpretation, noting that the ethic of individual achievement and self-sufficiency exists alongside an awareness of self *in*sufficiency which results in a new relationship between the individual and society (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001:xxi & 22). Beck and Beck-Gernsheim insist that whilst people do desire above all to lead a 'life of one's own',

> *"there are also signs that point towards an ethic of 'altruistic individualism'. Anyone who wants to live a life of their own must also be socially sensitive to a very high degree"* (2001:xxii).

As the literature review demonstrated, the problematic conjunction of individualism with altruism is a familiar motif in philanthropic studies, yet despite concerns regarding the alleged incompatibility of self-less and self-interested behaviours, philanthropy frequently involves the simultaneous pursuit of both private and public ends (Frumkin 2006:3). Indeed, philanthropy can provide concurrent outlets for an individual's desire to be unique and for their desire to belong because it offers an opportunity to make personalised contributions to the public good. By this account, the self-less and self-interested ingredients of philanthropy are not antagonistic, but rather what holds it together.

The argument that individualised cultures can develop altruistic ethics is made in Robert Wuthnow's research, which shows that the majority of the American population consider solidarity, helpfulness and concern for the general welfare to be as important as self-actualisation, professional success and personal freedom.

> *"Being an individual does not exclude caring about others. In fact, living in a highly individualized culture means you have to be socially sensible and be able to relate to others and to obligate yourself, in order to manage and organise your everyday life. In the old value system the ego always had to be subordinated to patterns of the collective. A new ethics will establish a sense of 'we' that is like a co-operative or altruistic individualism. Thinking of oneself and living for others at the same time, once considered a contradiction in terms, is revealed as an internal, substantive connection"*
> (Beck and Beck-Gernsheim 2001:211-2).

'Thinking of oneself and living for others' is also a theme in Sennett's work, which argues that people aspire to an 'intimate society' because closeness to other people enables them to develop their own self (Sennett 1977). The simultaneous desire to be an individual and to belong to the wider community, and the subsequent ongoing struggle between our 'I' and 'we' identities, is a theme of modern life, which will be explored in the data below.

Agency is a central idea in Beck and Beck-Gernsheim's work, encapsulated in the suggestion that the desire and the capacity to create a 'life of one's own' is the most powerful force in modern society.

> *"The choosing, deciding, shaping human being who aspires to be the author of his or her own life, the creator of an individual identity, is the central character of our time"* (2001:22-3).

This capacity for self determination explains the ability of people born into poor families to reinvent themselves as 'philanthropists', a social role confined solely to elites in previous eras. However, as the media analysis in chapter 5 shows, the social background of 'nouveau philanthropists' is rarely forgotten and their humbler origins are constantly foregrounded.

This review of the literature shows that, despite its intangible nature, identity is a central feature of life in late modernity. At the start of the 21st century, identities are increasingly fragmented and unstable due to major social transformations including secularisation, depersonalisation of social relationships and constantly changing networks within which people live and work due to increased geographical and occupational mobility. These changes create a greater preoccupation with the concept of identity and a need to devote more time and effort in pursuit of self-fulfilment and self-realisation. Having reviewed the key ideas in identity theory and discussed their application to the understanding of philanthropy, I will now describe a study undertaken to explore the role that identity management plays in the presentation of self by philanthropists.

4.2 Researching the philanthropist's imagination

As noted in section 2.2 of the literature review, current understanding of what UK philanthropists think about their philanthropy is based exclusively on data produced in interviews (Lloyd 2004; Handy 2006; Mackenzie 2008), surveys (Taylor, Webb et al. 2007) and focus groups (Edwards 2002), yet there is no rationale for prioritising these methodologies, especially given the unknown accuracy of self-reports on philanthropy (Bekkers & Wiepking 2007:41). An inherent risk in using these methods to explore a normative topic like philanthropy is that they encourage self-conscious answers, over-reflection and the generation of rather formulaic responses affected by social desirability bias. As Frank notes, people tend to explain themselves in ways that convey a positive impression – or at least do not make them appear in a bad light – because, *"most people are strongly motivated to win the approval of other people"* (1996:145). For example, when donors are asked to reflect on their acts of giving away money, they routinely deny that they are generous, frequently insist that they "get more than they give" and often refer to a belief in "giving back" due to the good fortune they have experienced or the values instilled in their upbringing. Whilst these responses may be accurate reflections of reality in some cases, the frequency with which similar sentiments are expressed suggests they may be repeated because they sound like the 'right' answers, rather than necessarily being sincerely held views.

Methodology

The methodology used in this chapter differs from existing studies of contemporary UK philanthropy, which rely on data produced in response to questions set by researchers. Rather than generate new data through primary research, I have chosen to analyse already-existing data that has been produced by philanthropists and appears in publicly available documents. This approach follows that advocated by Silverman (2007) who draws a distinction between 'manufactured' data, such as that produced by surveys and interviews, and data gathered in the 'everyday world'. The methodology of this thesis reflects a belief that the latter is appropriate for investigation into topics, such as philanthropy, that risk generating socially desirable and pre-scripted (albeit unintentionally so) responses. Distortions in manufactured data are a result of over-scrutiny of the topic and over-reflection by the people being questioned. As noted above, when people are asked questions about philanthropy, their answers are likely to reflect norms about what people living in that society are expected to think. By basing my research on data that already exists in the public domain, I hope to avoid stimulating yet more formulaic comments and erroneously analysing them as if they were an accurate reflection of the subject, rather than the 'appropriate script' expected of people who are occupying the role of philanthropist. I also hope to analyse this data in such a way that it is possible to generalise beyond personal experiences towards the broader social behaviours involved in philanthropy to identify the systemic nature and meanings of philanthropic acts.

The methodology used for this part of the study is a secondary analysis of a range of publicly available data, including the governing documents, annual reports and websites of charitable foundations that have been established by the 170 significant philanthropists identified in chapter 3, as well as speeches and interviews given by those philanthropists. The chosen methodology, secondary analysis is defined as,

> *"any further analysis of an existing dataset which presents interpretations, conclusions or knowledge, additional to or different from those presented in the first report"* (Hakim 1982:1).

The advantages of using this methodology include access to better quality and more extensive data, in terms of sample size and number of variables, than time and resources would otherwise have allowed (Robson 1993:282); ability to concentrate on analysis and interpretation rather than data-collection (Baker 1988:254-60) and the opportunity to find new insights in existing data because,

> *"as a general rule, a second researcher will bring a fresh perspective to the strengths and limitations of any dataset and be more innovative in exploiting it"* (Hakim 1987:31).

However, it is important to be aware that disadvantages of this methodology include lack of control over the content of the data, which will have been produced for purposes other than those pursued by the person conducting secondary analysis (May 1997:78) and the time-lag between data-collection and publication, which means secondary analysis is more dated than research using original data, as in this thesis where the data was published in 2006.

Creating the dataset

As described in the methodology section of chapter 3, two databases were created to hold information about the sample of 170 significant, philanthropists: an SPSS database was used for quantitative and factual information and a Philanthropic Text database was used to hold qualitative data, including text from foundations' governing documents, annual reports published in 2006, and statements made by philanthropists in speeches and press reports. This chapter focuses on the latter database; all the data contained in that database is publicly available and appears either in documents that have been generated in the course of establishing and running private philanthropic trusts and charitable foundations (hereafter referred to simply as 'foundations') or in public statements made by philanthropists in the sample.

The reason for focusing on data generated by foundation philanthropy is that, whilst not universally used, foundations are widely considered to be the primary vehicle for administering the charitable giving of major donors (Clotfelter and Ehrlich 2001:x; Fulton 2005:48; Deep and Frumkin 2006:189; Frumkin 2006:96; Fleishman 2007:274). This is because such donors prefer, *"a vehicle of giving that allows them maximal personal choice of, and control of, the goals and process of giving"* (Silber 1998:143). In addition to issues around control, further reasons that donors set up foundations are: to earmark money for giving away whilst delaying decisions about where to give it; to avoid giving excess wealth to heirs which may be considered debilitating; to take advantage of tax breaks available for this form of giving; and to *"create a vehicle for promoting large-scale, lasting social change"* (Fleishman 2007:37-9). Frumkin argues that foundation philanthropy is of prime significance for three reasons: because of the amount of resources controlled by private foundations; because both assets and grant making by foundations are increasing; and because foundations are said to constitute the *"leading edge of the field"* (Frumkin 2006:124). A preference for giving through foundations is equally true of the UK's rich givers, as Hurd and Lattimer note,

> *"most of all, the rich give through foundations. These are charitable trusts which are endowed with a sum of money or block of shares and which then serve as a tax-free vehicle for making donations. For regular donors such a vehicle simplifies the process [of giving] considerably, meaning that tax administration only has to be performed once a year rather than for each separate gift, and making it easy for the donor to give to charity not just cash but also shares in a company or some other income producing asset"*
> (1994:v-vi).

139 of the 170 significant philanthropists that constitute my sample (82%) have set up private foundations, representing a combined asset base of £9.8 billion. The ownership of a foundation was easily identifiable in the majority of cases (71%) where it was named eponymously, for example Rod Aldridge and 'The Aldridge Foundation', or where the relationship between a donor and their trust is widely known, for example Peter Lampl's 'Sutton Trust' or David Sainsbury's 'Gatsby Foundation'. But some detective work was required to establish links between other individuals in my sample and their foundations, for example where only initials are used (e.g. Aubrey Weiss and the 'A.W. Charitable Trust'), where the foundation is named after something significant in the donors' life (e.g. Carol Hogel's 'Dunard Fund' named after her home, Dunard House, near Aberfeldy in Scotland) or where the only link to the donor is through their being named as a trustee (as with Sir Evelyn Rothschild and the 'Eranda Foundation'). It is possible I have wrongly concluded that 31 individuals do not have foundations, as some of these people may have set up a foundation that leaves no indication of their connection to its source of income. However, if the donor is not a trustee then they have no legal jurisdiction over spending decisions, which means they are likely to fall outside my research interest in the ongoing impact of philanthropists in contemporary society.

Information about the philanthropic activities of the 31 donors in my sample who have not (to my knowledge) established a private foundation was gathered from press reports, interviews and speeches. Biographical information on all donors was also gathered from these sources and supplemented with data from the website Know UK, an online resource that searches the databases of all major biographical publications including 'Who's Who' and Debretts' 'People of Today'.

As charitable foundations are legal entities, they generate publicly available documentation, which forms the basis of much of this analysis, including their entry on the Charity Commission register, governing documents, annual reports and financial accounts. These documents function simultaneously as legal documents and personal expressions of philanthropic intent. They follow a prescriptive template and must comply with rules set down by the Charity Commission, which approves and regulates charitable activity in the UK. Yet they also provide an opportunity for donors to put 'on record' their reason for establishing a charitable foundation, a rationale for choosing their intended beneficiaries and an explanation of their preferred approach to contributing to the public good. Opportunities to undertake identity work are more constrained in documents dominated by legalistic requirements compared to other types of documents in which authors are more liberated to 'be themselves'. This chapter therefore continues with a discussion of the different types of philanthropic documents that exist, and the different opportunities for identity work that each type creates. Examples of identity work carried out within the communication of information about philanthropic acts are then presented, and the main themes that appear in the messages that philanthropists transmit about themselves are drawn out. The chapter concludes with a discussion on the role that philanthropy plays in

the creation and maintenance of donors' identity, how this has changed over time and the increasing importance of this aspect of philanthropic activity in conditions of late modernity.

The opportunities for identity work in different types of philanthropic documents

Different types of documents create different opportunities for identity work. The language used by philanthropists in legal documents is constrained by the requirements dictated by charity law, which applies a uniform template to all types of charity. Every foundation must provide the same type of information about its purpose and activities within a set of inflexible categories relating to *what* it seeks to do, *who* it intends to help and *how* it proposes to go about its activities. These three extremely complex questions are reduced to, literally, a box-ticking exercise. There are thirteen categories of 'what' the charity exists to do with options including 'relief of poverty', 'arts/culture' and 'disability', yet 72.4% of the sample ticks 'general'. There are seven categories of 'who' the charity seeks to help, such as 'children/young people' and 'elderly/old people', yet 26% of the sample tick 'general public' and 82% tick 'other charities'. Thus the answers provided are either exhaustive, as every box is ticked, or not enlightening, as learning that they aim to help the 'general public' and 'other charities' reveals nothing about their actual activities.

The one opportunity in the legal documentation that allows for some degree of personalisation – being neither a closed question, such as 'name' or 'address', nor a 'tick box' question – is the space provided for defining the charity's objects. However, only a minority take this opportunity to say something meaningful about the purpose of their activities. An analysis of the objects of the foundations established by philanthropists in my sample found that 70% wrote extremely generalised statements regarding the objects of their foundation, as shown in column 2 of table 4.1.

The widespread use of generic legalistic statements could imply that philanthropy is denuded of cause, revealing the donors' commitment to the *idea* of philanthropy rather than to any specific beneficiaries. However, cross-referencing legal and personal documents reveals that such generic statements are most likely drafted by lawyers and do not reflect the reality of the more focused nature of philanthropists' activities. As columns 3 and 4 of table 4.1 show, philanthropists are clearer about the intended destination of their donations and the impression they wish to create about themselves, than the legalistic language implies.

Table 4.1: Comparison of statements about philanthropic activity in different types of documents and in comparison to actual grant-making activities

Name of foundation	Definition of charitable objects as it appears in the Register of Charities	Description of foundation as it appears in the foundations' 2006 Annual Report	Focus of grant-making activity
The Paul Hamlyn Foundation	"the objects of the charity are to further such charitable purposes and to benefit such charitable institutions as the trustees think fit."	"Our main aim is to make grants to organisations to address issues of inequality and disadvantage, particularly in relation to children and young people"	The Arts, Education, India
A W Charitable Trust	"[The objects of the charity are] for such charitable purposes of charitable institutions as the trustees may from time to time in their absolute discretion determine."	"The Trustees' aim is to provide help, whether financial or otherwise, to all Jewish persons and institutions in need"	Jewish organisations in the UK and Israel
The Zochonis Charitable Trust	"[The objects of the charity are to support] such charitable institutions and for such purposes (being purposes which are exclusively charitable according to the laws of England) as the trustees in their absolute discretion think fit"	"The Zochonis Charitable Trust is a lasting testimony to the generosity and philanthropic concerns of Sir John Zochonis"	A wide variety of charities, many of which are based in Manchester

In the 30% of cases where the objects written into legal documents are not generic, they offer more detailed information on the philanthropist's focus of interest but still largely fail to capture the spirit of the donor's intent. For example, the objects of the John and Rosemary Lancaster Foundation are:

> *"to promote the spreading of the Christian message through making grants to appropriate organisations and registered charities".*[80]

This sparse factual account of the foundation's aims contrasts with a fuller account of their landmark project, a Christian youth centre in Clitheroe called 'The Grand', described by the philanthropist in a press release, which paints a far more detailed picture of the donor's concerns and ambitions.

> *"The Grand is about regeneration. The transformation of this building into a state-of-the-art venue continues the provision of new and much-needed facilities in Clitheroe. Our aim is to strengthen community and create key development opportunities, in particular for young people."*[81]

[80] The John and Rosemary Lancaster Charitable Foundation, Trustees Report and Financial Statement for the year ended 31st March 2006, p.2

[81] 'Ben Cantalon to join Steve Chalke at launch of new Oasis community venue', Christian Today, 25/03/08.

This brief review of the different documents in which philanthropists describe their philanthropic activities, shows that there is a large difference between the formal generic description of philanthropic activities, drafted to comply with legal requirements, and the personalised descriptions of philanthropic intent, which more authentically reflect the donors' personal tastes and preferences. Legal documents capture bureaucratic information in a uniform manner, which largely suppresses individuality and reveals little about the personality of the donor or the intentions behind their philanthropy. Personal documents, such as the narratives contained within annual reports, the text on foundation websites and press releases provide a platform for the donor to offer a subjective account of themselves and their philanthropic acts, to contextualise their philanthropy within their own biographies and to express the extent of their influence and ambition. The constraints found in legal documents and the subjectivity found in personalised documents are differentiated, in turn, from the language used in the media to discuss philanthropy, as will be discussed in chapter 5. The differences between these three perspectives – the legal, the personal and the public accounts of philanthropy – are summarised in table 4.2.

Table 4.2: The contribution of different types of philanthropic documents to identity work

	Data Sources		
	Legal documents: Governing documents Annual report (excluding narrative) Financial accounts Summary Information Return	**Personal documents:** Annual report narratives Foundation websites Press releases Quotes given to the press Speeches Articles Autobiographies	**Public documents:** Print media coverage Biographies Books about philanthropy
Overall focus of this type of document	The structure and objects of philanthropic organisation	The outcomes and change the philanthropist seeks to create in the world	The wealth and the lifestyle of the philanthropist
How are philanthropic aims discussed?	Generically - 70% of governing documents contain generalised 'objects'.	Specifically - the aims of philanthropic spending are clearly set out.	Not discussed – the beneficiaries are largely absent from public narratives of philanthropy.
How are philanthropic approaches discussed?	Vaguely – tick boxes and closed questions provide minimal opportunity to explain how money is spent	Prescriptively – donors have a clear idea of how their money can be best used to achieve their aims.	Not discussed – minimal public interest in how philanthropists spend their donations.
What is the dominant perspective of these documents?	The "we" of society, how philanthropy relates to the public sphere and the common good.	The "I" of the donors, and the nature of their personal, idiosyncratic contribution.	The "other" of philanthropists who are economically distinct, eccentric, exotic and 'not like the rest of us'.
Overall emphasis	Bureacratic and legal	The presentation of self	The presentation of wealth

Different types of philanthropic documents are found to present different accounts of philanthropy and philanthropists, and to have different capacities to contribute to identity work. The constraints found in legal documents tend to suppress the individuality of the donors and offer limited opportunities for conducting identity work, whilst personal documents create greater opportunities for identity work; the latter feature more heavily in the remainder of this chapter.

The findings, presented in the next section, are based on an inductive analysis of a dataset containing all identifiable, publicly available statements regarding the intention and actions of the 170 significant philanthropists that are discussed throughout this thesis. Bottom up coding was undertaken, whereby the codes were generated during a thorough reading (and many re-readings) of the text, which was marked up with highlighters and then analysed to identify patterns and relationships within the dataset (David and Sutton 2004:232).

4.3 Findings: the role of philanthropy in identity work

This study finds that when philanthropists make public statements about their charitable giving, they often use the opportunity to 'tell a story' that conveys idealised impressions of themselves. Examples of such identity work found in the data, are exemplified and discussed as follows:

"I am successful"

References to the successful personal and professional lives of donors are a common motif in the data. The story being told may be one of success despite the adversity of their circumstances, or simply the attainment of excellence. An example of the former appears on the Jack Petchey Foundation website, which carries photographs of the donor laughing and surrounded by happy children, accompanied by text which describes his achievements in the face of poverty and discouragement.

> *"Jack Petchey was born in July 1925 in the East End of London, England. From a background with very few advantages he became a prominent businessman and property developer. In 1945 at the end of the Second World War Jack Petchey left the Navy and became a clerk. He was told by the personnel officer of his firm: "You'll never make a businessman". However, this discouraging remark did not prevent him from becoming one of the most successful entrepreneurs in Britain!"*[82]

A similar story of success against the odds is depicted in material produced by the Clore Duffield Foundation, which states,

> *"The Clore Foundation was founded in 1964 by the late Sir Charles Clore, one of Britain's most successful post-war businessmen and one of the most generous philanthropists of his day. Sir Charles was born in Whitechapel, the son of Jewish immigrants from Riga. In the 1950s he was the pioneer of company takeovers, becoming a household name in Britain and beyond."*[83]

Whilst this type of rags-to-riches narrative arc is found to be a common feature in media reports of philanthropy (see chapter 5), stories told by philanthropists themselves tend to mention briefly (if at all) any unpromising starting point and focus instead on the culmination of their life's journey which is frequently described as 'successful'. This is illustrated by two further examples:

Peter Harrison's foundation website carries a photograph of a smiling donor whose philanthropy is presented as the sharing of his recipe for success. The accompanying text says:

---

[82] www.jackpetcheyfoundation.org.uk/?about_us/who-is-jack-petchey.html, viewed 4/11/09

[83] www.cloreduffield.org.uk/page.php?id=34, viewed 4/11/09

> *"As a keen and active sportsman throughout his life, Peter Harrison believes that education and sport provide the key stepping stones to self-development, creation of choice, confidence building and self reliance. A pioneering and successful businessman, entrepreneur and sportsman himself, Peter wishes to share his success by making these stepping stones more readily available to those who may be disabled or disadvantaged and who may not otherwise have the opportunity to develop their self potential."*[84]

Similarly, Rod Aldridge's website describes him as a successful entrepreneur, and explains that he has chosen entrepreneurship as a specialism for the City Academy he is funding,

> *"because [entrepreneurship] describes a state of mind which strives to solve problems rather than accept defeat. An entrepreneur is determined to succeed, is not afraid of failing, remains positive throughout and will ultimately win through... The notion of entrepreneurship describes self-starting, highly motivated and confident learners who make full use of every opportunity for personal and community success".*[85]

References to 'success' can also be incorporated within rhetoric that describes the specific action taken by the donor. For example, the 'about us' section of the website of 'Cool Earth Action', a charity funded by Johan Eliasch, says, *"Johan is one of the world's most successful businesspeople who decided to put his money where his mouth is"*[86]. Some philanthropists prefer descriptions of success to be articulated by third parties. For example Peter Lampl's foundation (The Sutton Trust) has produced a leaflet containing supportive quotes from former Prime Minister Tony Blair and current prime minister Gordon Brown, saying,

> *"Sir Peter Lampl is a successful businessman and social entrepreneur...Sir Peter is a great role model for other business entrepreneurs and leaders who would like to give something back to society".*[87]

"I am devout"

As noted in the description of 'Salvation Seekers' in chapter 3, a dominant logic amongst contemporary UK philanthropist involves giving to projects that promote a set of religious beliefs and helping others who share those beliefs. Expressions of religious beliefs contained in extracts from the objects of governing documents include philanthropists indicating that their aims are *"the advancement of Christianity"* (Sir Maurice Laing); *"advancement of Christian faith, poverty, education, good citizenship"* (Robert Edmiston); *"to advance Christian religion, public health projects, education and arts"* Michael Hintze; *"[t]he advancement of the evangelical Christian faith at home and abroad"* (Sir John Laing); *"people in need within the [Jewish] community"* (A. Chontow); *"to advance religion in accordance with the orthodox Jewish faith"* (Itzchok Cymerman); *"advancement of Jewish orthodox faith, relief of poverty, renaissance of religious study"* (L. Faust); and *"promoting and advancing Orthodox Judaism"* (Rifka Gross).

---

[84] www.peterharrisonfoundation.org/, viewed 4/11/09

[85] www.aldridgefoundation.com/entrepeneurship_specialism, viewed 4/11/09

[86] www.coolearth.org/295/coolearth-31/who-we-are-153.html, viewed 4/11/09

[87] Accessed via www.suttontrust.com, viewed June 2007, full URL unfortunately lost

A typical instruction within many major religions is to tithe, or give away, a percentage of wealth to charity. A number of philanthropists openly subscribe to this practice, including Philip Richards who told a Christian newsletter, *"It's good Christian teaching that you give away a tithe"*[88]. A more expansive account of the role of religious beliefs is given by John Studzinski, who was raised a Catholic and made a Knight of the Order of St Gregory by Pope John Paul II. In an interview explaining the motives behind his philanthropy, he says, *"I'm drawn to fragility, as was St Francis, one of my favourite saints and a champion of the poor"*. (Handy 2006:200).

"I have taste"

Philanthropists described in chapter 3 as 'Culture Vultures' are focused on the arts, which can involve both the expression of personal tastes and attempts to influence other people's tastes. A notable example of the latter is Peter Moores who describes his aim in his foundation's annual report as, *"the raising of the artistic taste of the public whether in relation to music, drama, opera, painting, sculpture or otherwise in connection with the fine arts"*[89].

As Moores' fortune derives from a family business running the Littlewoods football pools and a retailing empire, positioning himself as an arbiter of the nation's artistic taste may be an attempt to use philanthropy to distance himself from the more mundane source of his wealth. A similarly example of 'reinvention through philanthropy' is the property developer, Donald Gordon, who explained his £20 million donation to the Royal Opera House and the Wales Millennium in the following terms: *"I am hoping to make the transition from what they call tycoon to opera appreciator."*[90]

"I have a coherent biography"

Unlike Donald Gordon, some philanthropists build on their life's work, rather than attempt to recreate themselves anew in their philanthropy. Following a logic described as 'Kindred Spirits' in chapter 3, their philanthropy is expressed as a natural extension of themselves and their life's work, with clear links between their personal, professional and philanthropic identities.

Examples of philanthropists who seek to express a coherent life story through their giving include H. J. Joel, who made his fortune in horse breeding and has set up a foundation to, *"assist the aged, including former employees of the horse racing and breeding industry and their employees"*; Mike Gooley, founder of travel company Trailfinders and a former SAS officer, who has established a foundation that aims to, *"encourage young people in outdoor activities and Armed Forces veteran organizations"*; and Peter Ogden, a grammar school boy who studied physics and made his fortune in the technology company Computacenter, whose philanthropy is focused on, *"helping bright children from low income backgrounds, and science education"*.

Links between an individual's biography and their philanthropy are not always about building on success. Some philanthropists draw on their experience of problems, such as the rock star Eric Clapton who funds the Crossroads Centre in Antigua, which offers treatment for addicts and research into addictions. In a letter posted on the Crossroad's website he describes himself as *"as a recovering addict and alcoholic"*, and describes his love of the Caribbean island where his centre is situated:

---

[88] 'God and the Money Men', Centre for Applied Christian Ethics newsletter no.27, November 2005.

[89] Peter Moores Foundation Trustees' Report and Accounts for the year ended 5th April 2006, p.2

[90] 'Hey, big spender', The Guardian, 20/11/03. As Donald Gordon's donations were made in 2003, he is not included in the sample of 170 philanthropists used in this thesis.

"Antigua has always been a special refuge – a safe place, a serene place where one can begin the process of healing from even the most devastating events and life situations."[91]

"I am ambitious"

Many philanthropists express a desire to be taken seriously, within government and on the global stage, by defining problems and developing and funding their own solutions rather than supporting the work of established charities. An example of what this thesis calls 'Agenda Setters' is Chris Hohn, whose foundation website reveals the extent of his ambition:

"Aspirations are high... We aim to be the gold standard in every grant we make and in every system we put in place. We constantly strive to make extraordinary change in the lives of children in developing countries"[92].

Tom Hunter has posted a message on his website, signed by himself and his wife, which sets out his aims in an ambitious manner which is reminiscent of a political oration:

"It's our belief every child deserves the opportunity to succeed, to be all that they can be. That success should not be postcode or country dependent – whether a child grows up in Cumnock or Kisumu they deserve the right to exceptional health, vibrant education and real career opportunities. There are basic human rights no person should be denied and the chance to succeed must be one of those rights... No-one ever wakes up and deliberately says to themselves, 'I must fail today' but sadly not enough of us go to school or work and say, 'Today, I'm really going to make a positive difference.' Success for us is enabling every child to be all they can be, as simple and as challenging as that sounds. We will succeed, one way or another."[93]

The final phrase of Hunter's statement is a good example of how the 'freer' spaces in personal philanthropic documents enable philanthropists to express themselves; there is no opportunity within a legal document to make a declaration that: *"We will succeed, one way or the other".*

Other ambitious approaches to philanthropy involve funding projects in order to prompt government funding or action. For example, Clive Cowdery's Resolution Foundation seeks to change government policy towards low wage earners. His annual report emphasises that the foundation is, *"actively engaging with policy-makers and practitioners to bring about change"* and notes that they have circulated papers to government departments and key stakeholders in the UK parliament[94].

The ambitious aims of arts philanthropist, Louise MacBain, are contained in her foundation's objects, which include the aim, "*to help devise solutions to problems of global concern*", and the mission statement posted on her website is similarly ambitious, she seeks to *"begin to address the world's problems".*[95]

---

[91] http://crossroadsantigua.org/history_letter.aspx, viewed 4/11/09

[92] www.ciff.org/about-us/message-from-the-ceo.html, viewed 4/11/09

[93] www.thehunterfoundation.co.uk/about/, viewed 4/11/09

[94] The Resolution Foundation Report and Financial Statements 30 September 2007, pp. 3, 5 & 6

[95] www.ltbfoundation.org, viewed 4/11/09

Ambitious talk is not restricted to newer and younger donors. Max Rayne's foundation, established in 1962, aims to,

> *"build bridges within our complex world. We aim to enlarge sympathies through increasing tolerance and understanding, to reduce exclusion and conflict, to bring people together for the good of society, and ultimately to help create a more comprehending and cohesive world."*[96]

Finally, Iain Fairbairn's foundation, also established in the 1960s, describes a similarly broad and ambitious mission on its website,

> *"The Foundation has always believed in the need to support and maintain a free, stable and socially cohesive society, where enterprise is encouraged and people are able to realise their potential, take advantage of opportunities and play their part in democratic life".*[97]

"I matter to an area"

Not all philanthropists seek influence on the international stage, some focus their influence within a more localised area. Links between people and place is a common theme in philanthropy, as identified in the 'Big Fish' logic described in chapter 3. Donors often support causes and organisations in their home town, where their companies are based or in a place that has come to be significant to them for another biographical reason. Philanthropists who identify themselves with a geographical area include Alan Higgs who describes the objects of his charity as, *"inhabitants of Coventry"*; Peter Scott, whose foundation website advertises itself as serving, *"charities operating in Cumbria and the very north of Lancashire"*; Sir Martyn Arbib, whose foundation's objects include *"to establish or assist a public museum in the Thames Valley area to educate public on history, geography and ecology of the area"*; and Sir Patrick Moore's foundation, whose annual report describes its support for a new swimming pool and leisure centre at Formby, near Liverpool and claims it, *"is eagerly awaited by the residents of Formby and the surrounding areas, who have sought such a facility for many years"*[98].

A final example of a philanthropist who seeks to emphasise the link between his giving and a particular place is John Caudwell, who was raised and based his mobile phone business in Stoke-on-Trent. He states the objects of his philanthropy as *"children in Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire, Derbyshire and the nation at large"* and explains his focus on that part of the world, *"You can always think for various reasons that the grass is greener on the other side, but home is where the heart is".*[99]

"I am sincere"

Some philanthropists communicate directly with the public in order to emphasise the sincerity of their motivations and demonstrate how seriously they take their philanthropy. A good example of this type of identity work is contained in a letter written by Elton John, which is published on his foundation's website, and worth quoting at length:

---

[96] www.raynefoundation.org.uk, viewed 4/11/09

[97] Esmee Fairbairn Foundation Annual Review 2002, p.1

[98] The Freshfield Foundation Trustees' Report and Accounts for the year ended 5th April 2006, p.1

[99] 'The John Caudwell Story' www.bbc.co.uk/stoke posted 9/08/2006.

> *"Most of you know me as a singer, songwriter, entertainer, and composer, and I do dearly love performing for and connecting with people through song. But the most meaningful part of my public life is my work as a humanitarian in the global effort to end the AIDS epidemic. Over the years, I have lost many dear friends to this terrible disease. In the mid-1980's, I began channeling my grief into efforts to help raise money for the pioneering charitable organizations that formed during those dark, grim years to fund AIDS research and provide vital services to people with HIV/AIDS.... When our lives are done, won't we want it to be said that when we saw millions of people suffering, millions more at risk, millions more abandoned, a whole continent in danger of dying – we stood up and REFUSED to let it happen? Forty million people are infected with HIV. Eight thousand die every day. We have both the moral obligation and the power to end this epidemic. Do we have the will? I know I do, and I pledge to remain committed to this cause for the rest of my life."*[100]

Through this letter, John appears to be trying to supplant his 'pop star' identity with a humanitarian identity, or at least to clarify that the latter is more significant to him.

Philanthropists who offer other forms of help in addition to money, such as their skills, expertise or contacts, may do so as a demonstration of their genuine concern. For example, Tom Farmer says, *"It's not just about money, it's about time, effort, support and doing whatever you can"*[101]. Stanley Fink is another philanthropist who gets involved with the charities he supports. Emphasising the sincerity of his actions, he says, *"I do it because I want to help, from common humanity and caring about fellow human beings. I don't do it out of guilt, I do it because it needs to be done"*[102].

"I don't think money matters"

All significant philanthropists are, by definition, extremely wealthy, but a consistent theme found in their personal statements is an explicit rejection of the importance of money. For example, Christopher Ondaatje describes his philanthropy as a quest for freedom, as well as a desire to be remembered for something other than the way he accumulated his wealth.

> *"I wanted to set myself free... My fear then was dying with 'financier' written on my gravestone... If you just make money and don't do anything with it to help other people, it's a wasted life. I want to give something back"*[103].

The most high profile global philanthropist in the year covered by this study was Warren Buffett, who pledged over $30 billion to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in June 2006. Although Buffett was, at the time, the second richest man in the world, his public image was of a frugal man, living far below his means. For example, many reports refer to the fact that he, *"lives in the same house he bought 50 years ago"* and *"is known for leading a simple lifestyle"*[104]. Buffett's oft-expressed fondness for cherry coca cola and playing endless games of bridge [105] conveys a

---

[100] www.ejaf.org/pages/about/letter.html, viewed 4/11/09

[101] 'Farmer honoured with Carnegie medal'. The Scotsman, 11/08/05

[102] 'The New Philanthropists', Daily Telegraph, 21/04/07

[103] 'The Devil that drives', The Scotsman 19/8/03

[104] 'Let's leave it to the supernerds to make poverty history ', The Herald 30/06/06

[105] 'The great givers ', The Independent 8/09/06

message that this is a man who is essentially the same as anyone else, whose wealth has not changed him.

In a similar way, cheap or plastic wristwatches have recently become a common signal amongst philanthropists who wish to make a statement that money does not matter. For example, a profile of Roman Abramovich, notes that, *"despite his estimated wealth of £10.8 billion, the second highest personal fortune in Britain, he sports a chunky Eighties-style digital watch. It doesn't look expensive"*[106]. An anonymous wealthy donor's clothes are described as *"smart casual but not ostentatious. The watch on his wrist is plastic"*[107]. Charles Feeney, who won fame as "the billionaire who wasn't" when the scale of his secretive philanthropy was finally revealed (O'Clery 2007), has become the most well-known of the frugal philanthropists, proudly flashing his cheap watch, using a plastic bag as a briefcase and sitting in economy class on aeroplanes because, in his words, *"first class doesn't get there any faster"*[108].

"I have priorities other than making money"

Many philanthropists in the sample describe philanthropy as a route to securing things that money cannot buy, including fun, freedom, self-respect, a good reputation and emotional health. Duncan Bannatyne emphasises the pleasure he gains from his philanthropy, *"You only live once and if you don't enjoy it, it's your own fault"*[109].

Jon Moulton claims his philanthropy has non-financial drivers, *"I wanted to enjoy myself more...By 1997 I had made enough money to see me off this planet in comfort. I now want to do difficult transactions off the beaten track"*[110]. Irvine Laidlaw offers a similar explanation:

> *"You reach a point where you want different challenges. If over the next ten to twenty years I can manage to help a few thousand people have a better start in life then I would regard that as my greatest achievement"*[111].

As well as enjoyment and challenges, self-respect can be pursued through philanthropy. For example, Jemima Khan, who helps Palestinian children through her foundation, is quoted as saying; *"Life is utterly pointless unless you have a purpose that you believe in. It shapes your life and gives you self-respect."*[112]

"I care about my legacy"

Reputation management has historically been viewed as a driver of philanthropy and some of the language used by philanthropists on their websites appears to supply the adjectives with which they hope to be known and remembered. The Wates' brothers foundation refers to, *"the generosity of the Founders [and] the enthusiasm and knowledge of the Wates family"*[113]; the profile of the Prince of Wales on his official website states that he seeks, *"to do all he can to use his unique position to make a difference for the better"*[114].

---

[106] 'Inside the hidden world of Roman's empire ', The Observer 24/12/06

[107] 'Giving it Away', The Independent on Sunday 2/07/06

[108] 'Passing along his good fortune', Los Angeles Times, 8/03/08

[109] 'Dragon who became fairy godmother', Sunday Times 24/12/06

[110] 'Jon Moulton, founder, Alchemy Partners: Dicing with the Debt Meister', The Independent 29/10/06

[111] 'Laidlaw to give away personal fortune of £600m', The Herald 25/11/06

[112] 'Meet the A-list philanthropists', Mail on Sunday 5/03/06

[113] The Wates Foundation Report and Financial Statements 5 April 2006, p.5

[114] www.princeofwales.gov.uk/personalprofiles/theprinceofwales, viewed 4/11/09

Ernest Cook is described as being *"devoted"*[115] to the preservation of English country houses; and Joseph Levy is described as having, *"worked tirelessly all his life for many charitable causes and in particular had a deep concern for the welfare of young people"*[116].

One donor who acknowledges the wish for a good reputation as a contemporary motivation is Arpad Busson who says, "*It's human nature to want to be seen doing the right thing*"[117], Busson also describes philanthropy as carrying far more meaning than his 'day job' in hedge funds, *"Business is an extraordinary thing, but it does not fill your soul the way helping others does."*[118]

Multiple messages regarding identity

Whilst the extracts from statements made by philanthropists are intended to illustrate different aspects of what has been called here 'the philanthropist's imagination', it does not imply that rich donors undertake philanthropy for single and separate reasons. It is possible to identify multiple messages regarding identity in most examples of donors' rhetoric about their philanthropy. A prime example, from one of the UK's most well known philanthropists, Tom Hunter, illustrates his interest in philanthropy as a search for purpose in life, to make an impact and to gain enjoyment,

> *"at 37, I'd achieved everything in my life. That was nice on the one hand, but pretty hollow on the other. I wanted to know what the next bit was about...You can literally change the world and get great pleasure from doing it... you will never make a better investment."*[119]

Similarly, when discussing plans to distribute her fortune during her retirement[120], Anita Roddick expressed a rejection of money, a belief in redistribution and a desire for fun,

> *"I don't want to die rich. Money does not mean anything to me. I don't know why people who are extraordinarily wealthy are not more generous... I'm going to have a bloody good 20 years doing something great."*[121]

Therefore these findings should not be interpreted as a reductionist treatment of philanthropic motives, but rather as seeking to draw out specific examples of identity work that are carried out through statements about philanthropy.

---

[115] www.ernestcooktrust.org.uk/history/index.html, viewed 4/11/09

[116] www.jlcf.org.uk/about_us.html, viewed 4/11/09

[117] 'The New Philanthropists', Saturday Telegraph magazine 21/04/07

[118] 'Super-rich, please give generously', Management Today 26/09/07

[119] 'Meet Britain's most generous tycoon', The Independent, 17/07/06

[120] This interview was given the year before Roddick died; her fortune was left to charity in her will.

[121] 'Anita vows to recycle £118m Body Shop windfall', Daily Telegraph 18/03/06

4.4 Discussion: philanthropy as an expression of significance, influence and authenticity

An examination of the rhetoric used by contemporary philanthropists in describing their philanthropic acts reveals that it does play a role in the creation and maintenance of their identities. Philanthropists communicate a variety of different messages, including information about their family background, their connectedness to a geographical area, their religious beliefs, the extent of their personal and professional success, their ambition and ability to set agendas, their possession of taste, their sincerity, their rejection of wealth and how they wish to be remembered.

The various dimensions of this identity work can be condensed into three properties that are especially valued in early 21st century culture and that philanthropists seek to emphasise in their presentation of self: being significant, being influential and being authentic.

Being significant

As noted in the introduction, there is a rising tide of anti-rich sentiment in the UK. Wealthy people find it difficult to gain cultural affirmation in a society that values wealth, yet does not value the holders of wealth. Despite the almost unquestioned dominance of capitalism as a means for organising Western societies, those who succeed within the rules of market economies are not deemed virtuous and may indeed attract criticism. As a commentator of wealth in the US notes, *"millionaires are plagued by the fear that while they have achieved success, they have not achieved significance"* (Brooks 2000:183). The same is true in the UK, where money-making is not viewed as a significant meaning-making experience.

For people who have achieved financial success but not socially upheld significance, philanthropy offers an opportunity to pursue this latter goal. Philanthropy enables an individual to be judged on the basis of how they spend their riches rather than on how they made them. People use their discretionary income (income above that required for basic needs) to exemplify their tastes and values as, *"more and more individuals want to be identified not by their occupational base (in the Marxist sense), but by their cultural tastes and lifestyles"* (Bell 1976:38). Some philanthropic acts are, therefore, a way to demonstrate publicly that the donor is interested in maximising the meaning and purpose of their life, and not just their means.

Philanthropy offers a useful opportunity for overcoming the contradictions involved in being both wealthy and worthwhile and for proving that one has attained genuine social significance rather than just merely financial success.

Being influential

The self-conscious ambition of some philanthropists in the sample, who express a desire to effect change on a global scale and set the agenda for how society should run, is not historically unusual. As Adam notes, *"Philanthropy always has something to do with power and the shaping of the future of society"* (Adam 2004:5). Such ambition is also an aspect of hyperagency, which is the capacity of wealthy individuals to control the conditions under which they and others live, and has been identified as prevalent amongst contemporary US philanthropists (Schervish 2000b:20).

The nature of influence changes over time and in different places because every culture offers its citizens an image of what it is to be a man or a woman of substance (Hyde 1979:xiii). During the 'greed is good' decade of the 1980s in Western nations, this image was of a successful capitalist: materialistic and acquisitive, concerned with getting rather than giving. In other cultures, and at other times in history, this picture is reversed such that the dispersal of wealth is lauded more loudly than its possession: anthropologists document the 'big men' in many societies being those from whom the most goods flow. Unlike these alternate scenarios, in the UK at the start of the 21st century, the dominant image of an influential individual is one who succeeds in both wealth-holding and wealth-distribution. Contemporary society promotes competing values: people are encouraged both to accumulate and to distribute, as Brooks jokes, *"To calculate a person's status, you take his net worth and multiply it by his anti-materialistic attitudes"* (2000:50). A man or woman who seeks influence in contemporary UK society will find that being both rich and generous is a winning combination.

Being authentic

When philanthropists emphasise the sincerity of their motivations and highlight how seriously they take their philanthropy, they are, in part, seeking to counter widespread accusations that their commitment is not authentic and that it is driven by self-interest rather than selflessness, as discussed in the introduction and literature review. One way that philanthropists underline their authenticity is to choose philanthropic projects that build on their personal and professional biographies, rather than recreating themselves anew in their philanthropy. When they do branch out into new fields, they often do so on a grand scale and offer their time, skills and contacts as well as their money, to provide reassurance that they are not opportunistic, short-term supporters. However, authenticity is a difficult trait to prove and is largely outside the control of the individual. Taking actions in order to be viewed as authentic is likely to be counter-productive because calculated behaviour does not enjoy cultural affirmation and people consider spontaneous acts to be more authentic.

Authenticity is a highly valued cultural attribute in the early 21st century UK, but it is not a quality that is easy to attain or that is bestowed lightly. Evidence that philanthropic acts are authentic is largely judged by the degree of consistency between philanthropists' private and public acts. As Goffman noted, we expect other people's behaviour to have an 'expressive coherence' (1959:63), and inconsistencies are judged harshly because they are thought to occur in pursuit of private gain (Goffman 1959:67). Whilst inheritees can experience discomfort at living with unsought wealth and feel a subsequent need to legitimate themselves, this appears to be especially true for the self-made who have experienced hyper-social mobility. Philanthropists can appear to be seeking reassurance they have found an authentic way to live and express themselves. In recent years, the rapid wealth-creating opportunities available in industries such as information technology and financial services, means that great fortunes have been acquired at great speed. Philanthropy can be a strategy pursued by the newly rich for confronting what has been described as 'sudden wealth syndrome' (Bishop and Green 2008:42). These newly wealthy individuals may find themselves lost in an unknown world of established elites and old money; to this extent they are 'strangers' trying to find an authentic place in an inauthentic world.

Conclusions

Analysis of the rhetoric used by contemporary UK philanthropists in describing and discussing their philanthropic acts confirms that philanthropy does play a role in the creation and maintenance of donors' identity. The language used by philanthropists is found to serve a wider purpose than simply fulfilling the legal requirements of establishing and reporting on their philanthropic activities. The findings show that many philanthropists use opportunities to describe and discuss their philanthropic activities as platforms to express something significant about their own identity. Whilst the precise role that philanthropy plays in identity work is dependent on many factors, such as donors' desired identity and availability of other sources of identity, a number of themes emerge within the data that demonstrate its role as both a means of expressing the self and a means of making an impression on others.

Philanthropist's rhetoric typically offers an account that presents their philanthropy as an outcome of their achievements, experiences, values, beliefs and preferences; that integrates their giving into a coherent narrative regarding their personal and professional biographies; and that creates and sustains an impression of themselves as people of influence, largely unconcerned about money and with the capacity to set ambitious agendas. In sum, philanthropy offers an opportunity to create and sustain an identity as a significant, influential and authentic person.

Whilst philanthropy has always offered opportunities for identity work, any discussion of its contemporary manifestation must take account of the changed context. Philanthropy now plays a more complex role in contemporary identity work due to wider developments in society and dramatic transformations in social structures since the period of industrialisation. The emergence of modern philanthropy occurred alongside the emergence of the modern individual; both have their roots in the 'great transformation' and are intimately bound up with the problematic pursuit of both self-realisation and belonging. Where once people were born into well-defined social roles that endured throughout life, modern capitalist societies offer greater opportunities for geographical and social mobility that enable people to have more control over who they are and how they live – so long as they invest time and effort in seizing those opportunities. Whereas once people experienced an integrated identity throughout their lives, people must now invest a lot of time and energy in managing their identities, which, despite these efforts, remain fragmented and unstable. Furthermore, where wealth was considered a sign of success in early capitalism and ostentatious displays of wealth were an expected part of elite culture (Veblen 1994), recent years have seen a backlash against the rich (as discussed in the introduction), which has given way to a more hesitant approach to displaying wealth. Contemporary philanthropy is therefore a particularly suitable vehicle for carrying out identity work because it provides opportunities both for self-expression and for being part of a wider community.

At the start of the 21st century practising religion is in decline, people have longer and healthier life spans and time frames are more near-focused. In previous centuries, when concern about being judged in the after-life was widespread, donors were more concerned with managing their reputations *after* death. The wording of charitable bequests, contained in last wills and testaments, were in essence self-penned eulogies, intended to influence the way the deceased would be remembered and commemorated (Gray 1905:12). One consequence of secularisation is that people have become more concerned with their identity during life than with their reputation after death, and a related consequence is that people have come to see their fellow men as a more significant audience than God. Therefore the language used to describe contemporary philanthropic acts often takes the form of a living commentary on how the donor's character should be assessed, their values understood and their life justified.

However, religion continues to be a motivating factor for a significant percentage of contemporary donors. As discussed in the preceding chapter, 17% of contemporary UK philanthropists were identified as 'Salvation Seekers' whose donations are primarily focused on promoting their chosen religion or serving the interests of members of their own religious group. A further 4% of the sample has 'Salvation Seeker' as their secondary type, meaning that religion plays a role in the philanthropic activity of a fifth of all the donors discussed in this thesis. This sub-set of philanthropists often openly declare their religious motivation, as illustrated in the explicitly religious extracts from governing documents and quotes presented in the section sub-headed "I am devout" in 4.3 above. However, it is possible that some of the other four-fifths of donors also have some faith-based motivation, but choose not to foreground that driver, perhaps because of concerns that it is not viewed as an acceptable motivation in the 21st century. The potential disparity between the actual and the stated role of religion as a motivator of contemporary philanthropy would be an interesting question for further study.

Many of Goffman's ideas were found to be useful for making sense of contemporary philanthropy; his concepts of identity management, the 'idealised impressions' offered to observers who demand consistency and the 'playing down of wealth' by the wealthy are all evident in my findings. Many donors are seeking to express themselves, and to make an impression on others, through their philanthropy. However, the coherence of the 'idealised impression' that they are trying to make is threatened by anti-rich sentiments and the public's knowledge of their behaviour outwith their philanthropic activities. Self-aware philanthropists are aware of the need for consistency and sincerity in their acts, as Zak Goldsmith - an inheritee and environmental philanthropist - notes, *"For anybody who is both wealthy and socially concerned, there is some contradiction in our lives"*[122]. There is a general sense that the idea of the 'philanthropic rich' involves some sort of contradiction because accumulation and distribution are perceived to be mutually incompatible. The public often perceives 'gaps' in the performance of philanthropists due to concurrent display of conspicuous and compassionate consumption. For example, the purchase of private jets and hosting of multi-million pound parties alongside charitable donations causes confusion amongst the observing public and contributes to the unstable identity of the philanthropist. Such perceived inconsistencies may lie behind the lack of cultural affirmation for philanthropists because observers suspect the 'real' selfish person is attempting to hide behind an inauthentic selfless front. It may be that rich people need to 'perform' being a good person more frequently and more loudly than the non-rich, because there is an assumption that wealth is undeserved or disproportionately distributed. To this extent, the practices of contemporary philanthropy and the way it is talked about may owe more to observers' views of the rich than the views of the rich on philanthropy.

The expression of personal and professional success is a typical element of identity work amongst the rich. Douglas points out that all consumption involves communicating something about the self to others (1978) and the communicative act it is most often assumed to perform is as a status symbol, a badge of wealth and membership of the elite. But definitions of 'success' change over time, as Brooks argues, *"the cultural radicalism of the sixties was a challenge to conventional notions of success... to replace the old order with a new social code that would celebrate spiritual and intellectual ideas"* (2000:32-3). Philanthropic acts are one route to demonstrating success in the new order.

---

122 www.satyamag.com/apr03/collins.html viewed 23/06/08

Philanthropy also offers people an opportunity to construct a coherent narrative of their life history because being philanthropic enables the integration of wealth accumulation into a narrative arc in which 'all along' the intention was wealth distribution. Philanthropists often attempt to present an integrated identity, consistent across their life span, in which the accumulation of wealth is described as taking place with the *pre-existing* intention of distributing it. Even when philanthropists 'inherit' their philanthropy, for example by taking over the running of a family foundation, the language they use often seeks to present this destiny as freely chosen. This is because there is a desire for their identity as a philanthropist to be considered of their own creation, not imposed, which fits with Beck's suggestion that people wish to 'lead their own lives'.

To conclude this discussion, the data demonstrates that, in addition to other motives for, and outcomes of philanthropy, it plays a role in the creation and maintenance of donors' identity as the rhetoric of philanthropists is often more revealing of themselves than of their chosen beneficiaries. This is not to suggest that philanthropy is *solely* about identity, or to make claims about the degree to which it is explicit or important to any individual donor, but simply to state that philanthropy can contribute (intentionally or not) to donors' identity work.

As noted in the attempt to create a typology of contemporary UK philanthropists, philanthropy as an activity is remarkably resistant to generalisations. Its impact covers a multitude of activities and, as discussed in the Introduction, scholars have failed to agree on its defining essence. Philanthropists themselves also defy generalisation, the sample of just 170 people discussed in this thesis includes all ages, genders and backgrounds. But the one common factor that can unite this activity, and the people who undertake it, is that it contributes to identity work.

Whilst this chapter has explored philanthropy in the philanthropist's imagination by analysing the rhetoric used by significant contemporary UK philanthropists in describing their philanthropic acts and their identities as philanthropists, the next chapter focuses on the role of philanthropy in the public imagination, with a study of the representation of philanthropy and philanthropists in the UK media.

Chapter 5
Philanthropy in the public imagination

As the literature review showed, understanding of contemporary philanthropy in the UK is often a product of industry sponsorship and existing research is largely based on interviews with small samples of self-selected philanthropists (examples of the latter notably include Lloyd 2004; Handy 2006). Therefore, what we think we know about philanthropy is either influenced by the perspective of observers with an agenda or based on the views of an unrepresentative group of major donors. A contribution of this thesis is to present data based on more robust sampling, and to examine the topic from the perspectives of both philanthropists and those observing them. This chapter is concerned with the latter – the public image of philanthropy and philanthropists – using a dataset of media print coverage in the year 2006. It begins with a review of previous studies and explains why media coverage is an appropriate proxy for 'public perceptions' of philanthropy, then the methodology is described, an overview of the data is given and the findings are presented and discussed.

5.1 A review of the literature on media coverage of philanthropy

There is very little published research that directly addresses the question of the media's approach to contemporary philanthropists in the UK. The only source of empirical information on the relationship between the media and philanthropists in the UK is Theresa Lloyd's book 'Why Rich People Give', which is unfortunately untheorised. Published in 2004, it is based on interviews with 100 rich people, advisers to the wealthy and major donor fundraisers. Lloyd finds that most of her interviewees firmly believe the media has a hostile attitude to philanthropy and take it for granted that the press will present giving in a negative light (2004:221 & 233). A number of philanthropists are quoted expressing this belief, for example a self-made millionaire in his 50s describes journalism as *"the enemy of philanthropy"* (p.236) whilst a younger self-made man concurs, *"I am afraid of the media. It's always negative... They have great power and there is no right of reply"* (p.233). A fundraiser who raises funds from rich people echoes the donors' sentiments, *"Journalists decry giving. They enjoy digging the dirt. The press can be very hurtful"* (p.232).

Hostility to the media, accompanied by frustration and resignation, is evident in Lloyd's interviewees across the age, gender and 'source of wealth' spectrum. For example, a self-made man in his 70s asks,

> *"Why are the media nasty? They don't do good news, they are snide and they pander to jealousy. The obituaries of philanthropists are nice but during their lifetime journalists dig. There's nothing to be done"* (p.232).

A female philanthropist in her 50s who inherited her wealth says,

> *"Reforming the press is a hopeless cause. We won't be able to change their negative approach. You need to accept from the outset that whatever you do will be rubbished in newspapers because that's what they're there for. If you are giving money away people will think you are doing it for self-aggrandisement"* (p.234).

Lloyd identifies a number of recurrent features that appear in the media's approach to philanthropy (2004:235-236). She claims the media tend to attribute 'despicable motives' and assume that rich people's philanthropy is solely driven by social aspirations, desire for political access and hopes of obtaining privileges. This contrasts with the motives expressed by the donors she interviews, who identify the primary reason for giving as belief in the cause, and secondary motives of 'making a difference', self-actualisation, a sense of duty or obligation to others and a desire to build relationships with the staff, donors and beneficiaries of the charity. A second recurrent feature identified by Lloyd is that the media are hostile to specific types of philanthropy: donations to political parties, support for elite organisations such as the arts, opera and Oxbridge universities and support for stigmatised groups such as gay men and lesbians are said to be the causes most likely to provoke the ire of journalists. Thirdly, Lloyd notes that media reportage of philanthropy is often a thinly veiled attack on the existence and source of donors' wealth, rather than its philanthropic destination; this is said to apply whether their fortune was inherited or self-made. Finally, Lloyd claims that the media deliberately confuse their readership about whether gifts are made from corporate or from personal wealth. An individual's personal fortune can be robust even when their companies are experiencing difficulties, but journalists' determination to write an exposé can make it difficult for prominent business people to give from their personal wealth, as customers react badly to public displays of largesse from owners of companies that are raising prices or making redundancies[123]. Despite overwhelming feelings of negativity about the impact of media coverage on philanthropy, Lloyd finds a minority of interviewees who consider some parts of the media to be supportive, particularly local newspapers (p.240); differences between coverage of philanthropy in local and national newspapers are discussed further below.

Aside from Lloyd, there is no published research that directly addresses the question of the media's approach to contemporary philanthropists in the UK, and her study only reports opinions from within the philanthropy sector. But there is a small body of literature that explores the media's approach to the part of society that is variously referred to as the charity, nonprofit, voluntary or philanthropic sector. Four publications are relevant to this thesis, all of which explore media coverage of charitable organisations rather than media comment specifically focused on philanthropists.

[123] Whilst Lloyd's findings were published well before the 2008/09 global recession, this latter finding is likely to become more pertinent during this economic crisis.

The first of these four reports to be published was 'Charities, Media and Public Opinion' (Fenton, Golding et al. 1993) which was funded by the UK government's Home Office, and contains five different research projects tackling questions regarding the source and nature of public opinion about charities and volunteering. One of these projects involves a content analysis of local and national print and broadcast media in the UK, which seeks to identify the volume, incidence and form of media images regarding the UK voluntary sector. The analysis finds that individual charities are most likely to gain prominence through their campaigning work but that overall the largest quantity of media coverage is prompted by the actual work undertaken by charitable organisations, notably the services they deliver; thus the focus is on what charities *do*, rather than on the values they promote or the opinions that they hold. Fenton et al also conclude that the type of coverage charities receive is related to the type of newspaper it appears in: broadsheets are more likely to include charity coverage and analysis; tabloids tend to focus on fundraising stories; and local newspapers focus on the good works of local charities and examples of good citizenship set by their volunteers and fundraisers.

Six years later, a chapter within a book on 'Social Policy, the Media and Misrepresentation' uses much of the same data presented in Fenton et al to explore the construction of voluntary sector coverage in the UK media (Deacon 1999). This study begins by noting, *"There has been surprisingly little concerted investigation into the existing relationship between mainstream media and the voluntary sector "* (p.56). Deacon seeks to fill that vacuum by presenting a content analysis of over 3,000 items of voluntary sector-related news stories in the press and broadcast media. He concludes that media treatment of the sector is characterised by a *"combination of indulgence and neglect"* (1999:59), as he finds that coverage is almost entirely favourable, yet superficial, containing little in-depth engagement with the topic. He concludes that,

> *"News reporting offers a decidedly restricted view of voluntarism: marginalising contentious, minority or non-photogenic areas, presenting organisations in an indulgent but largely anodyne and descriptive context, and engaging in little reflexive debate about the strategic role and needs of the sector"* (Deacon 1999:65).

Deacon finds that the vast majority of stories (94%) concern British charities and that coverage focuses on a narrow domain of voluntary activity, notably health, children, animals, the environment and overseas aid. Building on a point made by Fenton et al, Deacon concludes that voluntary organisations are far more likely to receive coverage for their 'deeds', such as fundraising and meeting needs, rather than coverage of their 'thoughts', such as raising topics and adjudicating upon the needs of others.

Deacon does not analyse discrepancies in coverage between local and national press, but such differences are clearly present in the account of his data. Local papers are said to be the most likely to promote the view that 'charity begins at home' whilst broadsheets are more likely to feature news about overseas relief and development (Deacon 1999:1-2). Local press are found to focus mainly on fundraising initiatives and other 'good works', whilst national TV and radio news are said to give greater prominence to voluntary agencies as 'signallers' and 'critics' (p.58). Voluntary activity is presented in the local media as valued in its own right, independent of its success in delivering its goals, because it offers opportunities for 'good citizenry', and local charities receive positive coverage from local newspapers because they provide, "*a useful means for locating and 'localising' a programme or paper within its target region"* (p.59).

The third publication, 'Truth on the Sidelines: Philanthropy and Foundations in the Media' (Gould, Lewis et al. 2003) is based on data from the US rather than the UK, and is focused on media coverage of grant-making foundations rather than the operating or fundraising charities studied by the reports discussed above. Much of its analysis and commentary is superficial and un-theorised because it is designed to be useful to foundation officials rather than researchers, but two findings are relevant to this thesis. An analysis of a sample of articles from each of two six month periods, one in 1997-98 and one in 2002-03 concludes that the majority (60%) of coverage of philanthropy is contained in news stories, rather than features and analysis, and that such stories typically appear in either the local/metro section (26%) or in the business section (24%). The next most frequent section in which stories about philanthropic foundations appeared was national news (11%) with just 7% each in lifestyle/arts and opinion/editorial. The US media therefore presents philanthropy as something 'newsworthy' that is done by local people, business leaders and corporate entities, and rarely worthy of wider editorial reflection. Gould et al also find that the most frequent reason for philanthropic foundations to appear in the press is because of a significant donation or fundraising campaign. Over a quarter (27%) of stories concentrate on such acts, and a majority of them (68%) focus on 'local heroes' who are the donors and activists within a specific community (Gould, Lewis et al. 2003:9). There is less coverage of trends in giving, the relationship between philanthropy and politics and the donor's control of gifts, which might all be categorised as 'thoughts' about giving, thus confirming Deacon's finding that the media is more interested in non-profit stories that concern deeds rather than thoughts.

The fourth and most recent study that is relevant to the research presented in this thesis is Hale's content analysis of non-profit and philanthropy coverage in the US media (Hale 2007). Hale cites Deacon's work, amongst others, to argue that previous literature has established the ubiquitous presence of the non-profit sector in the media, which encourages people to 'think about' nonprofits. The philanthropic sector is therefore included in what is termed 'first-level agenda setting', ascertained by the frequency with which a topic is discussed within the media:

> *"News selection is at the heart of the agenda-setting process since the issues that fail to pass through the gatekeepers of the news also fail to give salient cues regarding the relative importance of the issues"*
> (Wanta, Gola and Lee (2004) cited in Hale 2007:p.466).

Hale seeks to extend the analysis beyond merely quantitative measures to examine the 'attributes' contained within media coverage. His assessment of 'second-level agenda setting' uses the concept of media framing to analyse the *meaning* of media coverage and ascertain *how* people are encouraged to think about an issue rather than just *whether* the topic appears in the media. Hale analyses around 1,000 randomly sampled newspaper stories from nine major US newspapers and finds that media coverage of non-profits is generally quite favourable yet largely 'episodic', in that it is focused on identifiable, named non-profit organisations rather than 'thematic' coverage of the non-profit sector as a whole and its role in society. Media framing analysis demonstrates that the media usually frames non-profit stories as isolated episodes rather than contextualised within a broader narrative, such that, *"the media show nonprofits to be of temporary and not lasting significance"* (Hale 2007:482).

Furthermore, Hale finds that when the media does discuss the sector thematically, the coverage becomes less favourable. Hale also finds support for Deacon's suggestion that media coverage is characterised by 'indulgence and neglect' noting, *"although the media generally portray nonprofits in a positive light, they often portray them as out of the spotlight altogether"* (Hale 2007:482). Finally, Hale finds that the media frequently represent nonprofits as local organisations that hold fundraising events; this finding supports Gould et al's finding that philanthropy is primarily presented as a local phenomenon with limited impact and minimal wider relevance.

The literature discussed above spans two decades and includes a number of different research questions about the wider charity sector in both the US and the UK, but some commonalities relevant to this thesis are apparent. Firstly, that philanthropically funded organisations receive ubiquitous, but not substantive, media coverage. Secondly, that media coverage varies between different types of newspapers, with the local press being generally more favourable and focused on fundraising and 'local heroes', whilst the national press is slightly less favourable yet presents more substantive insights that contextualise philanthropy within wider society. Thirdly, that the media is interested in a narrow domain of voluntary activity – notably 'newsworthy' deeds in support of domestic and popular causes – and largely neglects the thoughts and ideas emanating from charities and their donors.

The research presented in the rest of this chapter is designed to build on the strengths and rectify weaknesses identified in the literature discussed above. It analyses primary data and therefore moves beyond the subjective opinions of philanthropists as reported by Lloyd; the sample is entirely drawn from UK media reports, unlike Gould and Hale who use US data; and the sampling and analysis are solely focused on philanthropy and philanthropists, rather than on the wider issues of media coverage of recipient nonprofit organisations, as in all but Lloyd above. Therefore, this thesis builds on the approaches used in the earlier studies whilst making a further contribution to knowledge by introducing an empirical focus on the representation of philanthropy and philanthropists in the UK media and a theoretical interpretation of the data, undertaken within the framework of a sociological analysis.

Specific questions addressed in this new research include: What is the balance of coverage between individual philanthropists and the broader philanthropic sector? Are philanthropists more likely to receive coverage for what they say or for what they do? And in what circumstances is media coverage of philanthropy more or less favourable? It seeks to assess the accuracy of Lloyd's interviewees, who predominantly believe that media coverage of their philanthropic acts is negative and cynical; it explores whether the relationship between the nature of media coverage of charities and the type of newspaper in which it appears also holds for coverage of philanthropy; it applies the theoretical frameworks utilised in Hale's paper to new data on media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in the UK; and it identifies and analyses the dominant themes within media coverage to arrive at an understanding of the representation of philanthropy and philanthropists in the popular imagination.

However, before presenting the findings of this study, as this chapter is described as an exploration of the public understanding of philanthropy, it is important to first explain why the media is considered a suitable proxy for public perceptions.

5.2 Media coverage as a proxy for public perceptions of philanthropy

Sociological studies have taken media coverage seriously for many decades and media discourses are widely understood to be directly reflexive of public opinion (Ewart 2000:2). For example, Furedi notes that, *"most people gain their information through the media, rather than through direct experience"* (1997:52), and Couldry argues that the media can be considered an adequate proxy for public opinion:

> *"It is generally taken for granted that the media... have a particular authority to speak on behalf of society as a whole. The media have the power to speak 'for us all' – indeed to define the social 'reality' that we all share"* (2000:273).

When the mass media first emerged in the mid-twentieth century, leading sociologists noted its importance in both providing information and shaping our experiences. For example, C. Wright Mills noted,

> *"Very little of what we think we know of the social realities of the world have we found out first-hand. Most of the 'pictures in our heads' we have gained from [the mass] media – even to the point where we often do not really believe what we see before us until we read about it in the paper or hear about it on the radio. The media not only give us information; they guide our very experiences"* (1956:311).

Unlike cruder Marxist analyses, Mills is not arguing that the mass media manipulates public opinion but rather that people rely on it to confirm their pre-existing, if latent, opinions.

> *"The individual does not trust his own experiences... until it is confirmed by others or by the media. Usually such direct exposure is not accepted if it disturbs loyalties and beliefs that the individual already holds. To be accepted, it must relieve or justify the feelings that often lie in the back of his mind as key features of his ideological loyalties"* (Mills 1956:312).

An extensive body of literature has since attested to the fact that media institutions are crucial in validating and affirming wider conceptions about aspects of social life. Stuart Hall is a notable proponent of the view that the media plays a key role in the process of cultural production and reproduction, including the creation and circulation of dominant discourses, which involve the production of knowledge through language (Hall 1992:291). He explains how the media undertakes this role by,

> *"referring to or constructing knowledge about a particular topic of practice: a cluster (or formation) of ideas, images and practices, which provide ways of talking about, forms of knowledge and conduct associated with, a particular topic, social activity or institutional site in society. These discursive formations as they are known, define what is and is not appropriate in our formulation of, and our practices in relation to, a particular subject or site of social activity; what knowledge is considered useful, relevant and 'true' in that context; and what sorts of persons, or 'subjects' embody its characteristics"* (Hall 1997:6).

Hence the importance of the media goes beyond its ostensible purpose of reportage, because media representations do not just reflect social subjects and historical events, they constitute and shape them (Hall 1997:6). Similarly, Carey argues that newspaper text is, *"[t]he point of contact in which the participant encounters and lives the culture"* (cited in Ewart 2000:2). This perspective is developed by Ewart, whose research explores the role of the Australian local media in constructing the identity and culture of individuals and the communities in which they live. Ewart's conclusions support Hall's theoretical proposition as she finds that,

> *"A community comes to recognise and hence know itself through its representation in local media. Part of this recognition process involves the establishment of a set of 'norms' for behaviour, appearance and characteristics"* (Ewart 2000:1).

Ewart also argues that a specific role of the media is to *"create the conditions whereby consensus amongst individuals about the desirability of particular values can be reached"* (2000:2). Such a role clearly goes beyond reportage and gives the media a more significant function in the lives of those who consume it.

In addition to this theoretically grounded rationale for using media coverage as a proxy for public opinion, there is also a pragmatic line of reasoning regarding access to data. The availability of LexisNexis, an online, searchable archive of the full content of most UK newspapers[124] makes it possible to create a large and comprehensive database of representations of philanthropy and philanthropists within the media that is freely accessible to any future researchers who wish to review the data and analysis. Time, cost and logistical obstacles militate against the creation of a new dataset as creating a representative sample of 'the public' and gathering data from that sample would have been costly, time consuming and prone to social desirability bias from respondents distorting their answers to say what they perceive to be 'the right thing' about philanthropy (as, for example, discussed in Silverman 2007). The possibility of creating a dataset from online discussions (such as within web forums and blogs) about philanthropy and philanthropists, was considered but rejected due to concerns about the self-selecting nature of the online public, which makes this option no more likely to be representative than a print media-based sample. Furthermore there is insufficient precedent for using blogs and similar sources to create a reliable and robust dataset, whereas many prior sociological studies use content analysis of media coverage to investigate various social phenomena (for example Furedi 1997; Best 1999).

[124] UK coverage within the LexisNexis database includes the daily and Sunday editions of the following national titles: The Times, Telegraph, Guardian, Independent, Express, Mail, Mirror and the Sun; the inclusion of local newspapers from every UK region means the dataset comprises 458 national and regional newspapers in total.

Methodology

A search was undertaken of the LexisNexis database to identify all articles that contained 'major mentions'[125] of the terms 'philanthropy' or 'philanthropist', in sixteen national newspapers[126] in all regions of the UK[127], between the dates 1 January 2006 and 31 December 2006. This search generated a total of 626 articles, including a substantial number of repetitions of the same article that appeared in different editions of the same newspaper. A preliminary review of the full dataset was undertaken to eliminate articles that were duplicates or not appropriate for the purpose of the research; articles were eliminated for a wide variety of reasons, as listed in Appendix D. A total of 208 articles were removed, leaving a final dataset for analysis of 418 articles. The combined length of these articles was over 500 pages of text (at 12 point font) and nearly 300,000 words in total.

Having collated the data, three 'waves' of analysis were then undertaken. The analysis began with mining the data by hand to identify over-arching features and statistics in order to build up an overview of the dataset, presented in section 5.3 below. The second wave involved undertaking an affective and cognitive framing analysis, largely building on the methodology used in Hale's analysis of US media coverage (2007). The framing analysis, presented in section 5.4, involves assessing both the 'affective framing' of the data, which refers to how positive or negative it is, and the 'cognitive framing' of the data, which refers to how the substantive attributes influence the topic under discussion. Affective framing was identified by coding each article on a 5-point scale (very favourable, favourable, neutral/mixed, unfavourable, very unfavourable) and by undertaking an adjectival count to assess whether the 'sentiment' of articles about philanthropists was positive, negative or neutral. This count was achieved by going through the whole dataset twice, firstly searching for every use of the word 'philanthropist' and noting the adjectives used in front of that term, and secondly (when marking up the codes for the main content analysis) noting any adjectives that had been missed on the first search. Cognitive framing was identified in three ways: by assessing whether the article focused primarily on what philanthropists do, what they say or simply the fact of their existence; by coding each article according to whether philanthropy and/or philanthropists were the *object* of the story (comprising more than 50% of the substance of the article) or a story *attribute* (comprising less than 50% of the substance of the article); and examining whether the story was presented *episodically* as an isolated incident or was presented *thematically* and contextualised within a broader narrative.

Finally, the third wave involved undertaking a content analysis to identify the themes present in the whole dataset and to explore the relationships between these themes. Content analysis is a method that has been developed to explain how meanings are exchanged within complex webs of social interaction with the ultimate aim of yielding significant insights into human behaviour (Krippendorf 2004). The chosen method is especially appropriate for the purposes of this thesis because,

---

[125] When the data collection was undertaken in early 2007, one search function on the LexisNexis database was 'type of mention', which offered the chance to select 'all mentions' or to apply a filter to identify only 'major mentions' of the chosen terms; the latter option was chosen to ensure the resulting data bore sufficient relevance to the topic of philanthropy and philanthropists.

[126] The sixteen national newspapers that were searched are the daily and Sunday editions of: The Times, Telegraph, Guardian, Independent, Express, Mail, Mirror and the Sun; these newspapers were chosen on the basis that they appear in the LexisNexis database, which is an online, searchable archive of the full content of most UK newspapers.

[127] The inclusion of local newspapers from every UK region means the dataset comprises 458 national and regional newspapers in total.

> *"when we seek to measure subjective aspects of mass phenomena such as the values or opinions current in a population, we must begin with symbols such as text that must somehow be processed to produce the classifications or quantities we require. This processing (regardless of how it is done) is content analysis"* (Markoff, Shapiro et al. 1975:2).

As noted in section 5.1 above, content analysis is the methodology of choice for previous research that explores representations of the philanthropic sector in the media. This methodological choice is defended by the authors of one of those studies on the grounds that it enables the systematic extraction of relevant material which, *"allow[s] us to make inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics and messages."* (Fenton, Golding et al. 1993:121-2). Furthermore, content analysis is a suitable methodology given the data that is being used as newspaper articles are, *"semantically rich, relatively complex, and varied; yet they are sufficiently standardized in both function and format to suggest valuable opportunities for systematic comparisons of their contents"* (Markoff, Shapiro et al. 1975:2). It is also an appropriate method to tackle a topic that, as discussed in the introductory chapter, carries a lot of ideological baggage, because it can "measure subjective aspects of mass phenomena" (p.2). Finally, it should produce robust findings because, *"it is not content analysis unless it is within the range of ambition of the scientific tradition: variously phrased, the work must be systematic, objective, replicable, 'valid'"* (p.6-7).

The process of undertaking content analysis begins by transforming a mass of data (in this case c.300,000 words) into an organised dataset through a process of coding (Markoff, Shapiro et al. 1975:3). This process was initially undertaken using the computer package HyperResearch, which is the electronic equivalent of marking up documents with highlighter pens (David and Sutton 2004:232) but the task was eventually completed by hand as the dataset proved manageable without an advanced software package. As David and Sutton note,

> *"[qualitative] analysis by means of reading and re-reading the data, making memos by hand and squint analysis followed up by written reflections upon the findings may give as much insight as any software"* (2004:252).

The dataset was coded by hand using an open-ended strategy to identify the main themes within media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists; these codes emerged inductively as significant variables and patterns were noted in the course of reading, re-reading and organising the data. Cross-referencing the codes highlighted the repeated presence of a number of distinguishing features within the dataset. After the data was coded, fourteen themes were apparent, which were then merged to create the three macro-themes presented and discussed in section 5.5.

These three waves of analysis ensured that the dataset was rigorously scrutinised from many different angles. The findings from each wave were fed back into other elements of the analysis in an iterative process, resulting in a coherent and comprehensive exploration of representations of philanthropy and philanthropists in contemporary UK print media.

5.3 Overview of data for the media analysis

The overview of data covers five aspects of the dataset:
i. Drivers of media coverage across the year
ii. Coverage by broadsheets, tabloids and local newspapers
iii. Newspaper section analysis
iv. Quantity of coverage
v. Philanthropists named in the media

Drivers of media coverage across the year
A total of 418 articles that involve 'major' references to philanthropy and/or philanthropists were published in 2006. This averages out to just over one article per day so, by the yardstick of media coverage, the topic appears to be a small but regular part of everyday life. Whilst the content analysis will examine more closely the actual material contained in these 418 articles, a preliminary review of the data identified four main reasons for this topic to appear in the print media: calendar-driven coverage, event-driven coverage, public relations-driven coverage and editorial-driven coverage. Each of these drivers will be considered in turn.

Coverage is clearly calendar driven; articles are not evenly spread over the calendar year, as shown by the monthly analysis in Appendix E. The average number of articles per month is 35, yet February, March and May had 25 articles or less, whilst April, October and November had 45 or more. The uneven levels of coverage result from certain times of the year being commonly felt to be more or less appropriate times for discussing charitable activity. For example, in the run-up to Christmas, many newspapers organise their own fundraising appeal for a chosen cause, and appear more willing to cover other philanthropic activities. Coverage in the autumn therefore greatly exceeds coverage in the height of summer.

Media coverage is often event-driven. When a prominent philanthropist dies, such as Simon Sainsbury in October 2006, or a historically large donation is announced, such as Warren Buffett's c.$30 billion gift in June 2006, or Richard Branson's $3 billion pledge in September 2006, the media agenda is driven by these events. Incidents of this nature spark initial news reportage and then subsequent analysis, comment and editorial related to the original story.

Coverage can also be a result of efforts made by public relations (PR) professionals. The many articles that reported research findings from the Sutton Trust (January 2006) or the launch of RED products to raise funds to fight disease in poor countries (February 2006) indicate a successful PR effort within those organisations.

Finally, certain newspapers appear to have made a conscious decision to allocate more or less space to stories about charity and philanthropy and to have a broad editorial 'line' about how positive these articles will be. As discussed further below, local and regional editors take a broadly positive approach to covering such stories, especially when they involve people living within their distribution region, whilst broadsheet editors allocate far more space than tabloid editors but take a more measured approach to the content of coverage. Within these broad categories of 'types' of newspaper, editorial decisions vary for a variety of pragmatic and ideological reasons, for example the Times and Sunday Times carry a lot of coverage to support the publication of their annual Rich List and Giving Index whilst the Guardian and the Observer have more minimal and critical coverage, which may be related to that paper's left-wing perspective and a view that philanthropy as incompatible with support for extensive welfare state provision.

Coverage by broadsheets, tabloids and local newspapers

Table 5.1 presents a breakdown of the database of media coverage by types of newspaper. It shows that the topic of philanthropy is almost exclusively the preserve of broadsheets and local newspapers, with less than one in ten of the articles appearing in tabloids.

Table 5.1: Coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in different types of newspaper

Type of newspaper	Number of articles	Percentage of coverage
National Broadsheets	212	51%
Regional	166	40%
National Tabloids	40	9%

Whilst broadsheets and regional papers demonstrate similar degrees of enthusiasm for covering philanthropic activities, the approach and content varies considerably between these two types of newspaper. This finding is discussed further below, but in essence broadsheets tend to take a more neutral-to-negative stance, whereas regional papers take a more positive-to-neutral approach. Within the regional press, certain cities – such as Liverpool, Birmingham and Aberdeen – appear disproportionately interested in this topic, as shown in the data presented in Appendix F, for example coverage in Liverpool papers is double that in the Welsh papers. Accounting for the irregular spread of coverage across the regions of the UK would be an interesting question for further research. A preliminary hypothesis would be that such towns are distinct in having a celebrated tradition of philanthropy with many notable 'famous sons and daughters' who serve as philanthropic role models. An article from the dataset, which appeared in a local Liverpool newspaper, supports this hypothesis, claiming it is,

> *"a city that has a strong history of philanthropy and business acumen. From Henry Tate to the Rathbone family, from Joseph Williamson to William Hesketh Lever, we've always looked after our own whether in money or kind – from the washhouses of Kitty Wilkinson to the poor children on the streets with Father Nugent. We are a city that cares."*[128]

[128] 'We have a basic human need to give', Liverpool Daily Echo, 29/05/06

Newspaper section analysis

As shown in table 5.2, almost half (43%) of the articles in the dataset were published as news stories, the rest were features or appeared in specialist sections, such as business, sports, obituaries and gossip columns.

Table 5.2: Breakdown of articles by section of newspapers

Newspaper Section	Number of articles	Percentage of articles
News	180	43%
Features	95	23%
City / Business / Financial	43	11%
Other	24	6%
Comment	22	5%
Sports	14	3%
Obituaries	14	3%
Letters	14	3%
Gossip columns	8	2%
Education	4	1%

This corresponds to the trend identified in US media coverage of philanthropic organisations, which also found the highest proportion of articles appearing in the news section (Gould, Lewis et al. 2003). However, in the US 60% of coverage appeared in the news section, compared to 43% in the UK, which may reflect the greater interest in, and hence 'newsworthiness' of, philanthropy within American society.

57% of UK media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists occurs outside the news section, in particular it appears in the features section, comment pages and gossip columns, all of which depend more on opinion and rumour than fact. The preponderance of articles within such sections of newspapers may be related to the diffusion of societal norms regarding philanthropy and philanthropists. This finding therefore provides some support for the suggestion, discussed further in the content analysis below, that the depiction of philanthropy in the UK media is more an extension of the old 'society pages' than a topic considered worthy of serious news reporting and in-depth analysis.

Quantity of coverage

The overall number of articles in the dataset (418) constitutes just a preliminary measure of the presence of philanthropy and philanthropists in the print media; it does not take account of the amount of space or the prominence that is allocated to these articles. Therefore, any assessment of coverage must also take account of their length and positioning. Table 5.3 shows that the articles are overwhelmingly short, with four out of five being under 1,000 words.

Table 5.3: Summary of length of articles

Length in words	No of articles	Percentage
Under 1,000	337	81%
1,001-2,000	71	17%
Over 2,000	10[129]	2%

Furthermore, table 5.4 shows that within the sub-set of articles with fewer than 1,000 words, both the median and mode are under 500 words.

Table 5.4: Length of articles under 1,000 words

Length in words	No of articles	Percentage
Under 100	18	5%
101-200	29	9%
201-300	36	11%
301-400 *mode	63	19%
401-500 *median	55	16%
501-600	30	9%
601-700	31	9%
701-800	31	9%
801-900	26	8%
901-1000	18	5%

It was not possible to identify where in the newspapers the articles appear, as the LexisNexis database does not provide this information. Clearly there is a substantial difference in the importance accorded to a front page story, even if it is substantially shorter than a longer article tucked away in the inside pages. Further research would be helpful, both to analyse this issue of prominence and to compare these findings to the average length of articles on topics other than philanthropy and philanthropists. Whether or not this topic is being 'short-changed' relative to other topics also depends on the unknown variable of length of all articles. But the generally short length of these articles, noted above, arguably militates against them having a substantive presence, denies opportunities for in-depth analysis, and increases the likelihood of cursory and superficial treatment of the issue.

Philanthropists named in the media

The focus of each article was examined to record whether it focused on a single, named philanthropist, a handful of philanthropists or the whole philanthropic sector. As shown in table 5.5, media coverage was found to be far more likely to focus on single philanthropists than to discuss philanthropy in a collective sense or as a social phenomenon.

[129] Of which, the mean was 2,995 words long and the longest was 5,151 words.

Table 5.5: The focus of media coverage

Focus of story	Number of stories	Percentage
An individual philanthropist	256	61%
A few philanthropists	46	11%
Many/the whole sector of philanthropy	116	28%

In order to explore this finding further, the names of the individual philanthropists referred to in media articles were also recorded. In the 61% of cases when only one philanthropist is named, it is frequently found to be one of a very small group who are repeatedly featured in media coverage. In 10% of the cases where the focus is on a single, named philanthropist, that person is Tom Hunter; in 7% of cases it is Peter Lampl; and in 5% of cases it is Andrew Carnegie. Thus three men (one of whom is dead) account for over a fifth (22%) of the media coverage of individual, named philanthropists. Adding in the next most frequently mentioned names: Tom Farmer (4%), Irvine Laidlaw (3%) and Peter Moores (3%) means that just six men account for a third (32%) of all media coverage of named philanthropists in the UK media. This is an important finding as general perceptions about philanthropy may be grossly distorted by this focus on a handful of philanthropists.

Even when the media refers to philanthropy in a collective sense, and discusses the sector rather than a named individual, the story is often illustrated with reference to a member of this small group of philanthropists. In the entire dataset, Tom Hunter's name appears 263 times, Irvine Laidlaw is named 57 times and Tom Farmer's name appears 53 times[130]. In total 119 individuals are named as philanthropists in the dataset, as shown in Appendix G. In the introduction it was noted that a majority of the UK population make charitable donations (Wilding, Clark et al. 2006) which raises the question: if millions of people freely give away their own money to charity, why are just 119 people identified in the media as philanthropists? This finding reinforces the suggestion that much media coverage is in fact about the possession of celebrity, power and wealth rather than simply about philanthropic acts.

Summary of overview of data

The media carries a small but steady flow of stories about philanthropy and philanthropists; broadsheets and local papers carry far more coverage of the topic than tabloids and each type of paper approaches the topic in distinctive ways; less than half of the coverage appears in the news sections of the papers; articles are predominantly short, almost all are under 1,000 words in length, with a median of 450 words; most (61%) of stories are about single named philanthropists rather than the collective activity of philanthropy; and within stories focused on single philanthropists a handful of names recur frequently with just six male donors accounting for a third (32%) of all such coverage.

Having established the basic parameters of the dataset under study, a framing analysis and content analysis were undertaken to explore more fully the nature of UK media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists.

[130] These figures include multiple mentions of Hunter, Laidlaw and Farmer within the same article.

5.4 Findings of affective and cognitive framing analysis

The findings of the framing analysis support Deacon's description of media coverage as 'surprisingly indulgent' (1999:59) with *"remarkably little negative coverage of voluntary agencies and their work"* (p.4). As table 5.6 shows, the majority of stories in all types of paper were favourable to some degree and just one in seven (14%) of the articles were unfavourable to any degree.

Table 5.6: Favourability of media coverage

Favourability of coverage	Number	Percentage[131]
Very favourable	72	17%
Favourable	181	43%
Neutral	105	25%
Unfavourable	43	10%
Very unfavourable	17	4%

Favourability was related to the type of newspaper in which the article appears as shown in table 5.7; local papers were the most likely to provide positive affective framing and tabloids the most likely to provide negative affective framing.

Table 5.7: Cross-tabulation of types of paper and affective media framing, shown as %(N)

Type of newspaper	Very favourable	Favourable	Neutral/ Mixed	Unfavourable	Very Unfavourable
Broadsheet	14% (28)	39% (79)	31% (63)	11% (22)	5% (10)
Local	22% (36)	48% (78)	20% (33)	9% (14)	1% (3)
Tabloid	15% (8)	46% (24)	17% (9)	14% (7)	8% (4)

This confirms the finding of previous studies, which found a similar emphasis on positive stories about charity in the local media,

> *"In the local press, local charities and their good works, local appeals and examples of good citizenship achieved through volunteering and the goodwill of fundraisers are the main themes of coverage"* (Fenton, Golding et al. 1993:7).

This finding also echoes Deacon's conclusion that,

> *"In the local media, voluntary activity was more highly valued in its own right, as local 'good citizenry' was seen both as a reliable column filler for a quiet news day, and as a useful means for locating and 'localising' a programme or paper within its target region"* (1999:59).

[131] This column adds up to 99% due to rounding errors.

Deacon attributed the favourability found in local coverage to the *'appreciably more constrained representations of voluntary activity'* (1999:59) that are found in such newspapers. As the local press focus mainly on fundraising initiatives and other 'good works' they create far fewer opportunities to critique charitable activity than in broadsheets, which are more likely *"to give greater prominence to voluntary agencies as 'signallers' and 'critics'"* (p.58).

To triangulate these findings, and to investigate further the opinions expressed by Lloyd's interviewees regarding the negative approach held by journalists (2004), an adjectival count was undertaken to identify whether qualifications of the word 'philanthropist' were positive or negative. A total of 123 different adjectives were identified, listed in Appendix H. Rather than tending towards either extreme of favourability or negativity, the majority (55%) were found to be neutral references that referred to descriptive or historical factors, for example 'local philanthropist, 'Catholic philanthropist' and 'Scottish philanthropist'. Just under a third (30%) were positive, for example 'great philanthropist', 'legendary philanthropist' and 'best-loved philanthropist'. Only 15% could be construed as negative or pejorative, for example 'disgraced philanthropist', 'ruthless philanthropist' and 'tax-ruse philanthropist'.

Whilst this adjectival-incidence count appears to disprove the suggestion that the media is especially hostile to philanthropists, this analysis may not tell the whole story because the variables are nominal, with no meaningful interval between them. This means that categorisation of adjectives in one of the three columns does not imply anything about the strength of how positive or negative they are. One especially negative reference can have more impact than a large number of benign or positive references, especially if the negative adjectives resonate more strongly with the readers' existing prejudices about philanthropy and philanthropists. Therefore further analysis was undertaken to explore the relationship between affective framing and other variables. Table 5.8 cross-tabulates the affective framing with whether the focus of the story is a single, handful or whole sector of philanthropists.

Table 5.8: Cross-tabulation: Focus of story and affective framing, shown as %(N)

Focus of story	Very favourable	Favourable	Neutral/ Mixed	Unfavourable	Very unfavourable
One philanthropist	20% (53)	41% (105)	27% (68)	9% (23)	3% (7)
A Few	15% (7)	50% (23)	24% (11)	2% (1)	9% (4)
Many/All	10% (12)	46% (53)	23% (26)	16% (19)	5% (6)

This cross-tabulation shows that only 12% of the coverage of single philanthropists is unfavourable to any degree, compared to 21% of the coverage of philanthropists as a group, indicating that the media find it easier to be negative about philanthropists *en masse* than they do about individual, named philanthropists. This is possibly a result of friendly relationships developing between journalists and their interviewees, as well as a reflection of the consequences for gaining future access should the resulting article be hostile. Degree of favourability is also likely to relate to the house style of different types of newspapers; whilst no formal study of this aspect was undertaken, it appears that broadsheets tend to use more under-stated language than the hyperbole found in tabloids, whilst local newspapers use more superlatives.

Whilst further research may be useful, the findings of this affective framing analysis demonstrate that the media is not as negative as some people, including many philanthropists, suggest.

A cognitive framing analysis was then undertaken in order to investigate the substantive attributes of the dataset and to explore how media depictions influence the way that philanthropy and philanthropists are described and discussed.

The cognitive analysis began by coding each article according to whether the main story attribute was focused on what philanthropists 'do', 'say' or 'are'. Whilst the analysis undertaken by Hale (discussed in section 5.1 above) only coded media coverage according to whether it focused on what philanthropists 'do or 'say', a third category of 'are' was introduced in order to accommodate the significant number of profiles of philanthropists that appear in newspapers, which did not fit neatly into either of Hale's categories of 'deeds' or 'thoughts'.

Table 5.9: Main story attribute in UK media coverage of philanthropy

Main story attribute	Number	Percentage
What philanthropists are (profiles)	103	25%
What philanthropists do (deeds)	288	69%
What philanthropists say (thoughts)	27	6%

Table 5.9 shows that, as predicted in the literature, media coverage focuses on the deeds rather than the thoughts of philanthropists, and table 5.10 shows that this finding is constant across all types of newspaper.

Table 5.10: Cross-tabulation of types of paper and main story attribute

Type of newspaper	What philanthropists are (profiles)	What philanthropists do (deeds)	What philanthropists say (thoughts)
Broadsheet	33% (66)	60% (122)	7% (14)
Local	18% (30)	76% (124)	6% (10)
Tabloid	13% (7)	81% (42)	6% (3)

The data does not support the finding in the extant literature that broadsheets are more likely to carry coverage of the ideas and opinions of major donors, as all types of paper carry a low percentage (either 6% or 7%) of coverage that is focused on the 'thoughts' of donors. However, by introducing a new category of story attribute ('are', referring to profiles of philanthropists), it becomes clear that broadsheets are twice as likely to carry profiles and to discuss the existence of philanthropists, than either the local press or tabloids.

In order to investigate this issue further, table 5.11 presents a cross-tabulation of main story attributes with whether the focus of the article is a single, handful or whole sector of philanthropists. This analysis finds that what individual philanthropists have to say is far more likely to receive coverage than the 'thoughts' of collective groups of philanthropists.

Table 5.11: Cross-tabulation of the focus of the article with main story attribute

Focus of story	What philanthropists are (profiles)	What philanthropists do (deeds)	What philanthropists say (thoughts)
One philanthropist	31% (79)	60% (154)	9% (23)
A few philanthropists	20% (9)	80% (37)	0% (0)
Many/all philanthropists	13% (15)	84% (97)	3% (4)

The next element of the cognitive framing analysis involved coding each article according to whether philanthropy and/or philanthropists constitute the main *object* of the article, or were simply an *attribute* of the story. Table 5.12 shows that, as the literature suggests, media coverage tends to be superficial, with a far higher percentage of articles containing philanthropy as an attribute, rather than the object of the story.

Table 5.12: Is philanthropy the object or just an attribute of the media coverage?

Story Object or Attribute?	Number	Percentage
Object (focus of >50% of article)	158	38%
Subject (focus of <50% of article)	260	62%

This finding supports the suggestion, discussed further in the content analysis below, that the media is not especially interested in the topic of philanthropy *per se*. The presence of philanthropy and philanthropists as story attributes may be a device to allow journalists to use a philanthropic act as a 'hook' to write a story focused on an alternative concern, such as the individual's wealth, celebrity, involvement in salacious gossip and so on. For example, media coverage of the launch of the RED product line by U2 frontman Bono to raise funds for the global health fund, features in a number of articles in the dataset. Most of these articles begin with a brief reference to the Irish pop star's philanthropic work before moving on to non-philanthropic aspects of the story, such as the singer's private life or evaluations of the fashionable status of the stock.

The final aspect of the cognitive analysis examined whether the article treated the philanthropy under discussion as an *episodic* and isolated incident or as part of a broader *thematic* narrative about that area of social life. As table 5.13 shows, and again as the literature suggests, media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists is found to be more often episodic, presenting philanthropic activities as isolated incidences rather than part of a larger narrative.

Table 5.13: Episodic or thematic nature of media coverage

Nature of coverage	Number	Percentage
Episodic	245	59%
Thematic	170	41%

However, re-analysing this finding according to the type of newspaper in which it appears, finds that broadsheets are more likely than local and tabloids to thematically frame their coverage, as shown in table 5.14.

Table 5.14: Cross-tabulation of types of paper with whether coverage is episodic or thematic

Type of newspaper	Episodic	Thematic
Broadsheet	54% (109)	46% (93)
Local	63% (103)	37% (61)
Tabloid	63% (33)	36% (19)

These differences could relate to the remit of each type of newspaper, for example local media need to find a relevant 'hook' to demonstrate their ownership of a story, which can tend towards an episodic depiction. An example of this situation occurred in 2006 when Peter Moores donated £6 million to keep two paintings in the UK. Moores' local newspaper, the Wigan Evening Post, covered this story from the angle of 'Wigan businessman saves Canalettos'[132], whereas in the national press the story was linked thematically to discussions about government funding of gallery acquisitions.[133]

Further discussion of the findings of the framing analysis is given after the findings of the content analysis are presented.

5.5 Findings of content analysis

As described in the methodology (section 5.2), the dataset of UK newspaper coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006 was coded to identify the main themes; these codes emerged inductively as significant variables and patterns were noted in the course of reading, re-reading and organising the data. Cross-referencing the codes highlighted the repeated presence of three distinguishing features within the dataset, as follows:

1. Media focus is on wealth and celebrity rather than on philanthropy.
2. Differential treatment is given to different types of philanthropists: more, and more favourable, coverage is given to those who are male, local, dead and those that have experienced hyper social mobility.
3. In many respects the presentation of philanthropy and philanthropists is incoherent and riven with contradictions, notably:
   - Philanthropy is described as a classic virtue of Victorian England yet is also said to be quintessentially American.
   - Philanthropy is viewed as both an expectation and an eccentricity of the rich.
   - Philanthropists are depicted as deserving of authority and yet also frequently treated as objects of contempt.

The themes that emerged in the content analysis will be described and exemplified, and a concluding discussion will reflect collectively on how these themes inform our understanding of the meaning of philanthropy in contemporary UK society.

[132] '£6m to stop pictures leaving country', Wigan Evening Post, 02/06/06

[133] for example, 'How Canaletto found a place in British hearts', Sunday Express, 04/06/06

1. Media focus is on wealth and celebrity rather than philanthropy

The first finding of the content analysis is that media coverage is far more concerned with wealth and celebrity rather than with the detail of philanthropic acts. Coverage that is ostensibly about 'giving back' tends to focus on 'money-making' with minimal analysis of the nature and destination of its redistribution. Whilst philanthropy is a widespread activity, a small number of extremely rich individual philanthropists account for a large proportion of coverage, as noted in section 5.3 above. These philanthropists are presented as a type of celebrity and to some extent philanthropy is treated as an extension of the 'entertainment' and 'society' sections of newspapers.

Lack of interest in the detail of philanthropic acts is evident in the way that the media frequently refers generically to the broad concepts of 'philanthropy' and 'philanthropist' without providing any further details about the nature of specific philanthropic acts or the intended beneficiaries. For example one article refers to, *"[Ronald] Hobson who, like the ebullient Sir Don [Gosling], has given away millions to good causes"*[134] and another notes that, Hans Rausing is *"one of the most significant private philanthropists in the UK"*[135] without any reference to the causes that Hobson, Gosling or Rausing support.

The use of the word 'philanthropy' as an abstract and generic term is most apparent in the frequent media shorthand of attaching the adjective of 'philanthropist' to people's names without further explanation, for example making reference to "*philanthropist Sir Paul Judge*"[136] or *"businessman and philanthropist Sir Alan Sugar"*.[137] An organisation may be described as being "*chaired by a millionaire philanthropist"* or someone may be *"married to a well known philanthropist",* even though the rest of the story makes no further reference to what the philanthropy entails[138]. 'Thumbnail' sketches that refer to an individual's philanthropy often occur, even when the article makes no further reference to charitable giving. For example, an article about the Iraq war describes an intervention by *"financier and philanthropist"* George Soros[139]; a gossip column refers to, *"the wealthy, Syrian-born, arms dealer and philanthropist Wafic Said"*[140]; a business story about Tom Hunter's bid to take over the company McCarthy and Stone mentions his knighthood for services to philanthropy in the final paragraph[141]; and articles about the by-election held in Dunfermline in February 2006 rarely failed to mention that the town was the birthplace of well-known philanthropist Andrew Carnegie[142].

---

[134] 'Queen's secret admirers ', Sunday Express 23/04/06

[135] 'Secret gong for billionaire who avoids taxes ', Daily Mail 25/05/06

[136] 'A lesson in television: teacher's TV is one year old', The Guardian, 06/02/06

[137] 'Entrepreneurs line up for TV's longest job interview', Liverpool Daily Post, 22/02/06

[138] Both examples are from 'Atomic power chief quits and may join nuclear group suitors ', Daily Telegraph 13/06/06.

[139] 'A false metaphor has been written out in blood', The Guardian 2/11/06

[140] 'Ephraim Hardcastle', Daily Mail, 13/09/06

[141] 'Hunter-led consortium wins McCarthy and Stone', The Scotsman 5/09/06

[142] For example, 'The new fight for Fife', The Herald, 24/01/06

The launch of a new UK philanthropic initiative, 'The Fortune Forum' occurred in the autumn of 2006, and media coverage focused largely on the celebrities involved rather than the *raison d'être* of this new organisation:

> *"Bill Clinton will be there. So will the size zero super-model Lily Cole, ballet dancer Darcey Bussell, Michael Douglas and Catherine Zeta-Jones, and even the artist formerly known as Cat Stevens. It could well turn out to be Britain's celebrity dinner of the year"*[143].

Prioritising the wealth and celebrity involved in this event, rather than the philanthropy, occurred in all types of newspaper. A broadsheet described it as, *"the biggest charity bash [where]... champagne will be guzzled by the bucketload [by]... London's A-list"*[144] and a tabloid noted it is, *"more like an Oscar's party* [than a charity event]... *where the wealthy gain access to A-list celebrities by pledging money to good causes"*[145].

Media focus on wealth and celebrity rather than on philanthropy may reveal discomfort with concurrent acts of consumption and compassion. Spending on oneself and on others are not exclusive categories but are often treated as though they are mutually incompatible, or at least problematic when pursued simultaneously. This perspective is exemplified in coverage of Sigrid Rausing, who is both one of the UK's wealthiest residents and a notable philanthropist, causing the journalist to struggle to accommodate both aspects of her lifestyle choices:

> *"Rausing may want to change the world, but she is not self-denying. She and [her husband] Abraham live in a £20m house near Holland Park and she spent a rumoured £10m doing it up. It has the second-largest garden in London after Buckingham Palace; she also owns 40,000 acres in the Scottish highlands"*[146].

When the media highlight the luxurious lifestyles enjoyed by philanthropists, they raise questions about their authenticity. For example, a profile of Tom Hunter points out the irony of how Hunter uses his wealth to maintain a 'simpler' life.

> *"The best thing Tom Hunter has ever bought, he says, is his private jet, because 'it allows me to live here'... He prides himself on being an Ayrshire boy, a man of uncomplicated values who still meets his primary school friends for a takeaway... But Hunter's problem is this: the private jet is the means by which he keeps himself, in his own words, 'grounded'."*[147]

Another example occurs in media reports of a *"lavish 50th birthday in Salzburg"*[148] featuring the biggest ever fireworks display staged in Austria held in honour of John Studzinski, which is contrasted with the image he is said to have cultivated as *"a devout Catholic with a chapel in his Chelsea home [who] finds time at weekends to work in soup kitchens and shelters for the homeless"*[149]. Further examples that raise questions about the authenticity of gestures made by wealthy people include a report of Lean Scully's £3.7 million legacy gift to the Edinburgh

---

[143] 'Stars queue to join Clinton at ball', The Observer, 24/09/06

[144] 'Celebrity and the new philanthropy', The Independent, 26/09/06

[145] 'Charity's rich legacy', Sunday Express 1/10/06

[146] 'Books, money and milk cartons'. The Guardian 14/06/06

[147] 'Meet Britain's most generous tycoon'. The Independent, 17/07/06

[148] 'Business big shot', The Times, 3/10/06

[149] 'Cracking the Studzinski code', The Observer, 8/10/06

Festival that discusses the absence of provision for her disabled brother in her will and concludes that *"the Irish angel's denial of her brother 'clipped her wings'"*[150]; the contextualisation of Paul van Vlissingen's philanthropic acts within the *"not entirely spotless"* record of his company which is blamed for polluting the Dutch stretch of River Rhine and investing in apartheid South Africa[151]; and a description of Robert Edmiston, who heads the Giving Index within the 2006 Sunday Times Rich List, as a *"climate change criminal"* because his company imports 'gas guzzling' Sports Utility Vehicles.[152]

Gratuitous references to celebrity lifestyles and ostentatious displays of wealth frequently recur in media coverage that is ostensibly about philanthropy. City Academy schools are said to gain *"a touch of glamour"*[153] by philanthropist sponsors such as Arpad Busson, who is described as a "*Riviera playboy and gossip column favourite*"[154]. A profile of the arts philanthropist Louise Blouin MacBain states that, "*the board of her foundation reads like the world's best dinner party – celebrities, artists, politicians and royals*"[155] and the journalist, visiting Blouin MacBain's home, notes that,

> *"Two glasses of white wine followed after Blouin MacBain, who is Quebecoise, whispered the order in Parisian French into the walkie-talkie she uses for communication with her staff, all of whom call her Madame"*[156].

Even when an individual philanthropist is not viewed as a star in their own right, journalists often stress the close connections between major donors and the world of celebrity. For example, John Madejski is described as a "*multimillionaire, mega mover and shaker, fervent philanthropist and friend of the stars and celebrities*"[157]; it is claimed that John Studzinski, "*wines and dines with the likes of Sting, Mel Gibson and novelists PD James and Ken Follett. He is even said to have a line into the Prince of Wales and the Duchess of Kent*"[158]; and Stanley Fink is described as, "*a leading light in a tight-knit community of publicity-shy, fabulously wealthy, City philanthropists who mingle with royalty and figures from show business and the arts*"[159].

There is almost no media coverage of the destination of donations or the impact they have on beneficiaries. In place of any genuine engagement with the detail of philanthropic acts is a focus on donors' appearance, personality and lifestyle. A typical example is a profile of Tom Hunter (identified in section 5.3 as the primary focus of much media coverage), which dwells on his personal appearance, his mobile phone and his dress-sense rather than his philanthropic efforts:

---

[150] 'Irish angel's £3.7m Festival legacy falls foul of family row', Scotland on Sunday, 20/08/06

[151] 'Paul van Vlissingen: Dutch billionaire who became a progressive Scottish landlord and funded conservation projects in Africa', The Guardian 6/09/06

[152] 'Cameron in retreat over gas guzzler donation', The Times, 15/09/06

[153] 'How new school backers hit the golden route to a gong', Sunday Times, 15/01/06

[154] 'The Acceptable Face of Capitalism ', The Independent 8/09/06

[155] '"My dream? The world"', The Observer 8/10/06

[156] ibid

[157] 'Madejski lovin' it', The Times 13/11/06

[158] 'Cracking the Studzinski code', The Observer 8/10/06

[159] 'The Acceptable Face of Capitalism', The Independent 8/09/06

> *"[Hunter] would have the air of a Bond villain were it not for his Gnarl Barkley ring-tone and extraordinary choice of clothes – a lurid purple jumper offset by a dazzling striped shirt with a Harry Hill collar, crinkle-creased blue jeans, spotty multicoloured socks, and Persil-white trainers. It is as if he has been basted in glue and rolled around a branch of Topman"*[160]

Hunter is clearly a charismatic individual, and part of the job of a journalist is to paint a picture with words to enable readers to visualise the subject. But profiles of philanthropists do more than bring the subject to life; they often segue into portraits of celebrity lifestyles and imply that the latter is consciously pursued as a goal. For example, a different article on Tom Hunter claims that he is,

> *"more likely to hobnob with Bill Clinton or Bob Geldof thanks to his high-profile donations to charity. Or live it up among the jet-set in the south of France with close friends Philip Green, the retail billionaire, and property trader Nick Leslau"*[161].

Some media coverage contains a critique of this close connection between philanthropy and celebrity,

> *"One well established financier, who does not want to be names, says [Tom] Hunter's money 'has got him lots of lovely friends, like Bono and Geldof', and that the Scot is, 'buying his stairway to heaven'"*[162].

The journalist then asks, *"So, does Hunter want to be a rock star – or is altruism his only motive?"*[163]; the depiction of philanthropists as celebrities makes this a largely rhetorical question.

The prevalence with which philanthropy is linked to celebrity is apparent by the exceptions. Journalists express surprise when a rich donor is not famous, for example noting that, *"[d]espite his huge personal fortune, Mr [Donald] Kahn is relatively unknown"*[164]. Similarly the low public profile of another major donor warrants this media comment:

> *"Have you ever heard of Robert Edmiston? You should have. Last year this Birmingham-based car importer gave almost £44 million – more than 10 percent of his wealth – to Christian charities, making him Britain's most generous philanthropist. But how many people have ever heard of him?"*[165].

Such comments confirm that celebrity is viewed as an intrinsic aspect of philanthropy.

---

[160] 'Meet Britain's most generous tycoon', The Independent, 17/07/06

[161] 'Big game Hunter aims for pot luck at the garden centre', The Observer, 5/03/06

[162] 'Meet Britain's most generous tycoon', The Independent, 17/07/06

[163] ibid

[164] 'Reclusive Macintosh aficionado donates £500,000', The Herald, 24/06/06

[165] 'Why red tape, tax and a sclerotic welfare state are strangling philanthropy', Daily Mail, 27/06/06

2. Differential treatment is given to different types of philanthropists

The second finding of the content analysis is that certain types of philanthropists receive more, and more favourable, coverage. Philanthropists that are male, local or dead, and those whose life stories involve hyper social mobility (usually depicted as 'rags-to-riches' tales), all appear to be of particular interest. This section discusses each of these favoured types in turn.

Male philanthropists

Of the 119 philanthropists that are named in UK print media coverage during 2006, 21 (18%) are female, of whom six lived in the Victorian era, leaving only 15 contemporary female philanthropists found deserving of media interest. However only nine of these women appear in the dataset of 170 significant philanthropists described in chapter 3. This has two consequences: firstly that 16 female philanthropists who have been objectively defined as 'significant' are not deemed newsworthy, and secondly, that over half of the female philanthropists that appear in UK print media coverage are either historic figures or not especially notable givers. Of the latter type, some of the women named in the press as philanthropists either make quite modest gifts or associate themselves with charitable causes but have no significant donations on record. Their inclusion in discussions of philanthropy appears to be due to their fame for non-philanthropic activities, such as careers in fashion or show business, or their marriages to famous men, reinforcing the role that celebrity plays in representations of philanthropy.

In addition to the difference in quantity of representations of male and female philanthropists, there are also distinct qualitative differences in the way the media reports their activities. When the subject is a male donor, the articles tend to focus on the size of their fortune, how they made their money and details of their luxury lifestyle. When female philanthropists are mentioned, they are often described in trivialising ways, focusing on their looks, their private lives and their personal connections. A typical example of a 'thumbnail sketch' of a major male giver is,

> *"Irvine Laidlaw [who] founded the world's largest events and conference company... He now has more time – and money – to donate to politics, philanthropy and his passion for fast cars and boats"*[166].

Media treatment of female donors is typified by references to the cultural philanthropist Louise Blouin MacBain who is described as, *"the mysterious arts doyenne, best known as the £260 million blonde divorcee who once dated Prince Andrew"*[167] and Ann Gloag who is encapsulated as a, *"Perth-born former nurse"* who is now a *"diminutive, demanding and driven"*[168] billionaire. Other women with significant philanthropic achievements[169] are described dismissively as, *"a reformed socialite and former model"*[170] (Renu Mehta), *"a fabled beauty, a king's widow"*[171] (Queen Noor) and *"doyenne of the silk stocking district"*[172] (Brooke Astor).

---

[166] 'Philanthropists who funded Tory election campaign; £5m paid back to keep anonymity', The Herald, 1/04/06

[167] '"My dream? The world"', The Observer, 8/10/06

[168] Both quotes about Anne Gloag are from 'Sister of Mercy', Sunday Times, 9/04/06

[169] None of the three women named in this sentence are in the main dataset for this thesis as they either made major donations in years other than 2006 or they are not based in the UK.

[170] 'Celebrity and the New Philanthropy', The Independent, 26/09/06

[171] 'Royal beauty beams for her billionaire', Daily Mail, 15/11/06

[172] 'Doyenne 'living in squalor' at 104', Times 27/07/06

The differential treatment of women in public life has been widely noted, and it is well understood that the looks and personal lives of women receive more attention than that of men in similar positions (see, for example, Walters 1998). The treatment of female philanthropists is part of this pattern but it may also be affected by a specific cultural discomfort with the existence of rich women, especially those who have created their own wealth in traditionally 'male words' such as publishing (e.g. Louise Blouin MacBain) and transport (e.g. Ann Gloag). The female philanthropists that do feature in media coverage, such as Anita Roddick, Stella McCartney and J. K. Rowling, have made their fortunes in more traditionally feminine industries, respectively, cosmetics, fashion and novel writing. Media coverage may also reflect societal perceptions of the 'proper' role for men and women, such that female philanthropists who support the arts (e.g. Vivien Duffield) and breast cancer (e.g. Stella McCartney) are deemed less threatening than those who support more political issues such as human rights (such as Sigrid Rausing). Research into the gendered treatment of philanthropists deserves further attention, but for the purposes of this thesis it is sufficient to note that men receive both more, and more respectful, treatment in UK media representations.

Local philanthropists

Local philanthropists appear primarily - and unsurprisingly - in the local or regional newspapers that cover the area where they live. What is less predictable is the extent to which praise for their acts is often out of proportion to the extent of their giving. For example, a local newspaper describes a man who made a charitable bequest of £5,000 to a local school within a will worth £1.5 million as a, *"local hero... who enriched his community"*[173]. A man who, *"collects more than £1,000 a year for good causes through hard work and social events"*[174] is celebrated as a philanthropist in another local newspaper; and the *"amazing philanthropy"* of another man, who left charitable bequests worth £5,000 and £10,000 in a will worth over £5 million, is described as a *"generous and public spirited gesture"*[175] in his local newspaper.

This finding of a particular, and somewhat disproportionate enthusiasm, for local philanthropists accords with the findings of the framing analysis, presented above, that the local media is more positive about both philanthropy as an abstract ideal, and about its incarnation in specific named individuals.

Dead philanthropists

The differential treatment of deceased donors is apparent in two dimensions of the data. Firstly in terms of the frequency with which historical figures are cited: of the 119 named philanthropists, 20 (17%) are long dead, such as Andrew Carnegie (1835-1919), Octavia Hill (1838-1912) and Sir William Burrell (1861-1958). It appears the passage of time enhances both interest in, and perceptions of, these philanthropists as references to historic figures range from neutral to positive, and occasionally verge on hagiographic. The second type of dead donor that receive particularly favourable treatment in the media are the recently deceased, whose obituaries often highlight their philanthropy, even when the details of these activities are quite sketchy. Indeed, obituaries are a format especially prone to presenting philanthropy as an abstraction requiring no specific detail. For example, Charles Janson's obituary[176] describes him as 'a philanthropist' with no mention of what his philanthropy entailed, and Isobel Bigley's obituary[177] says she was known for the philanthropic work undertaken with her husband, but again no details are provided of what that involved. Obituaries of people with objectively

[173] 'Charity gifts in £1.5m will', This is Lancashire, 13/03/06

[174] 'Norman's 60 years of fundraising, Coventry Evening Telegraph, 2/11/06

[175] 'Generous heart of a millionaire', Herald Express Torquay, 7/11/06

[176] 'Obituary of Charles Janson', Daily Telegraph 2/08/06

[177] 'Isobel Bigley', Times 26/10/06

impressive records of philanthropic achievements are also likely to be widely published. During 2006 two significant UK-based philanthropists died, Simon Sainsbury and Paul van Vlissingen, both of whom received prominent and panegyric obituaries in multiple national newspapers, for example the former was described as 'charming and debonair' and 'one of the most generous of his generation'[178]. Like the gendered treatment discussed above, this is clearly a normative occurrence, yet the revisionism contained within obituaries can give the impressionism that as far as the media is concerned, the best donor is a dead donor.

Philanthropists who have experienced hyper social mobility

Despite the fact that a quarter (28%) of significant contemporary philanthropists are inheritees, media coverage of philanthropy rarely discusses 'old money' and focuses instead on the newly wealthy, and in particular on those philanthropists who have experienced hyper social mobility. Impoverished childhoods are staple features in the stories that the media choose to tell about philanthropists. For example, a profile of Tom Farmer, the Scottish owner of Kwik-Fit who sold out to Ford for £1 billion in 1999, dwells on his upbringing in a Leith tenement[179]; Duncan Bannatyne, the entrepreneur who appears on TV's Dragon's Den, is described as, *"one of seven children brought up in poverty"*[180]; and a profile of hedge fund manager Christopher Hohn notes he is *"the son of a white Jamaican car mechanic who emigrated to Britain in 1960... his background was quite humble"*[181].

Media coverage also dwells on the humble beginnings of philanthropists' wealth-creating activities. For example, financier Arpad Busson is reported to have *"begun his career selling toothpicks in his native Switzerland"*[182]; Philip Richards is said to have, "*earned his keep by picking up litter in the car park at the local motorway service station"*[183] and Richard Desmond was *"a former jazz drummer who once earned £1 a night as a cloakroom attendant"*[184].

This narrative of hyper social mobility appears to be enhanced (in terms of media value) when the intervening wealth-creation years, between poor origins and later generosity, can be interpreted as exhibiting immoral behaviour, thereby emphasising the need for a Damascene moment and 'repentance' through philanthropy. The label of 'robber barons' is still regularly applied to the founding fathers of modern philanthropy such as "*robber baron turned altruist"* Andrew Carnegie[185], and Andrew Mellon, described as, *"one of the most controversial of the American robber barons...reviled as a cold-hearted plutocrat who grew rich from anti-labour policies...it is arguable that his gift to the nation redeemed his many failings."*[186] The most prominent contemporary global philanthropists receive a similar epithet: *"Bill Gates and Warren Buffett are just the latest in a long line of ruthless buccaneer tycoons who mellowed into charitable donors."*[187] The notion that philanthropy is concerned with seeking atonement for earlier behaviour, particularly for actions that generated wealth, is widespread. For example, the founder of Great Universal Stores, Isaac Wolfson, is referred to as a *"financial psychopath"* who was almost prosecuted for fraud before ending up *"the most generous benefactor and*

---

[178] Both quotes from 'Obituary of Simon Sainsbury', Daily Telegraph, 9/10/06

[179] 'Tyre tycoon gives SNP a £100,000 pre-election boost', Mail on Sunday, 8/10/06

[180] 'Dragon who became fairy godmother', Sunday Times, 24/12/06

[181] 'Mr. Generosity'. Daily Mail, 29/06/06

[182] 'Giving away billions is hard business', Sunday Times, 02/07/06

[183] 'Million Donor Man', Sunday Times, 16/04/06

[184] 'Desmond hits winning groove', Sunday Times, 23/04/06

[185] 'The well-used landmarks of our towns and villages', Liverpool Daily Post, 25/09/06

[186] 'The robber baron who managed to be both emotionally stunted and a great philanthropist', Sunday Times, 17/12/06

[187] 'Why red tape, tax and a sclerotic welfare state are strangling Irish philanthropy', Daily Mail, 27/06/06

successful businessman of his age."[188] High levels of media interest in the wealth and behaviour of those who made their own money reflects normative views about the status of the self-made compared to inheritees, and also contributes to the distinctively UK cultural norm that wealth is something that the holder needs to be apologetic about, and seek to make amends for.

3. Media representations of philanthropy are incoherent and riven with contradictions
The third, and final, finding of the content analysis is that in many respects the representation of philanthropy and philanthropists in media coverage is incoherent and riven with contradictions. Three examples will be discussed:

Philanthropy is described as a classic virtue of Victorian England yet is also said to be quintessentially American
The first example of a contradiction inherent in media coverage is the frequency with which media coverage seeks to contextualise contemporary UK philanthropy in relation to its origins, and in the process of doing so reveals uncertainty as to whether to trace the lineage back in time to Victorian England or across the Atlantic to the twentieth century USA.

Twenty of the individual philanthropists that are named in the media coverage are Victorians, including Joseph Rowntree, William Rathbone, Angela Burdett-Coutts, William Burrell and Octavia Hill. The word 'Victorian' appears 73 times in the dataset and many articles refer to that era to set the scene for contemporary discussions and to suggest precedents that ought to be emulated today. For example, a profile of Michael Oglesby suggests he is, *"keeping the flame of Victorian philanthropy alive"*[189]; a comment piece bemoans the inability of the contemporary rich to *"match our Victorian forefathers in philanthropy"*[190]; and an article on the rise of the 'new philanthropists' suggests they are, *"rich Brits emulating their Victorian role models"*[191]. Yet much media coverage also subscribes to the view that Americans are more 'naturally' philanthropic than the Brits, with this suggestion especially apparent in coverage of Warren Buffett's c.$30 billion donation, announced in June 2006. For example, a broadsheet journalist writes about the USA: *"No other nation on earth has the capacity to produce individuals with the wherewithal and the motivation to extend such generosity"*[192]. This theme is echoed by a tabloid journalist who claims, *"The United States is home to the world's most dynamic entrepreneurs and its greatest benefactors"*[193], although that same article argues that, *"Victorian Ireland and Britain, despite the image of Dickensian poverty, were in reality as much of a philanthropists' paradise as the United States is today".* One commentary on the Buffet story emphasises that philanthropy comes more naturally to Americans, even though it was 'invented' in Victorian England.

> *"Philanthropists are back [in the UK]...They never went away in America, where even internet entrepreneurs who can't yet shave share the Victorian conviction that with great wealth comes responsibility"*[194].

[188] 'Clock stops for GUS ', Daily Telegraph, 7/10/06
[189] 'The New Philanthropists', Sunday Times, 15/01/06
[190] 'Why does Britain produce so few philanthropists?', Daily Mail, 27/06/06
[191] 'Charity's rich legacy', Sunday Express, 1/10/06
[192] 'Giving generously the American way', The Times 27/06/06
[193] 'Why red tape, tax and a sclerotic welfare state are strangling Irish philanthropy', Daily Mail, 27/06/06
[194] 'Giving it away', Independent on Sunday, 2/07/06

Explanations of this difference include suggestions regarding the existence of different normative beliefs about giving, such that, *"'large scale philanthropic work in the UK is not part of the cultural fabric in the same way that it is in the US"*[195], which is said to result in a situation where,

> *"Apart from a few names such as Sainsbury, Weston and Rausing, private giving is nowhere near the American league... Britain has yet to see the philanthropic urge reach American proportions. Its capitalists have yet to be made vulnerable to shame"*[196].

Other explanations include different beliefs regarding the appropriate size of government and tax-takes: "*The American low-tax, high-donation model is very different*"[197], and the presence of more numerous, and more impressive, role models in the US: "*Buffett and Gates are heading a trend among super-wealthy Americans*"[198]. One article summarises a number of the alleged differences between the two countries,

> *"the US has a weak welfare state, a strong immigrant culture and a tradition of religious giving... residual British awkwardness about wealth, success and class is also a factor... [as is] a scepticism towards the motives of philanthropists in large sections of British society"*[199].

UK philanthropists who are often assessed – and assess themselves – in the context of American norms regarding philanthropy, have absorbed this narrative. For example, the purpose of the launch of the Fortune Forum event in September 2006 was described as, "*nothing less than importing America's Bill Gates-and-Warren-Buffet-scale philanthropy to this side of the Atlantic*"[200] and the philanthropist behind the event, Renu Mehta, was interpreted as trying to, *"change the culture of giving in Britain by stimulating philanthropic habits you'd only expect to see across the Atlantic"*[201].

Whether a Victorian or American yardstick is used to assess UK philanthropy, contemporary donors seem destined to disappoint. A discussion of Stanley Fink and Tom Hunter concludes that, "*[d]espite their generosity, their donations are dwarfed by both [the American philanthropists Bill] Gates and [Warren] Buffett*"[202], and a damning conclusion on the efforts of today's rich claims that, *"the Victorian millocrats and merchant princes gave £210 per capita compared with a miserly £114 today"*[203]. Therefore, to some extent, both types of comparisons are really variations of 'failure narratives' rather than about locating the most accurate benchmark against which to measure contemporary UK philanthropy.

---

[195] 'We've found a gift of giving', Sunday Express, 2/07/06

[196] 'The Welfare State is waning, bring on the philanthropists', The Guardian, 28/06/06

[197] 'Who needs philanthropy?', The Guardian 27/06/06

[198] 'How to give it all away to the most deserving cause: you don't have to be Warren Buffett to make a big difference', The Independent, 1/07/06

[199] 'The New Philanthropists', Sunday Telegraph, 15/01/06

[200] 'Stars queue to join Clinton at ball', The Observer, 24/09/06

[201] 'Celebrity and the new philanthropy', The Independent, 26/09/06

[202] 'Charities get more of Fink's fortune', Daily Mail, 18/11/06

[203] 'Why red tape, tax and a sclerotic welfare state are strangling Irish philanthropy', Daily Mail, 27/06/06

Philanthropy is viewed as both an expectation and an eccentricity of the rich

The second contradictory assumption within media coverage that was identified in the content analysis, is an assumption that rich people are expected to give away some of their wealth and yet when they do, it is viewed as an eccentric use of money.

References to the concept of noblesse oblige (the idea that privilege entails responsibility) recur in media coverage. The Duke of Richmond's philanthropy is described as, *"acting from that fine tradition: noblesse oblige"*[204], another article suggests that, *"[t]he ranks of the rich are swelling, creating a global class whose members see it as part of their duty to use their wealth to support wider social objectives"*[205] and a profile of northern philanthropists remarks on a, *"powerful sense of duty to the communities where they made their money"*[206].

Yet media coverage simultaneously promotes the opposite position: that holding on to fortunes is 'normal' and that distribution – as opposed to retention – is noteworthy. For example one article claims that, *"[s]omething strange is happening to the seriously rich. Generally considered spendthrifts, some are now trying to save the world by giving away their vast fortunes"*[207]. In this account, philanthropy is not a 'natural' duty but rather a counter-cultural preference for distribution rather than accumulation. People whose behaviour goes against accepted norms are often stigmatised (Goffman 1963) but in this case they are more often treated as mildly eccentric. Media references to philanthropists often allude to unconventional behaviour. For example, Lee Jones, founder of the League of Welldoers, "*would take a horse and cart loaded with a piano and singer into the slum houses that were built around courtyards*"[208] and Adele Stewart, who left a £2 million legacy to the National Museum of Scotland in 2006, is depicted as,

> *"someone with eccentricities ....One of her traits was to forage in skips on her way home. She would collect things from skips and was a hoarder but she collected things mainly to pass on to other people who she thought would get use out of it."*[209]

Examples of eccentricity amongst modern donors abound. Brooks Mileson is depicted as a "*rags-to-riches tycoon of some eccentricity*"[210]and another article describes him as *"chain-smoking, addictive, impulsive, scruffy"*[211]. His eccentricity is illustrated by the fact that he has an animal sanctuary including *"ostriches, llamas, alpacas, wallabies, monkeys and raccoons"* that he personally feeds each morning.[212] Even contemporary acts of philanthropy that appear quite conventional are depicted in the media as eccentric, such as Peter Moore's efforts to renovate the 18th century building at Compton Verney into an art gallery, which is described as *"a slightly bonkers undertaking"*[213].

---

[204] 'Noble gestures to obligations of rich', Daily Telegraph, 29/03/06

[205] 'Ragged-trousered philanthropists they're not, but they know how to help Africa', Independent on Sunday, 18/06/06

[206] 'The New Philanthropists', Sunday Telegraph, 15/01/06

[207] 'Charity's rich legacy ', Sunday Express 1/10/06

[208] 'The modest hero of the city's needy', Daily Post Liverpool, 11/02/06

[209] 'Spinster's £2m present for the past stuns museum', Scotland on Sunday, 9/03/08

[210] 'This club is in my soul', The Independent, 4/02/06

[211] 'Marriage capital has a match made in the football heavens', Daily Mail, 29/03/06

[212] 'The Odd Couple: Their personalities could not be more different but Mileson can't hide his admiration for Romanov', Daily Mail, 10/05/06

[213] 'The art of eccentricity wins by a country pile', Sunday Express 23/04/06

Philanthropists themselves often collude in depicting themselves as unusual and by implication, as discussed further below, not realistic role models for others. Gulam Noon refers to his own energy and restlessness in epic proportions, saying, *"[e]ven ten elephants cannot hold me back after 8.30am"*[214], and Torquil Norman, who restored London's Roundhouse, describes himself as a *"starry eyed optimist"* and a *"complete bloody lunatic."*[215]Even the most prolific philanthropist of the 21st century, Bill Gates, is quoted using similar phraseology declaring, *"we're sort of crazy enough to say, 'Let's eliminate malaria'"* (Bishop and Green 2008).

Philanthropists are depicted as deserving of authority and yet also frequently treated as objects of contempt

The third and final contradiction identified in the content analysis is that philanthropists are widely depicted as members of a powerful and influential elite who should be treated seriously as opinion formers and societal leaders, and yet they are also mocked and treated with a degree of contempt.

Media representations paint a picture of, *"the cosy world of charitable giving"*[216] and describe philanthropic organisations as, *"a sort of club for the super-wealthy... [where] influential people come together"*[217]. Profiles of philanthropists often include reference to their personal and professional relationships with other philanthropists and members of the elite. For example, the Reuben brothers are described as friends of Tom Hunter[218] and Hunter, in turn, is described as, *"a close friend of billionaire Philip Green"*[219]. Links between philanthropists and politicians are frequently highlighted, for example it is said of Louise Blouin MacBain that she *"numbers Clinton, Kissinger and Bianca Jagger among her network of powerful friends"*[220]; Elly Elliott's obituary notes that she *"worked with [President Ronald] Reagan... her contacts were phenomenal"*[221]; and Bono is described as, *"the pop star who has befriended presidents and prime ministers through his campaigns for Africa"*[222].

The ease with which philanthropists enter elite circles related to their favoured causes is highlighted in a light-hearted reference to John Studzinski, who supports Catholic causes, and is described as, *"one of the best connected dealmakers in the City of London, to the point that there are rumours that he has the Pope's mobile phone number programmed into his phone"*[223]. A profile of Gulam Noon, a wealthy Indian immigrant, describes the scene in his office: *"The mantelpiece is crowded with photographs of Noon with dignitaries including the Queen, Prince Charles (twice), Tony Blair, Gordon Brown... Framed letters from business leaders and royalty adorn the corridors"*[224].

---

[214] 'Noon won't curry favour', Sunday Telegraph 13/08/06

[215] Both quotes from 'The magic round about', The Times 3/02/06

[216] 'Capitalist shake-up that aims to invigorate charities' methods', The Times, 25/09/06

[217] 'Celebrity and the new philanthropy', The Independent, 26/09/06

[218] 'Meet Britain's most generous tycoon', The Independent, 17/07/06

[219] 'The retail genius has a big heart', Western Daily Press, 2/03/06

[220] '"My dream? The world"', The Observer, 8/10/06

[221] 'Elly Elliott', The Herald, 7/12/06

[222] 'You too are a knight, Sir Bono', Sunday Times, 24/12/06

[223] 'Business big shot', The Times, 03/10/06

[224] Both quotes from 'Noon won't curry favour', Daily Telegraph, 13/08/06

The inclusion of philanthropists within global elites enables them to play a leadership role in society, summed up in this media comment, *"Large donors must be considered as among today's leaders, helping to create an environment we all want to live in"*[225]. In many cases making a donation appears to 'buy the right' to be considered an expert on the topic that their funding is designed to addressed. For example, Peter Lampl's foundation helps encourage school pupils from poorer backgrounds to go on to higher education; as a consequence he is often quoted in media articles reflecting on problems regarding university recruitment, discussing potential solutions and sharing his impatience with the UK government's record in this area[226]. After Johan Eliasch spent £20 million to protect 400,000 acres of Amazonian rainforest, his opinion on environmental issues was then given media space, for example he is quoted as saying,

> *"I'm fed up with the politicians in power who talk, but don't do anything. They have to act before it is too late. Once you have destroyed these forests, and the climate, too, it will have extreme consequences on life as we know it."*[227]

Indeed, in 2007, Eliasch was appointed as the Prime Minister's special envoy on the environment and climate change[228]. In a similar vein, Clive Richard's support for cricket in schools has 'bought' him a platform from which to criticise the UK government's policy on sales of school playing fields[229], and Tom Farmer's £100,000 donation to the Scottish Nationalist Party was followed within days by coverage of his views on Scottish constitutional questions[230].

The power held by philanthropists as 'authorised knowers' is endorsed by some media reports that uncritically reproduce philanthropists' own opinion of themselves as well placed to tackle issues that have traditionally been the concern of governments. They also promote philanthropists' claims regarding their ability to solve global problems, for example claiming that, "*These people [philanthropists] also make use of the influence and access to politicians...* [they] *hold politicos to account and leverage more government funding'*.[231] However, the media also questions the influence and power that is attributed, whether real or not, to philanthropists, for example arguing that, "*politicians become accountable not to a mass electorate but to a rich minority*"[232].

Co-existing with the notion that philanthropic acts constitute inherent displays of leadership that imply specialised knowledge and ought to command respect, is the view that, *"philanthropy is, if not exactly a dirty word in this country, at any rate nothing to shout about"*[233], and some media coverage indicates great contempt for rich donors. One article describes philanthropists as, *"hypocrites with more money than sense"*[234] and another suggests that philanthropy *"attracts the bored and under-qualified"* who are motivated by self-interest[235]. In a similar vein, sponsorship of City Academy schools are described as, *"little more than vanity projects for*

---

[225] 'Planet gets a helping hand', Sunday Times, 23/04/06

[226] for example, see 'Warning over school plans; fears children from poor families could lose out', Birmingham Evening Mail, 23/01/06 and 'Free week at Oxbridge', The Sentinel (Stoke) 28/01/06

[227] 'Planet gets a helping hand', Sunday Times, 23/04/06

[228] 'Gordon Brown headhunts Tory donor as envoy', The Times, 7/09/07

[229] 'Richards' shining example', Daily Telegraph, 10/02/06

[230] "Farmer – breakaway is inevitable", Sunday Times, 15/10/06

[231] 'The new breed of givers who get involved', Western Daily Press, 6/12/06

[232] 'We should be seriously unrelaxed about the existence of the filthy rich', The Guardian, 29/12/06

[233] 'Why does Britain produce so few philanthropists?', Daily Mail, 27/06/06

[234] 'How to put your money where your mouth is', Independent on Sunday, 17/09/06

[235] 'Women did charity work because they were bored, not charitable', The Times, 29/03/06

wealthy would-be philanthropists"[236]. Other examples of the media reflecting or generating general contempt for philanthropists include a donor described as being, *"motivated by a desire to be loved by as many as possible"*[237], and another who was said *"to crave the limelight"*[238]. In comparison to media representations of philanthropists as natural leaders, some coverage raises questions about their mental health and their morals. A profile of the arts philanthropist Carol Hogel notes, *"she is the third generation of Hogels going round doing philanthropic works, always the sign of a deranged mind"*[239], and a report of the historically large donation from Warren Buffett to the Bill Gates Foundation caused another broadsheet columnist to note, *"when the world's second-richest man gives most of his money to the world's richest man, we do well to count our spoons"*[240].

It is not only philanthropic acts that generate contemptuous comments in the public domain; some media coverage also mocks the individual who made the donation. In particular, many self-made UK philanthropists are the targets of contempt for the ways in which they created their wealth. For example, as Tom Hunter made his initial fortune through a sports wear chain he is *"credited with (or blamed for) giving Britain the shellsuit"*[241], Anita Roddick, the Body Shop founder, is summed up as the *"tycoon who taught women the joys of peppermint foot balm"*[242]; Indian entrepreneur, Charan Gill, is referred to as *"Scotland's curry king"*[243] and the woman behind the St.Tropez tanning business is dismissed as *"Fake tan queen Judy Naake turned philanthropist"*[244]. Such dismissive comments not only reflect normative views regarding the legitimacy of the self-made, they also undermine the authority attributed to philanthropists elsewhere in media representations and create a confused account of the status and authority of rich donors.

5.6 Discussion of representations of philanthropy in the public imagination

The content analysis revealed three main findings: that the media focus is on the wealth and celebrity of philanthropists at the expense of substantive discussions of philanthropic acts; that media coverage involves differential treatment for different types of philanthropists such that more, and more favourable coverage, is given to those who are male, local, dead and hyper socially mobile; and that in many respects the representation of philanthropy and philanthropists is incoherent and riven with contradictions, with examples of such contradictions being the concurrent suggestions that philanthropy is a classic virtue of Victorian England yet quintessentially American, that philanthropy is both an expectation and an eccentricity of the rich and that philanthropists are deserving of authority and yet also objects of contempt.

The first finding, that media coverage that is ostensibly about 'giving back' tends instead to focus on 'money making' and on the personalities and lifestyles of those involved, echoes the finding in the framing analysis which found that philanthropy is often treated as an extension of the 'entertainment' and 'society' sections of newspapers, rather than worthy of analysis

---

[236] 'Knighthoods 'for sale''. Daily Mail, 16/01/06

[237] 'Opera moneybag faces the music', Sunday Telegraph, 19/02/06

[238] 'Cracking the Studzinski code', The Observer, 8/10/06

[239] 'Hickey', Daily Express, 15/12/06

[240] 'The welfare state is waning, bring on the philanthropists', The Guardian, 28/06/06

[241] 'Big game Hunter aims for pot luck at the garden centre', The Observer 5/03/06

[242] 'Anita vows to recycle £118m Body Shop windfall', Daily Telegraph, 18/03/06

[243] 'Thanks a million', Aberdeen Press and Journal, 12/12/06

[244] 'Blackfriar', Daily Express, 06/10/06

regarding the nature and destination of donations. As noted in the literature review, the relationship between philanthropy and celebrity is not new, but there has arguably been an increased blurring of the boundaries between the categories of 'celebrity' and 'philanthropist', which has led to the coining of a new term: 'celanthropist' (Bishop and Green 2008:195 & 200)[245]. Theoretical interpretations of the modern phenomenon of celebrity argue that it has become a key site where cultural meanings are negotiated and organised (Turner 2004:6). Celebrities themselves are said to play a function in society by existing as a point of reference for the identity work of others, such that individuals make use of celebrities to create, reflect and recreate their own identities (p.97) and to discuss and evaluate their everyday life (p.116). A further interpretation of celebrity argues that,

> *"Stars articulate what it is to be a human being in contemporary society... they articulate both the promise and the difficulty that the notion of the individual presents"* (Dyer 1986:17).

Despite the views of some major donors (for example, as quoted in Lloyd 2004) that media coverage is relentlessly hostile, the overlap between philanthropy and celebrity ought to indicate some societal endorsement of major donors because, *"celebrity in general is largely confirmatory of dominant values"* (Turner 2004:22). This positive interpretation is supported by another study of celebrity which conclude that celebrities are *"fabricated on purpose to satisfy our exaggerated expectations of human greatness"* (Boorstin 1961:58).

The focus on wealth and celebrity, and concomitant minimal interest in the detail of philanthropic acts, is due to greater public interest in the possession of riches than in their distribution, and the fact that contemporary fame more often derives from wealth-holding than wealth-giving. Furthermore, in much the way that it is unclear why some people are celebrities, when their accomplishments are less well known than their image, so too the public can be familiar with the fact that an individual is a philanthropist without being aware of any specific philanthropic acts that they have undertaken.

The finding that some media coverage highlights the existence of philanthropy alongside evidence of luxury living is rooted in a misplaced assumption that philanthropic acts are either entirely self-less or purely self-interested. Whilst the academic literature has clearly established that philanthropy involves a synthesis of inner- and outer-directed benefits, this insight has not gained wider currency. The public imagination, as reflected in media coverage, retains a reductionist approach that insists on clear-cut categorisations, such that an individual is either self-denying or self-aggrandising. This is part of a wider debate about the relative importance of altruistic and utilitarian motivations (see for example Arrow 1972) that is ultimately unprovable and leads many observers to conclude that philanthropy is fundamentally paradoxical. Fleishman highlights the error in such polemical thinking because,

[245] According to the authors who coined the term (Bishop and Green 2008:194-213) notable 'celanthropists' are largely from the USA, including Hollywood stars such as Angelina Jolie, who funds philanthropic projects in the native countries of her three adopted children and is a Goodwill Ambassador for the U.N. High Commission for Refugees; television stars such as Oprah Winfrey, who has opened a Leadership Academy for Girls near Johannesburg; and sports starts such as Lance Armstrong whose 'Livestrong' campaign has raised $55 million for cancer research, including $10 million from sales of yellow armbands. However some UK examples are given, including businessman Richard Branson who personifies his 'Virgin' brand and who funds and convenes a global governance group called 'The Elders' to find solutions to intractable global problems; former prime minister Tony Blair who launched three philanthropic foundations after leaving office in 2007; and members of the royal family, including Prince Charles who set up The Prince's Trust in 1976, and the late Princess Diana who lent her personal appeal to a range of causes.

> *"Reasons for making large donations to charitable or other civic organisations vary from the purely altruistic to the self-serving, and include a large grey area where the two blend"* (Fleishman 2007:35).

Despite its empirical basis, the concept of the 'blended value' of philanthropy, involving benefits for both donor and recipient, has not gained widespread acceptance. As this media analysis demonstrates, questions regarding 'whose needs are being met' by philanthropy continue to be answered in a simplistic way that either critiques or honours philanthropists depending on the degree of self-denial exhibited, with little recognition that the act can meet both needs simultaneously.

The finding that media coverage is especially interested in, and positive about, philanthropy conducted by men, local people and the deceased, is essentially a confirmation of normative values. However it was also found that the public has a particular interest in philanthropists who have experienced hyper social mobility. These individuals' life stories follow a narrative arc reminiscent of a fairytale, in which the central character moves from rags to riches and (by implication) to 'redemption' through the redistribution of some of their wealth. Fairytales usually involve the transformation of central characters: from frogs to princes or from downtrodden Cinderellas to glamorous princesses. In the narrative depicted in media representations, it is philanthropy that transforms an individual from a life defined only by the absence or presence of money, to a life that has wider significance. Philanthropy is therefore presented as an institution that has transformative qualities which, in Brooks' terms (2000:183), transforms success into significance. The role that philanthropy plays in the life story of those who have not created their own wealth, and have therefore not experienced extreme social mobility, is less clear, but the lack of a need to transform or publicly reinvent oneself, could explain the lower incidence of inheritees amongst the most significant contemporary UK philanthropists.

A pervasive belief in the incompatibility of wealth accumulation and distribution is a contributing factor to the imposition of a fairytale-like narrative of rags-to-riches-to-redemption within accounts of philanthropy. However, the empirical basis for this narrative is unclear, as one commentator observes,

> *"large-scale charitable giving is not primarily the province of the robber barons racked by personal guilt over their depredations, no matter what amateur psychologists or historians with an anti-capitalist bent might assume"* (Fleishman 2007:36).

Rather than being truly representative of the life story of philanthropists, this narrative may be employed in order to contribute to a process of 'othering' of philanthropists, such that their experiences and achievements are placed firmly outside the realm of emulation. The public can applaud their final act, yet resist treating them as role models due to the unpleasant nature of their origins and the unsavoury aspects of their pre-philanthropy careers.

The finding that media representations contain many contradictory assumptions about philanthropy reflects a view expressed by an American commentator of philanthropy:

> *"The word philanthropy and the idea it carries with it arouses mixed emotions... We expect rich men to be generous with their wealth and criticise them when they are not; but when they make benefaction, we question their motives, deplore the methods by which they obtained their abundance and wonder whether their gifts will not do more harm than good"* (Bremner 1960 [1988]:2 cited in Fink 1990:137-8).

Whilst the suggestion that philanthropy is an expectation of the rich remains readily understood and 'noblesse oblige' is widely expected, the media coverage also contains numerous examples of the view that philanthropy is an aberration amongst the rich, to be understood as one facet of an eccentric approach to life. This is another means by which philanthropists are 'othered', presented as intrinsically different and not acting like 'normal' people, especially in relation to money. Like the use of the fairytale narrative, this representation of philanthropists as eccentrics may be a strategy that helps to release the public from an obligation to emulate the actions of major donors because they are too 'other' to be considered as role models.

Eccentricity can also be a strategy for reconciling altruism with 'me-generation' values. Acting in a nonconformist way has been described as a means of emphasising individualism, even when the act involves caring for others (Wuthnow 1991:36).

> *"The individualism that can be reconciled with caring... embodies a sense of non-conformity, of being different, of being able to live and act as one chooses, even if one's choices violate social norms; willing nonconformity is often necessary in order to be caring... because compassion is understood as a kind of wilful deviance from the conventional"* (Wuthnow 1991:114).

The content analysis found that philanthropists are often accorded a leadership role in society as a result of their donations. The ease with which philanthropically-minded businesspeople can meet world leaders epitomises the notion that philanthropists are part of a global power elite, as theorised by C. Wright Mills (1956). Yet, whilst much of Mills' analysis regarding the source of elite power and the barriers to social and economic mobility remains relevant today, his notion of 'natural elites' who are inherently worthy of what they possess, and his depiction of money as the single and ultimate signifier of success (p.242), are now dated because wealth and wealth-holding no longer bring automatic and inherent authority. The situation is clearer in the US where holders of wealth who wish to interact with other elites – political and religious leaders as well as celebrities – can ease their access to the new global power elite by cultivating a philanthropic identity. As a result, philanthropists and their descendents can acquire status both within and outside of their class as,

> *"[a]lthough private wealth is the basis of the hegemony of this group, philanthropy is essential to the maintenance and perpetuation of the upper class in the United States. In this sense, nonprofit activities are the nexus of a modern power elite"* (Odendahl 1990:4).

However, the situation is not so straightforward in the UK where contemporary perceptions of wealth reflect wider cultural sensibilities about the 'authority' of being rich and expectations of those who are wealthy. These expectations are found to involve contradictory notions: not only are both accumulation and distribution valorised but the rich are simultaneously encouraged to hold onto their wealth and to dispose of it philanthropically. The existence of these contradictory notions impedes consensus regarding the status of philanthropists.

Finally, it is important to note that chapter 3 identified 170 significant philanthropists that were operating in the UK in 2006, yet the media coverage discussed in this chapter contained only the names of 119 individual major donors, of whom twenty are historic characters and therefore excluded from a dataset of contemporary philanthropists. Therefore only around two-thirds of objectively defined significant contemporary philanthropists are present in public discourses about philanthropy. Some of the absences are due to conscious efforts on the part of individuals to avoid public attention, for example the eight individuals who are coded as 'Secret Operators' in the Eight Logics typology are obviously absent from media coverage. But this finding still raises questions about the lack of media interest in a large number of significant philanthropists, alongside excessive interest shown in a handful of their number. It may be useful to conduct further research into how some individuals, such as Tom Hunter, gain a very large media presence whilst others remain all-but invisible.

Conclusions

This chapter has presented the findings of a study exploring the public image of philanthropy and philanthropists using a dataset of media print coverage in the year 2006. It began with a review of previous studies of media coverage of philanthropy, explained why media coverage is an appropriate proxy for public perceptions of philanthropy, described the methodology for creating the sample and then presented and discussed a number of significant findings.

The framing analysis found that media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists is unreflective but broadly favourable, however significant differences were identified between different types of media. Local coverage still has embedded within it a civic focus, concerned with a distinct, geographically bounded community and the idealisation of that community. It is perhaps not surprising that donors classified as 'Big Fish' in the typology presented in chapter 3, frequently receive positive coverage in their local newspaper. In all types of newspaper, philanthropy tends to play a minor role as a story attribute rather than being a primary media object, and articles are more often episodic than thematically framed, presenting philanthropy as isolated, unconnected incidences rather than contextualised within a broader narrative. Overall, the framing analysis supports Deacon's conclusion that, despite the quantity and general favourability of coverage of philanthropy, there is, *"a broad lack of interest in reflective debate about their actions, motives, opinions and functions"* (Deacon 1999:59).

The content analysis found that media coverage of philanthropists focuses on their wealth and celebrity rather than the detail of their philanthropic acts, and that philanthropy is treated as an extension of the 'society' sections of newspapers, appearing more frequently outside of 'news' sections. Philanthropy is often viewed and discussed by the media in terms reminiscent of a fairytale, due to a particular interest in those whose lives have followed a narrative arc of rags-to-riches-to-'redemption'-through-redistribution. Finally, and crucially, the public imagination contains many incoherent and contradictory representations of philanthropy and philanthropists that reflects the lack of a coherent understanding of the nature and role of wealth and philanthropy within our society: the rich are expected to be philanthropic but donations are presented as an abnormal use of money; philanthropy is interpreted as both altruistic and egotistical, self-less and self-serving, promoting private interests yet for the public benefit. Philanthropists are presented as 'just like us' whilst being intrinsically 'other', they are objects of both fascination and repulsion; they are simultaneously depicted as powerful and influential yet fundamentally eccentric. These contradictory ways of perceiving philanthropy, often held simultaneously, reflect a wider cultural sensibility about the authority of being rich and our unclear expectations of the wealthy. We lack coherent representations of philanthropy and philanthropists because our society lacks a coherent story about wealth, whether it is kept for

personal gain or given away. Despite the UK's history as a cradle of capitalism, we are uncomfortable with money-making and unsure what status to accord rich people, especially the self-made. This lack of clarity regarding the presence and role of the wealthy and the subsequent desirability of wealth-giving, results in the confused characterisation of philanthropy and philanthropists in UK media coverage.

This chapter began by arguing that the media normally validates and affirms wider conceptions that are held in society. The very fact that the media has not got a coherent story to tell about philanthropists reinforces a central argument of this thesis: that philanthropy is an emerging and contested area of social life.

The next chapter explores an important aspect of the emerging representation of contemporary philanthropy, which suggests it has recently been reinvented and that an identifiable 'new philanthropy' exists.

Chapter 6
Is there a 'new philanthropy'?

This chapter examines the current consensus, noted in the introduction and literature review, that there is something distinctively 'new' about philanthropy at the start of the 21st century. Whilst this chapter discusses the emergence and meaning of 'new philanthropy' and 'new philanthropist', the scope of this phenomena encompasses what has also been called 'high engagement philanthropy', 'strategic philanthropy', 'venture philanthropy' and 'philanthrocapitalism', which are essentially synonyms as all refer to a new style of donor and a new approach to undertaking philanthropic acts that has allegedly emerged in recent years.

This chapter begins by defining 'new philanthropy' and 'new philanthropist' then draws on the data used throughout this thesis, in conjunction with a review of historic and contemporary literature, to test the claim that there is something distinctively new about contemporary philanthropy in the UK.

6.1 Definitions of 'new philanthropy' and 'new philanthropists'

The phrases 'new philanthropy' and 'new philanthropist' first appeared towards the end of the twentieth century and have entered more common usage during the past decade. Table 6.1 presents an analysis of the LexisNexis database, which demonstrates the increasing frequency with which these phrases have appeared in UK newspapers [246].

Table 6.1 Frequency of appearance of the phrases 'new philanthropy' and 'new philanthropist' in UK newspapers within the LexisNexis database between 2001-2007

	Number of appearance in UK newspapers in each year		
Phrase	**2001**	**2004**	**2007**
'New Philanthropy'	3	11	48
'New Philanthropist'	1	1	18

Foremost amongst those promoting the suggestion that a radical break has occurred in the practice and practitioners of contemporary philanthropy is Charles Handy, whose book 'The New Philanthropists' (discussed in the literature review) is arguably the most prominent publication about contemporary UK philanthropy. Handy seeks to describe and exemplify, *"the new enthusiasm for giving that seems to have infected many of the seriously rich in Britain today"* (2006:8), insists that, *"these givers are different"* (p.3) and argues that, *"we are certainly seeing a a new kind of philanthropic movement in Britain"*[247]. Other publications which endorse the suggestion that a new type of UK philanthropy has recently come into existence include

[246] In order to ensure the findings accurately reflect the growth in references to the search terms, rather than the growth in media outlets or extended coverage within the LexisNexis database, the search was restricted to those national newspapers that are fully covered in the dataset during the relevant years.

[247] Handy is quoted in 'Celebrity and the new philanthropy', The Independent, 26/09/06

'Why Rich People Give' (Lloyd 2004), 'A Guide to Giving' (Mackenzie 2005) and 'Philanthrocapitalism' (Bishop and Green 2008). Belief in a 'new philanthropy' is not restricted to the UK and a discussion of this phenomenon at the global level appears in a supplement of *The Economist* magazine (Bishop 2005) which analyses various aspects of new philanthropy; indeed the American, Bill Gates, has been named as the 'leader' of this movement[248] and the most prominent 'new philanthropist' (Bishop and Green 2008:52).

The idea of 'new philanthropy' implies a paradigmatic change in the charitable giving of rich people, and a review of its usage in academic and non-academic literature indicates this alleged paradigm shift has three different manifestations. Firstly, it is used to refer to new types of donors. 'New philanthropists' are said to be younger, richer, more likely to be self-made and living a cosmopolitan lifestyle. They are, *"in the prime of life, with goals still to achieve, passions to satisfy, and the energy that is needed to start something new"* (Handy 2006:9). The youthfulness of 'new philanthropists' is often cited as a defining feature: *"Many of the new breed of philanthropists have made their money in the City or computing. Some are still in their thirties"*[249]. The potential to create fortunes large enough to become significant philanthropists is closely connected to the emergence of industries, such as information technology, and the development of new financial instruments, such as hedge funds, which have created multi-millionaires long before retirement age. As a media report on 'new philanthropy' claims, *"most of them are self-made... they are hedge funders, bankers, corporate raiders, venture capitalists, dot-com millionaires, fashion tycoons or global magnates"*[250]. This profile of younger, self-made donors was identified as a recent trend in UK philanthropy in chapter 3.

Secondly, the term 'new philanthropy' refers to support for new types of causes. Prominent 'new philanthropists' are said to support emerging issues such as global health problems, notably HIV/AIDS and the environmental crisis, especially climate change. This aspect closely resembles the logic of 'Agenda Setters', discussed in chapter 3, who predominantly fund humanitarian, human rights and environmental projects in developing countries. For example, the largest philanthropic act of 2006 in the UK was Tom Hunter's £55 million donation to fund poverty alleviation in Africa[251], whilst another well-known Agenda Setter, Richard Branson, has funded a world council called 'The Elders' which is, *"a kind of United Nations of the great, the good and the rich to tackle issues such as conflict and global warming"*[252].

Finally, 'new philanthropists' are said to conduct their giving in new ways by setting up their own foundations and projects instead of funding existing charities. They are alleged to be distinctive in terms of being catalysts, rather than just responding to requests for money to support established charities (Handy 2006:3). They are said to use their power to leverage money out of other funders (especially the government) and claim to pay far greater attention to how their money is spent, by demanding targets, performance indicators and measurable outcomes. It is this aspect of 'new philanthropy' that lies behind the synonymous label of 'philanthrocapitalism', which refers to the application of businesslike skills to the charity sector. As the authors who coined that phrase explain, they are, *"[b]usinesslike in the sense of a serious focus on results"* (Bishop and Green 2008:272) and their preference for operating in this way is due to their background in the private sector. As Handy explains, *"New Philanthropists have all been successful, most of them in business... They look at their philanthropic projects in a*

---

[248] For example, *"At the head of this 'new philanthropy' is Bill Gates"* in 'Charity's rich legacy', Sunday Express, 1/10/06

[249] 'Bill Gates: the designer-trousered philanthropist', Daily Telegraph, 17/06/06

[250] 'The new face of philanthropy', The Times Saturday magazine 24/02/07

[251] http://www.thehunterfoundation.co.uk/news/?news_id=16 [viewed 30/07/09]

[252] 'Losing his virginity', Daily Mail, 21/08/06

businesslike way" (2006:15). 'New philanthropists' are also said to be distinctive in their preference for intensive personal engagement with the causes that they fund (Fleishman 2007:271), a trait found on both sides of the Atlantic:

> *"Britain's new philanthropists share with Buffet and Gates a mixture of impatience and business acumen that is shaking up the charity world. Reluctant to sign away their money to traditional [charities], they are adopting a hard-nosed approach that insists on looking at the bottom line. They want to make a difference, but balk at feeding the maws of self-perpetuating bureaucracies that squander money on administration and promotional campaigns. If charities don't cut the mustard, they are prepared to go it alone."* [253]

Data presented in chapter 3 shows that the vast majority (82%) of significant contemporary UK philanthropists do conduct their giving through personal foundations and the discussion in chapter 4 finds that rich donors are concerned with offering leadership and personal engagement as well as money, and often use the language of business to emphasise their outcomes-oriented approach.

Despite all three manifestations of 'new philanthropy' being echoed to some degree in various parts of my data, there is insufficient evidence to suggest that these variables are wholly new, particularly widespread or a result of changes that are specific to philanthropic behaviour. I therefore decided to test the idea that something called 'new philanthropy' came into existence at the start of the 21st century with a review of the historical literature and of wider claims about changes in behaviour that are characterised as 'new'.

6.2 Review of historical evidence for claims of a new philanthropy

The three elements that constitute the idea of 'new philanthropy' – new types of donors, new types of causes and new approaches to giving – were all examined in the light of historical studies on philanthropy.

The first suggestion, that new philanthropists are distinctively younger, entrepreneurial and 'first-generation' rich, is found to be historically typical rather than exceptional. The historic roll call of donors includes many self-made entrepreneurs who began giving before retirement, notably Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller (Chernow 1998; Krass 2002). In the UK, Thomas Guy, Isaac Wolfson and Joseph Rowntree all fit this description (Owen 1965). Indeed one of the standard historical explanations of Victorian philanthropy is that it offered an opportunity for 'new money' to buy the status required to be integrated into the elite (Owen 1965:165; Waddington 1996:183). Other types of 'new donor' emerge as a result of changing patterns in the distribution of wealth. In her 1934 book 'The New Philanthropy' (a title which demonstrates the currency of this phrase long before the present era), Elizabeth Macadam describes 'new philanthropists' emerging after the Great War: *"The class accustomed to generous giving gave place to a different class - the 'new rich', not bred in the same tradition"* (Macadam 1934:245). Having surveyed the philanthropic terrain in the first third of the twentieth century, Macadam concludes it is no longer *"the prerogative of the 'older families' or the 'upper class'"* (p.286).

[253] 'Giving away billions is hard business', Sunday Times, 2/07/06

Macadam's point that the profile of the rich has altered over time illuminates why the profile of philanthropists might also have altered: as a sub-set of those possessing wealth, philanthropists reflect the characteristics of the group from which they are drawn. For example, the annual survey of the UK's 1,000 richest people[254] has noted a shift from a majority that are inheritees to a majority that are self-made. Indeed, 77% of the members of the 2006 Rich List are self-made (Beresford 2006:10), which is a similar figure to the 72% self-made people identified in my sample of 170 of the most significant philanthropists in 2006, as shown in table 3.13.

Table 6.2 Comparison of the source of wealth of the rich and of significant philanthropists, both in 2006

Sample	% Self-made	% Inheritees
Rich List	77%	23%
UK philanthropists	72%	28%

Therefore, whilst a distinctive feature of the 'new philanthropists' is said to be that they are more likely to be self-made entrepreneurs than traditional philanthropists, this could be attributable to the changing composition of the rich, rather than the changing nature of philanthropists.

The second suggestion is that 'new philanthropists' support 'new causes' such as global health and the environment, yet similar shifts in the focus of philanthropic attention are found to have occurred throughout history because the most urgent social problems change over time. AIDS and climate change are prevailing concerns at the start of the 21st century just as, for example, historical studies show that it was popular to help poor maids to marry in the 15th century, to pay ransoms for people captured by pirates in the 16th century and to make contributions to rebuild London after the Great Fire in the 17th century (Jordan 1959; Owen 1965). Clearly the social problems facing 16th century philanthropists, such as the post-Dissolution decline in poor relief that had been provided by the monasteries and the consequences of epidemic disease, were not the same as those faced by donors living during the Industrial Revolution which *"posed problems for philanthropists different in degree and kind from those they had faced in the past"* (Owen 1965:91). Philanthropy is part of a mixed economy of welfare, therefore the role it plays in any given period will depend to a large extent on what needs are failing to be addressed by either the private or public sectors. It will also depend on the wider cultural context and prevailing social norms that influence philanthropy, just as these factors affect any other aspect of social life. For example factory schools, which set children to work in a factory by day and educated them by night, were considered a good solution to the 17th century problem of poor children who had no access to education and were needed to contribute to the family budget (Owen 1965:17). Factory schools would be viewed as unacceptable child labour today, but received enthusiastic support from philanthropists such as Thomas Firmin. As different social problems emerge in different ages, it is to be expected that the philanthropic individuals living in that age will offer new and appropriate solutions, as captured in this observation:

> *"The worthy citizen of the eighteenth century relieved his conscience by a gift to an orphanage; the benevolent lady of the nineteenth century distributed soup and blankets. Her daughter 'taught the orphan boy to read and the orphan girl to sew'; her grand-daughter went 'slumming'. The twentieth-century lady is on the committee of the village institute; her daughter is a guide captain and her son helps at an unemployment centre"* (Macadam 1934:191).

[254] *The Sunday Times Rich List*, the most recent example of this annual report being P. Beresford (2009)

Any perceived 'newness' in terms of causes is therefore more a consequence of external forces, notably changes in social need, social norms and provision by other sectors, rather than the result of internal decisions made by individual to seek out and support new types of recipients. The concerns of philanthropists living at the start of the 21st century are undoubtedly affected by contemporaneous issues, but taking a historical perspective highlights the inappropriateness of describing the constant evolution of privately-funded solutions to emerging social problems as 'new', given how quickly these 'new' issues will, in turn, become 'old'. Indeed, the ability of philanthropy to keep up with changing times is one of its most under-rated assets, as Macadam notes,

> *"This emphasis on the provision for new needs that may arise, rather than the bolstering up of old-established schemes, shows imagination and wisdom. The garden of charity needs contant pruning and weeding and replanting. Schemes which have outworn their usefulness must be allowed to die; others showing fresh shoots must be strengthened, and new growths must be tended and nurtured"* (Macadam 1934:259-60).

The third aspect of new philanthropy alleges that it involves new approaches to giving. New philanthropists are said to emphasise their 'hands on' engagement with the causes they support, for example by sitting on charity boards and interacting with staff and beneficiaries. But a review of the historical literature shows that giving time, skills and energy as well as money is not a novel formulation but rather echoes a sentiment expressed in Victorian England when,

> *"the dispensers of charity... were expected to give generously of their time and resources and to have a sustained personal involvement in their work. This was not 'checkbook philanthropy' satisfied merely by the contribution of money"* (Himmelfarb 1995:148).

Another facet of this type of 'newness' in contemporary philanthropic behaviour is said to be the implementation of businesslike models in the charity world, such as providing venture capital and using key performance indicators to monitor the impact and progress of donations. Yet the transfer of techniques from the business world into charities has a long history. For example, accounts of 17th century philanthropy note the emergence of 'associated philanthropy' based on the private sector model of joint-stock principles, which was frequently used to fund schools and hospitals (Gray 1905:124). The introduction of associational philanthropy was as revolutionary in its day as the introduction of 'venture philanthropy' (a method commonly associated with 'new philanthropists') is today. Associational philanthropy is an example of how 'old' philanthropists *"pioneered a range of new forms in which aid could be delivered"* (Cunningham and Innes 1998:7). Another idea pioneered by philanthropists in previous centuries (and often assumed to be a modern innovation) was the use of loan finance to hospitals in need of cash injections. Loans were often necessary due to founders' proclivity for providing capital, but not the running costs of such institutions (Gray 1905:226; Waddington 1996:190), which was clearly a major difficulty before the introduction of the state-funded National Health Service.

The concept of 'Five Per Cent philanthropy', pioneered in the second half of the nineteenth century by advocates of the social housing movement, is a further example of the historic transfer of business approaches into the philanthropic world (Tarn 1973). This concept combined commercial and philanthropic responsibilities by offering investment opportunities in house-building companies that built dwellings for the labouring and artisan class; tenants paid an affordable rent and investors' returns were capped at a maximum rate of 5%, with any surplus re-invested in efforts to tackle the shortage of decent housing (p.22-3). Five percent philanthropy demonstrated the compatibility of altruism with business acumen as investors made a profit (however restricted) whilst doing good, it also demonstrated a pre-existing concern with something often assumed to be a contemporary philanthropic obsession: that of sustainability. The policy of 'philanthropy and five percent' was implemented as a concerted attempt to ensure the self-perpetuation of the social housing movement, *"so that future generations might gain some benefit"* (p.46). Pursuing sustainability through revenue-generating schemes is therefore another *leitmotiv* of the 'new philanthropy' that does not withstand scrutiny. Despite claims that contemporary major donors have a new appetite for funding *"new entrepreneurial approaches"* (TSIC 2010:1), earnt income was *"a not insignificant source of income"* for charities in the early twentieth century, exemplified by 'self-supporting' residential institutions, such as homes for the blind, in which residents produced goods for sale (Macadam 1934:266).

In addition to the idea that strategies such as pursuing sustainability are unique to the modern philanthropic era, it is also suggested that the approaches taken by 'new philanthropists' are more innovative, bolder and cutting edge than their predecessors. For example, Handy claims that, *"they like to fill gaps and to meet needs neglected by others"* (2006:9), yet some 'old philanthropists' tackled the difficult issues of their times with ground-breaking initiatives. A prime example is London's Lock Hospital, which opened in 1747 to treat people with venereal diseases, described as, *"a courageous attempt on the part of mid [18th]-century philanthropists to grapple with one of the more noisome evils of their time"* (Owen 1965:53). Also in the health field, philanthropists were early supporters of contentious issues such as birth control, as well as backers of pioneering work in the new field of maternal health (Macadam 1934:129).

Finally, an archetypal feature of new philanthropy is said to be a desire for impact or 'value for money' which involves calculating the precise consequences achieved by philanthropic donations. For example, it is suggested that effective philanthropy involves, *"being confident that your gift will make a difference, and being assured that your donation is an efficient use of your money"* (Mackenzie 2008:13). Yet the suggestion that all 'old philanthropists' indulged in careless benevolence without concern for outcomes has no basis in historical evidence, and it is clear that concerns about ineffective philanthropic acts are not new, as documented by Macadam (1934:34-7). An example of a careful approach to philanthropic spending can be found as far back as 1758 when one of the life-governors of the Foundling Hospital, Jonas Hanway, resigned after calculating that it cost £60 to raise a foundling in the institution, which was more than twice the £25 needed to raise a child within their own family (Rodgers 1949:38). Similarly, the 'Five per cent' movement deployed research in support of both its aims and approach, demonstrating that *"very many of the sanitary and social evils which affect the conditions of the labouring classes have been proved to be attributable to the insufficient and inferior accommodation"* (Bowie 1854, cited in Tarn 1973:24) and evidencing the effectiveness of their chosen approach by publishing a report which showed that mortality rates fell by two-thirds as a result of better housing, and that infant mortality in 'model houses' was just a fifth of that found in the metropolis generally (Tarn 1973:24). Macadam also documents examples of research methods being used at the end of the 19th century, such as Charles Booth's famous survey of the London poor, as such work helped *"to ascertain the facts and to press for action"* (1934:161). A concern with measuring need and demonstrating the effectiveness of philanthrpoc interventions is therefore clearly not the sole preserve of 'new philanthropists'.

This review of historical precedents for the allegedly defining characteristics of 'new philanthropy' indicates that previous generations of givers demonstrate similar qualifications and might equally have been perceived to be as 'new' and 'ground-breaking' in their time as those who live and give at the start of the 21st century. It appears that 'newness' is a feature of every successive era, rather than the preserve of any specific generation. This begs the question, explored in the next section, as to why the idea of 'new philanthropy' has gained so much ground.

6.3 Why have claims of a 'new philanthropy' gained credence?

If there is nothing especially new about contemporary philanthropy, why has the idea gained widespread adherence? Three explanations are proposed: an ahistorical approach amongst contemporary commentators that might be deemed a 'loss of historical memory'; a 'preference for novelty' which is a defining feature of late modernity; and a desire by contemporary givers to appear distinctive and to distance themselves from the negative connotations of the traditional meanings of philanthropy.

The loss of historical memory

21st century philanthropists might appear to be, *"a breed apart from their forerunners"* [255] but this is an ahistorical approach as an awareness of philanthropic tradition would demonstrate that,

[255] 'Let's leave it to the supernerds to make poverty history', The Herald, 30/06/06

> *"[w]hile these 'new' innovations in the philanthropic universe position themselves as departures from 'traditional philanthropy', they have a great deal in common with certain strands of the American charitable tradition. Like... others in the past, these new philanthropists seek to give effectively and in ways that achieve results and address causes rather than just providing 'Band Aids'"* (Payton and Moody 2008:153).

Despite contemporary claims of 'newness', historical studies largely emphasise continuity over change. During the period of Owen's study, 1660-1960, he identifies differences in degree, rather than in kind (1965:75) and notes that few donors funded *"anything particularly venturesome or imaginative, money went, on the whole, to maintain established institutions or to create new ones of the same sort"* (p.474). When change does occur, for example the introduction of associational philanthropy in the 17th century or the new arrangements between private funding and the welfare state in the mid-twentieth century, it occurs as a process of adaptation rather than as a paradigmatic shift or sharp dividing line between 'old' and 'new' philanthropy, thus enabling philanthropy and philanthropists to remain relevant to changing circumstances.

The 'preference for novelty'

The second explanation for the widespread acceptance that something called 'new philanthropy' exists, is due to the 'preference for novelty', a term coined by economists but now used more widely in the social sciences. The idea of 'novelty' contains two implications: that it is both newly created and that it is improved or better. The intrinsic favourability of the term 'new' is reinforced by the fact that its antonyms are generally pejorative, for example: obsolete, old fashioned, not as good and out of date. The desire for the new is at least a century old, as Veblen noted at the end of the 19th century,

> *"A fancy bonnet of this year's model unquestionably appeals to our sensibilities to-day much more forcibly than an equally fancy bonnet of the model of last year; although when viewed in the perspective of a quarter of a century, it would, I apprehend, be a matter of the utmost difficulty to award the palm for intrinsic beauty to the one rather than to the other of these structures"* (Veblen 1994:80-1).

Recent sociological literature notes that a preference for novelty is a distinctive mark of modern consumerism. Avner Offer's central argument in 'The Challenge of Affluence' is that *"affluence is driven by novelty, and that novelty unsettles"* (Offer 2006:vii) and a study of 'the desire for the new' describes, *"the nature, origin and functioning of the process through which novelty is continuously created, introduced into society and then disseminated through all social classes"* (Campbell 1992:48).

Claims regarding 'newness' may therefore be a result of a wish on the part of both donors, and those who observe donors, to identify and promote the notion of novelty, even where there is little substantive basis for such claims.

The desire for distinction

The final explanation for attachments to the concept of a 'new philanthropy' is a desire by contemporary givers to be distinctive and to distance themselves from the negative connotations of the traditional meaning of 'philanthropy'. Being 'new' and different is part of distinguishing oneself as better, because people gain cultural cachet by displacing the authority of the past.

This explanation draws on Bourdieu's work 'Distinction' in which he argues that people use cultural capital as a strategy to create and reproduce social inequalities. Bourdieu notes that 'tacit demands' are made of people who occupy certain positions to demonstrate that they possess sufficient distinction to occupy certain social spaces (1984:25). One tacit demand is to demonstrate the possession of a certain quantity of cultural capital, which can take the form of philanthropy, as charitable giving can be used as a means to display refined cultural tastes and appropriate mores. In the past, simply being philanthropic may have served as a sufficient display of cultural capital and generated enough distinction to justify an elevated status. However, in a society where almost everyone can afford to make donations, elites will seek to distinguish themselves further by making donations in ways that differentiate them from people in lower social strata (Ostrower 1995). This could include choosing to donate to high-status organisations such as universities and cultural institutions, or by using what they perceive to be different approaches to giving, such as being emphatically 'strategic' or 'highly engaged'.

In support of the hypothesis that 'new philanthropy' is a recent facet of the quest for distinction, it is interesting to note that only famous and wealthy donors are described as 'new philanthropists'; this label is restricted to the economic and social elite. This situation is hardly new as a historic study of philanthropy notes, *"philanthropy was always connected with mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion"* (Adam 2004:3). Nor is this situation unique to any one country or era as a study of voluntary activity in 17th-19th century Italy notes, *"[c]harity had a crucial role in defining and reproducing the external and internal boundaries which characterized the body social in a particular period"* (Cavallo 1998:110). In support of the notion that a novel approach to philanthropy can be part of a strategy of differentiation, this author goes on to note that during the period of her study it, *"became a means to distinguish oneself from others – from the poor but also from one's peers"* (p.119).

This thesis argues that the distinction gained by acquiring the label 'new philanthropist' is a means of distinguishing oneself not only from 'inferior' social contemporaries but also from givers in the past. In the words of one adviser to 'new philanthropists': *"This is not your father's philanthropy; this is a whole new world of charitable giving."*[256] The cultural distancing apparent in such comments is noteworthy. Whilst the 'golden age' of 19th century philanthropy is often referred to with approval, the donors of that era suffer from a poor image, as a contemporary commentator notes: *"The reputation of Victorian philanthropists as interfering, paternalistic busybodies has deterred generations of successful Britons from setting off on the philanthropic path"*[257]. The rebranding of philanthropy as 'new philanthropy' may be, at least in part, an attempt to alter its entrenched, negative public image and shed the connotations of *"bewhiskered Victorian do-gooders"*[258] in order to appeal to younger, predominantly self-made people who have the capacity to make major donations. By this account, the idea of 'new philanthropy' is less about documenting substantive changes than it is concerned with re-branding philanthropy as a more attractive lifestyle choice for the potential major donors of the 21st century.

[256] Eric Kessler of Arabella Advisers, Washington DC, cited in the Financial Times, 1/12/07

[257] 'The new philanthropists', Sunday Telegraph, 15/01/06

[258] 'A continued charity of giving', Daily Post, 26/12/06

In sum, proponents of the 'new philanthropy' fail to recognise the historical precedents that undermine their claims of a recent radical break in the type of donors, causes and approaches that characterise significant philanthropy. Those that believe in the idea of 'new philanthropy' also appear to be unaware of the general disenchantment with things that are old in contemporary society, which leads to a self-conscious distancing from the past and the rise of a cult of novelty. Finally, the anti-rich sentiment discussed in this thesis creates an additional incentive for contemporary wealthy people to distance themselves from the philanthropic acts of the past, such that the idea of 'new philanthropy' is, at least in part, a strategy to make philanthropy more appealing to both potential donors and the observing public.

6.4 What is new about philanthropy in the 21st century?

Having argued that philanthropy undergoes a constant process of renewal, and is therefore no 'newer' at the start of the 21st century than in any other era, this still raises the question of what is distinctive about philanthropy in the 21st century.

The findings of this thesis support the suggestion that younger, self-made philanthropists who take an interest in global causes have recently emerged. The dynamic re-analysis of the Eight Logics typology, presented in section 3.4, showed that the dominant logic of UK philanthropy at the start of the 21st century was the 'Agenda Setters' who have the youngest average age (55) and the highest percentage of self-made wealth (84%). However, it is important to note that 'Agenda Setters' constitute just 17% of the most significant philanthropists operating in 2006, so are therefore very much in the minority. Furthermore, as this thesis is solely concerned with philanthropy - defined as significant monetary gifts made by rich individuals to unknown others - there is no control group to support claims that there is something distinctive about these donors. Whilst significant philanthropists may have become younger and have a different source of wealth, there is no historical evidence to suggest that previous generations were less concerned about outcomes or less willing to give of themselves along with their money. Nor is there sufficient data on the characteristics and opinions of non-rich donors to conclude that 'ordinary givers' do not share features that are alleged to be distinctive amongst the wealthy.

Whilst no evidence of a radical break between traditional and contemporary philanthropy has been identified, the fact that philanthropists and the public view philanthropy in very different ways (as discussed in chapters 4 and 5), may contribute to the emergence of claims about 'new philanthropy' and explain the attraction to donors in identifying themselves in this way. In order to elaborate this point, it is necessary to briefly review the literature on how meaning is created and shared within society.

The growing wealth gap between rich and poor, as discussed in the introductory chapter, has more than financial ramifications. The widening chasm between the top and bottom of society results in less common ground and fewer shared interests (Offer 2006) such that the meaningfulness of each other's actions becomes more difficult to comprehend. The importance of a shared framework of meaning for making behaviours mutually comprehensible has been noted by a number of sociologists. For example, Halfpenny notes that in the qualitative sociological tradition,

> *"The ability to grasp the meaningfulness of a particular action, to see it as reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances, derives from its embeddedness in a shared framework of meaning, which is socially sustained through interaction"* (Halfpenny 1999:207).

Similarly, Fulcher and Scott note that,

> *"People rely on their audiences sharing a background of assumptions that allow them to fill in the gaps for themselves and so to understand what is being said... An important part of this taken-for-granted background is a sense of social structure that people use to interpret and account for the actions of others"* (Fulcher and Scott 2003:56).

The absence of a shared 'background of assumptions' leads to difficulties in interpreting and interacting with fellow citizens. As Halfpenny points out, "*cultural or sub-cultural differences prevent us from achieving a shared sense of interaction*" (1999:208) and the subsequent different frames of meaning result in *"alternative symbolic representations of the same activities [that] clash across cultural divides"* (Ross 1996:18). Shared meanings about philanthropy may be one casualty of these culture clashes between rich philanthropists and non-rich observers.

The necessity of a shared framework for making gift transactions meaningful was identified by Bourdieu who claims, *"for a symbolic exchange to function, the two parties must have identical categories of perception and appreciation"* (1998:100). Bourdieu also says that people fail to recognise gifts as 'disguised exchanges' because they collectively choose (albeit unconsciously) to 'misrecognise' the reality of the exchange. Collective deceptions and misrecognition of the logic of exchange continues to occur in the context of mundane gift exchanges between equals, such as at birthdays and Christmas between family and friends, where the reality of obligation is masked by ritualised expressions of surprise ("oh, you shouldn't have!"). But Bourdieu's account is no longer applicable to actions involving major philanthropic acts, because the observing public is unwilling to participate in similar 'collective deceptions' or be complicit in misrecognising the logic of philanthropic exchanges ("oh, I know why you did that").

Bourdieu says that, *"for the alchemy to function, as in the exchange of gifts, it must be sustained by the entire social structure"* (1998:101, emphasis added). The separation of the rich from the rest of society undermines the coherence of the social structure and so the alchemy can no longer function. Lack of interaction between the wealthy and the rest of society means we fail to grasp the meaningfulness of each other's actions. One consequence of the chasm between rich and poor is the lack of a shared framework between contemporary philanthropists and the observing public, and the subsequent different interpretations of philanthropic acts as entirely self-less or entirely selfish. In a more deferential society, such as Victorian Britain, the public may have been willing to continue being complicit in 'misrecognising' the gifts of the rich as purely altruistic transactions. But in a less deferential society, where the 'natural authority' of the rich is no longer upheld, the public's willingness to be complicit in processes of misrecognition is diminished. In particular, observers are unwilling to sustain the taboo of drawing attention to any concomitant benefits accruing to donors, as noted by Godbout:

> *"Unlike the world of the market, the world of the gift is one where the implicit and the unsaid reign supreme. The magic of the gift can only operate as long as the underlying rules are not formulated. As soon as they become explicit, the carriage turns into a pumpkin, the king turns out to be naked, and the gift is reduced to reciprocity"* (1998:405).

Godbout claims that this desire to deny the selfless nature of a gift, and to expose the underlying self-interested logic of the exchange, derives from a desire to conform to modern notions of sophisticated realism (p.3-7). Modern individuals are said to fear being considered naïve and unaware of hidden meanings. To be a modern realist means 'knowing' that the gift is motivated by material interests rather than by altruism, just as it means 'knowing' that politics is about power, not ideals (p.3). In a similar vein, Osteen claims that, *"modernity prides itself on a ferocious individualism that mistrusts selflessness"* (2002:22) and a philosophical review of giving also supports the notion that, *"cynicism about philanthropy is a fashionable sign of sophistication"* (Martin 1994:xi).

This determination to deny the existence of true gifts frequently extends to denying one's own altruistic acts. The appropriate, modern explanation for giving and volunteering involves deflecting any suggestion of selflessness and an insistence that the benefits outweigh the costs to the donor. *"The message is clear: as long as he receives more than he gives, everything's all right – he's not violating the code of modern freedom"* (Godbout 1998:6). The idea that modern givers defend their behaviour before the court of utilitarian reason is also supported by Berking who suggests that, *"people feel the need to justify themselves in terms of the dominant ideology of self-interest* (1999:17-18)*"* and Osteen who says that,

> *"Contemporary Westerners are so uncomfortable with communalism and altruism that we tend to re-explain our generosity as self-interest... we remold connected selves into isolated consumers and replace collective obligations with individualistic gratifications"* (Osteen 2002:18).

Therefore, a distinctive feature of contemporary philanthropists is their willingness to expose the logic of philanthropic exchanges and to acknowledge the benefits that they receive as donors, such as enjoyment, purpose and meaning. This is because, as Wuthnow notes,

> *"we have social norms against sounding too charitable. Compassion, our culture tells us, must truly arise from some selfish motive. Utilitarianism, socio-biology, and many therapeutic accounts explain it away, telling us that altruism is really self-interest. At the popular level, we call people who go around acting too charitable 'bleeding heart', 'do-gooders', 'Goody Two-Shoes'. To avoid these labels we censor ourselves. We try not to brag about helping someone. And if we give an account, we are likely to downplay our choice in the matter"* (1991:77).

Therefore, contemporary philanthropists often loudly declare the benefits they accrue from their donations and state publicly that they 'gain more than they give', in order to *"conform to the egoistic morality of the times"* (Godbout 1998:7).

Negative perceptions of philanthropic acts may be, in part, a consequence of modern norms and morals, but the discomfort caused by large donations of money may also be exacerbated by their incompatibility with a model of gift exchange based on reciprocity. As discussed in chapter 2, Mauss notes that gift exchange involves more than just the act of giving and receiving: it is the third act – of reciprocation – that maintains equilibrium in the system. The open ended cycle of giving, receiving and giving back creates the ties that bind people together and, according to Mauss, transforms potential conflicts into alliances (2002). Yet, whilst gift giving ought to enhance solidarity, complications can occur. For example, when a rich donor makes a large monetary gift, reciprocation in kind is impossible and the inability to complete the

gift exchange results in tension and conflict, as over-generous gifts that are too big to be returned, humiliate the recipient (Bailey 1971:24). The asymmetric nature of major philanthropic acts makes them incompatible with gifting according to Douglas who states: *"A gift that does nothing to enhance solidarity is a contradiction"* (2002:ix). One response by contemporary philanthropists to the problems inherent in asymmetric gifts is to de-emphasise the monetary value of their gift and to emphasise the benefits that they obtain from the transaction. For example, rich donors often try to personalise cash gifts by becoming personally involved with the organisations they fund, by seeking engagement with their beneficiaries and by taking up naming opportunities and expressing the pleasure they receive from being associated with it (Silber 1998:143). This suggestion echoes a point made fifty years earlier by Goffman who noted that performances by the wealthy can include the 'playing down' of wealth, *"in order to foster the impression that standards regarding birth, culture or moral earnestness are the ones that prevail"* (Goffman 1959:46-7).

Rich people are aware that their philanthropic acts can provoke critical reactions. The re-branding of 'new philanthropy' may therefore reflect an effort to take account of the views and perceptions of the non-wealthy, observing public because it constitutes a response to the general perception of money as a 'bad gift'. As gift theorists have noted,

> *"the abstract nature of money makes it a fundamentally flawed sign of human value... Money is considered to be an inferior gift object because it does not require much time or thought from the donor"* (Cheal 1996:105).

This explains why 'new philanthropists' emphasise the non-monetary aspects of their giving, such as their time, skills and contacts, whilst de-emphasising the cash value of their gift.

A further interesting element of the re-positioning of philanthropy in the 21st century is the suggestion that it combines the most laudable elements of the past and the present, such that contemporary philanthropists are said to be, *"combining the reformist fervour of philanthropists from the Victorian age with business acumen and toughness of the 21st century world of commerce"* (McCall 2007:4). The morals and virtues of the past are perceived to be superior to those of the present by people from all parts of UK society, rich and non-rich alike. It is therefore an adroit move on the part of contemporary capitalists to marry their wealth-creating techniques, which do not command widespread acclaim, to notions of an old-fashioned tradition of philanthropy, which does enjoy public approval.

Despite widespread assumptions that the rich consume in order to flaunt their wealth, there is a counter suggestion that at the start of the 21st century, *"the Thorstein Veblen era is over"* (Brooks 2000:84) and has been replaced by a new era of 'financial correctness', which involves *"a set of rules to help [the rich] convert their wealth into spiritually and intellectually uplifting experiences"* (p.85). Philanthropic transactions are part of that new set of rules because they demonstrate that the rich person knows how to 'spend well' and that they reject the values associated with conspicuous consumption. As anti-rich sentiments grow more vocal, identity work that involves publicly rejecting wealth will be an increasingly good strategy for winning cultural approval. It also fits with sentiments held by some rich people, especially the newly rich, that money is not the pre-eminent yardstick of success, and that they wish to be valued and recognised for their personal qualities, not the size of their fortune (Lloyd 2004:4). Many philanthropists describe their philanthropy as a conscious decision to turn their back on the accumulation of means and turn instead to maximising meaning in their life, because they are aware that acquisition is not the only thing that brings status in the contemporary era (Cheal 1996).

The novelty inherent in the concept of 'new philanthropy' therefore relates to a new way of *presenting* philanthropy rather than any paradigm shift in the nature of contemporary donors, the causes they support or their approach to giving. What is primarily new about new philanthropy is the attempt to use language and to display attitudes that are more likely to gain widespread cultural affirmation. This is a response to the anti-philanthropy sentiment, described in the introductory chapter, which undervalues money as a gift, accuses donors of carelessness and assumes they are motivated by self-interest. 'New philanthropists' respond to these accusations by offering time as well as money, by demonstrating concern for outcomes, by focusing on impact and by being willing to acknowledge the benefits they gain.

Conclusions

This chapter has explored the suggestion that there is something distinctively 'new' about philanthropy at the start of the 21st century. It has argued there is minimal evidence of a recent and radical break in the way philanthropy is carried out in the UK, and that the caricature of 'old philanthropists' has little or no basis in historical evidence. Philanthropy was found to be a product of its time, which has undergone continual processes of change and has appeared 'new' at many points in its history. It was therefore argued that the role of the philanthropist is continually being re-invented to reflect contemporary needs, dominant values, available wealth, technological developments and the broader socio-political context.

Widespread acceptance of the idea of a 'new philanthropy' was said to be due to the loss of historical memory, a 'preference for novelty' and a desire by contemporary givers to be distinctive and to distance themselves from negative connotations of the traditional meaning of philanthropy. This latter point was discussed further in the context of studies of changing norms around gift giving and decreasing willingness to collude with disguising the logic of gift exchanges, especially when undertaken by wealthy people with whom the rest of society feels little solidarity.

Whilst substantive philanthropic behaviours have not radically changed in recent years, what is 'new' is the presentation of philanthropy, which has altered to reflect contemporary norms and dominant mores concerning wealth-holding and wealth-distribution This chapter has examined the rationale for claims of 'newness' and has concluded that, alongside a loss of historical memory and a preference for novelty, the self-conscious distancing from the philanthropy of the past is a response to the de-authorisation of wealth that appeals to both donors and observers. Some rich donors appear to believe that presenting themselves as 'new philanthropists' is more acceptable to contemporary observers who do not accept the legitimacy or natural authority of wealth. By distancing themselves from wealthy people of the past, by emphasising the non-monetary aspects of their gifts and by acknowledging the personal benefits of philanthropy, 'new philanthropists' are those who seek greater cultural affirmation in 21st century UK society.

Chapter 7
Conclusion

This chapter summarises the arguments presented throughout the thesis and reiterates the key findings in order to draw final conclusions about the meaning of philanthropy in contemporary UK society. It ends with a reflection on the methodological approaches and offers some ideas for future research directions.

7.1 Summary of thesis

The introduction made the case for the social, political and economic significance of philanthropy in contemporary UK society and noted it is a contested concept that provokes ideological reactions. Growing interest in the lifestyle and behaviours of the rich and a rising tide of anti-rich sentiment was identified and related to increased attention to philanthropy. Despite public interest, questions about wealth and philanthropy were found to have been largely neglected within the social sciences and the case was made that philanthropy is an important topic that warrants greater sociological analysis.

A review of the literature identified two important master narratives: philanthropy as an activity that is oriented to the self (in pursuit of, for example, reputation, status and enjoyment) and philanthropy as an activity that is external to the self (in pursuit of, for example, meeting the needs of others, patriotism and transforming the world). The presence of inner-directed and outer-directed benefits have been emphasised in all types of literature (grey, historic and contemporary), and whilst the emphasis has varied over time, there is general agreement that philanthropy involves a 'double intent' (Silber 1998:144) because it generates both public and donor benefits. This thesis therefore suggests that the debate about whether philanthropy is fundamentally selfless or selfish is a false dichotomy because the transformative potential of philanthropy can shape both the donor and the wider world, as philanthropy can simultaneously serve the public good whilst bringing meaning and purpose to the donor's life.

The lack of empirical data on contemporary UK philanthropists, noted in the introductory chapter, was addressed by the study presented in chapter 3. This chapter identified the most significant philanthropists operating in the UK in 2006 and classified their different approaches within a new typology. The 'Eight Logics' builds on a longstanding sociological tradition of creating heuristic models to clarify complex realities, and it improves upon previous typologies of philanthropists by employing exclusive categories, being based on a manageable number of classifiable acts, and being drawn from a full sample of data of all significant philanthropists operating in the UK in one recent year, 2006. This typology demonstrates the wide variety of behaviours that exist within the umbrella concept of 'philanthropy' and highlights the inadequacy of a single, generic concept to describe all rich donors and their distributional preferences. The typology also reflects the ambiguities of identity construction involved in philanthropy and the choices that donors face in deciding which aspects of themselves they want to emphasise and reinforce through their philanthropic acts. Finally, the multiplicity of logics revealed by the typology acts as a signpost to the contradictions that are observed in the subsequent chapters, which examine the experience of being a philanthropist and of observing philanthropy. The decision to explore contemporary UK philanthropy from the perspective of both philanthropists and the public was driven by a belief that social realities should be studied from the standpoint of the subjective meanings given to them by individual actors (Fulcher and Scott 2003:55). The

disparities in these perceptions and the nature of the response to philanthropy in the public imagination proved that thoughts about philanthropy are as interesting and revealing a subject as the acts and outlook of philanthropists themselves.

Chapter 4 examined the way that philanthropists represent themselves and their actions through an analysis of the rhetoric they employ in a variety of different documents. It explored the suggestion that philanthropy plays a role in identity management and found that it fits Goffman's notion of a 'performance' that involves both expressions of the self and attempts to impress others. Typically, philanthropist's rhetoric was found to present their philanthropy as an outcome of their achievements, experiences, values, beliefs and preferences; to integrate their giving into a coherent narrative regarding their personal and professional biographies; and to create and sustain an impression of themselves as people of influence, largely unconcerned about money and with the capacity to set ambitious agendas. Philanthropic acts were therefore found to offer many opportunities for identity work, as they help to create and sustain an identity as a successful person who is significant, influential and authentic.

Chapter 5 examined philanthropy 'in the public imagination' by undertaking a media analysis to explore interpretations of, and responses to, philanthropy and philanthropists. Media coverage was found to be generally unreflective but favourable, with variations depending on the type of newspaper in which it appears and the type of donor under discussion. Media representations of philanthropists were found to emphasise their wealth, celebrity and hyper social mobility, and media coverage was found to contain complex and contradictory representations, such as philanthropy being presented as both a norm and an eccentricity. The lack of a coherent story about philanthropy was related to the lack of a coherent story about wealth in contemporary UK society. Confusion about the role and contribution of the wealthy, including the questionable desirability of wealth-distribution, was found to result in the confused characterisation of philanthropy that appears in UK media coverage.

The penultimate chapter explored the suggestion that a 'new philanthropy' has recently emerged. Utilising the new data presented in this thesis, in conjunction with a review of the literature, it argued that no such radical break can be identified and that philanthropy at the start of the 21st century is as much a product of its time as the philanthropy of any other period. Whilst philanthropy itself has not undergone a paradigm shift, the response to philanthropists was found to have altered in recent decades as a result of major social changes such as individualisation, decreased deference and increased willingness to challenge the authority of the rich. Many contemporary philanthropists are aware of the views and perceptions of the observing public and have made adjustments in the way they conduct and present their philanthropy in order to win greater public affirmation. Changes in the presentation of philanthropic acts were related to recent developments in the relationships between rich and non-rich members of society, such that 'new philanthropists' seek greater cultural affirmation of both their wealth and their giving. The resulting re-branding of philanthropy, emphasising donors' personal engagement and gift of self as well as money, was found to be historically precedented, but a dominant ahistorical outlook, the preference for novelty and the desire for distinction mean that claims of a 'new philanthropy' have been widely accepted.

7.2 Concluding discussion

Philanthropy was found to be neither an obvious nor a straightforward idea: it is socially constructed and embedded in the social and cultural life of actors and the wider society in which they live, and has therefore proved to be an appropriate topic for sociological attention. The minimal amount of empirical evidence concerning contemporary philanthropy in the UK and the dearth of theoretical reflection of the data that did exist, created an opportunity for this thesis to add to the knowledge by meeting the dual need for both facts and theory.

In the light of the findings, summarised in section 7.1 above, I return to the research questions that were set out at the end of chapter 2:

1. What are the distinctive features of contemporary UK philanthropy?
2. What is the meaning and purpose of philanthropy from the perspective of both donors and the wider society?
3. Is there a new philanthropy?

What are the distinctive features of contemporary UK philanthropy?
A number of distinctive features of philanthropists, philanthropic acts and the context within which they occur were identified in this thesis, notably: eight distinctive approaches to undertaking philanthropy; the role that philanthropy plays in the identity work of rich donors; the transformative potential of philanthropy to turn money-making into meaning-making; the role of philanthropy in reconciling individual ambition with community solidarity; and the emergence of new ways of presenting and talking about philanthropy in response to the de-authorisation of wealth and the lack of cultural affirmation for philanthropic acts.

In contemporary society, people have greater freedom to pursue their own lifestyles and create their own identities so there is no longer an obvious, singular philanthropic script. Just as there is greater variety in every other aspect of contemporary life, philanthropists now pursue a variety of different types of philanthropy, each of which has distinctive features in terms of the donor profile, donor behaviour and approaches to giving. 'Eight Logics' of contemporary UK philanthropy were identified, of which the emerging dominant logic was found to be the 'Agenda Setters' who are distinctive in terms of being younger, more likely to be self-made, less male-dominated and seeking to create change on the global stage in a way that enables them to gain credit and retain control of the process. However, the 'Agenda Setters' account for only 17% of the most significant philanthropists operating in the UK in 2006. Despite the greater degree of attention they receive in media coverage (as discussed in chapter 5) and the widespread consensus that they embody a radical new approach to philanthropy (as discussed in chapter 6), the vast majority of contemporary UK philanthropists follow logics with other distinctive features, including the pursuit of religious beliefs ('Salvation Seekers'), empathy with others sharing their ascribed or achieved identities ('Big Fish' and 'Kindred Spirits'), a desire to support the establishment ('Patriots and Players'), to be a patron of the arts ('Culture Vultures'), to be charitable yet denuded of cause ('Big Brands') or to maintain secrecy about their giving ('Secret Operators').

The second distinctive feature of philanthropy is that it provides an opportunity for identity work, which is an increasingly important activity in late modernity as identities have become increasingly unstable and multi-faceted, and as the process of self-creation has become a life-long task. Philanthropy provides opportunities for acts of invention and re-invention of identity in keeping with 21st century definitions of success. Re-invention through identity work is a distinctive feature of contemporary life that is not exclusive to philanthropists, but those with sufficient resources can find that philanthropy offers particularly fast and effective opportunities for identity work.

Major donors often explain their philanthropic acts in a way that seeks to bring coherence to their life story, and that emphasises their morality and success as individuals. This approach may be especially useful for the increasing numbers of people who have created their own wealth, as the high degree of social mobility they have experienced, and the dramatic changes in their circumstances and living conditions, makes their life story particularly in need of a coherent narrative. Yet whether a person is *nouveau riche* or inherits their wealth, philanthropy can also be a response to the realisation that money is a means, not an end, in the pursuit of a happy, fulfilling and acclaimed life. Hence the third distinctive feature is that philanthropy in 21st century UK has the potential to transform money-making into meaning-making.

Philanthropy is a good vehicle for carrying out identity work because it provides opportunities for self-expression at the same time as proving oneself to be part of a wider community. When a donor makes a substantial gift, especially if they do so in a highly visible manner or have the thing they fund named after them, it draws attention to their uniqueness as an individual whilst binding them more closely to the community that benefits, whether it is a geographic community, a community of like-minded people, an artistic community and so on. In this way, the fourth distinctive feature of contemporary philanthropy is that it can be part of a strategy to resolve tensions between individual ambition and community solidarity that have arisen as a consequence of the rise of individualism and the ongoing need for belonging.

The final distinctive feature relates to the fact that contemporary philanthropy occurs within the context of a highly charged cultural atmosphere surrounding wealth (Schervish 1994:169) and lacks valorisation because of the absence of a shared framework of meaning between philanthropists and the public. The existence, extent and impact of the new British 'super-rich' has highlighted the habits and lifestyles of the wealthy, their disproportionate earnings, their luxurious consumption patterns and their allegedly minimal efforts to make a contribution to society (Lansley 2006; Dorling, Rigby et al. 2007; Orton and Rowlingson 2007; Toynbee and Walker 2008). The suggestion that there is a 'problem of riches' and a new category of the 'undeserving rich' reflects the strong opinions about the behaviour and morals of wealthy people, including philanthropists, which are now frequently held and expressed in the public domain. Yet such firm opinions sit uneasily with the under-conceptualisation of philanthropy in the popular imagination and people appear to feel strongly about something that is not fully understood.

In contemporary society all kinds of people, including philanthropists, experience unprecedented levels of scrutiny and comment regarding their actions, but decreased deference and increased access to information about the lifestyles and behaviours of rich people results in their behaviour attracting particularly high levels of scrutiny, comment and criticism. Awareness of this scrutiny is reflected in the rhetoric employed by philanthropists to describe and discuss their philanthropic activities in ways that appeal to contemporary sensibilities. Yet despite these efforts, different understanding and interpretations of philanthropy continue to be held by donors and by the public. These differences are related to wider cultural sensibilities about the authority

of being rich, decreased tolerance of acquisitive behaviours and higher expectations of those who are wealthy. It is also related to the fact that contemporary UK philanthropists are increasingly being viewed as a type of celebrity and – like other celebrities – are treated as both admirable and flawed. Those who seek to resist being criticised for enjoying a lifestyle of 'the rich and famous' need to find ways to communicate to the public that they have alternative values, despite their possession of wealth. As philanthropy involves giving money away, philanthropic acts can be a way of publicly expressing a rejection of accumulation and the values associated with conspicuous consumption. To use Goffman's language, this final distinctive feature can be summarised as philanthropists being engaged in efforts to *express* themselves and to *impress* others, such that their philanthropic gifts are 'sign vehicles', a way of conveying information about their significance, influence and authenticity.

What is the meaning and purpose of philanthropy from the perspective of both donors and the wider society?

This thesis has argued that despite the relatively small sums of money involved in contemporary UK philanthropy, especially in comparison to public spending, its importance lies less in the quantities of money than in the qualities that it represents, which entails a far wider purpose than simply the transfer of wealth from private individuals to good causes. I argue that philanthropy is primarily a social act, despite its frequently being examined as a purely economic transaction, and that we need to think sociologically about this topic because economists' focus on money-making obscures the extent of the meaning-making that occurs through philanthropic activities. Whilst philanthropy is often caricatured in the public imagination as being concerned with the pursuit of advantage, such as status, reputation or useful connections, my analysis of the different philanthropic logics and the way that philanthropists represent themselves, leads me to conclude that these acts are also undertaken as part of an ongoing process of identity work and the search for a meaningful and 'good' life. Some rich people give away significant amounts of money in order to feel that their life has had an impact, that they personally have made a difference and that they will be remembered favourably by the audiences that matter to them. Most people would like to be thought well of, both during and beyond their lifetime, but the possession of wealth gives some people the opportunity to achieve those ends through philanthropy.

This thesis highlights the absence of shared meanings between rich donors and non-rich observers, because the meaning of philanthropy is contested and its purpose is understood differently by philanthropists themselves and by the observing public. From the perspective of donors, philanthropic activities enable them to re-write their identity and endow their past with meaning, transforming their experience of inheritance or wealth creation into a process that appears to have led inexorably to philanthropic distributions. This retrospective re-writing of a life narrative helps to meet public expectations of coherence within a person's 'social front', which, as Goffman first noted, is demanded by observers who take a harsh view of people whose inconsistencies are exposed, for fear they have misrepresented themselves for private gain (1959:67). Yet despite philanthropists' concern with coherence, the public imagination was found to contain incoherent and contradictory representations of philanthropy; the UK public is divided over whether philanthropy is a great British tradition or an unwelcome American import; whether it is a norm or an eccentricity and whether philanthropists themselves are to be admired or ridiculed. But however philanthropy is viewed, it is understood to be the preserve of the rich, the famous and the eccentric. One consequence of such perceptions is that a process of 'othering' philanthropists occurs, which is a dangerous development in terms of the UK government's stated aim for creating a widespread 'culture of giving' that extends well beyond the super-rich (Home Office 2005). There is therefore a need for a more balanced and realistic picture of philanthropy, recognising that it has important public and personal purposes, in order to make it a more widely acceptable and desirable identity.

Public opinion about philanthropy is closely related to public opinion about wealth-holding and wealth-holders. Despite the extended dominance of market capitalism, it has not gained cultural affirmation and is on the defensive as an intellectual idea. Capitalism may be recognised as the best way to organise social and economic affairs but there is no general rejoicing about the workings of the market. Despite the continued existence of some narratives that are subservient to the rich, ideas regarding the 'natural authority' of wealth are no longer widely held. In contemporary consumer societies, and in a departure from the world described by Veblen, the people with most status in the 21st century are not those who consume the *most*, but those who are judged to consume the *best* (Brooks 2000). The mass-consumption era, with its status symbols and lifestyles centred on accumulating and hoarding as many luxury goods as possible, has been replaced by new forms of recognition and status, within which it is perhaps not an overstatement to suggest that 'giving is the new taking'. To suggest that the capitalist ethos has run up against an ethos that does not affirm it, and that public reputations now rest more on how people spend their money than how they acquired it, implies there is now newly fertile territory for philanthropy, because it offers a public demonstration of 'good spending' and may be extrapolated to denote a 'good life'. A final meaning of philanthropy is therefore that it offers a solution to the perceived cultural contradiction between the pursuit of market values and the pursuit of self-fulfilment, because it is simultaneously a demonstration of wealth and an outlet for self-realisation.

Is there a new philanthropy?

This thesis does not find evidence of a radical break between old and new philanthropy, but the presentation of philanthropy was found to have altered in order to better reflect dominant views about the accumulation and distribution of wealth that are held by both philanthropists and the observing public in the 21st century.

The novelty in being a 'new philanthropist' was found to be related less to issues of substance than to a self-conscious cultural distancing from what came before. 'New philanthropists' are aware that the traditional ideas of philanthropy lacks widespread cultural affirmation so they claim to do it 'better' than in the past and reject the approaches taken by their philanthropic predecessors. In contemporary UK society we lack cultural scripts on how to be rich and on how to be philanthropic: people are freer to pursue their own idea of how to be rich and generous, but that also means there is more potential to get it wrong. Judgements based on who consumes the *best*, rather than the *most* involve imprecise and opaque measure, which causes anxiety amongst the wealthy and offers little guidance for 'how to be a good millionaire'. Despite the idea of 'new philanthropy' being an ahistorical interpretation that can be understood as a manifestation of the preference for novelty, it has gained widespread adherence because there is a cultural cachet in displacing the authority of the past that appeals to both donors and the observing public.

Bourdieu's work was found to be particularly useful in undertaking this aspect of the study. I build on his suggestion that being philanthropic is one way of achieving distinction by further suggesting that 'new philanthropy' has emerged as a more refined signifier of distinction. Embracing the label of 'new philanthropist' is a way of differentiating oneself from other rich people who may have more inherent cultural capital but who are perceived to give less carefully, to less important issues or with less ultimate impact. Such a strategy is especially useful for the self-made rich who can find themselves lost in a world of old money in which they are not socialised or at ease. Focusing on emerging issues and promoting the application of businesslike skills in the charity sector, provides an accessible source of social and cultural capital for people who lack the cultivated dispositions and cultural competences required to

pursue more traditional, elite forms of philanthropy, such as patrons of the arts and supporters of establishment causes.

The rhetoric of anti-rich sentiment and anti-elitism was also found to be a driver of philanthropy that is characterised as 'new'. Our society is self-consciously anti-elitist and many philanthropists express a desire to be accepted as 'one of the guys'. Younger philanthropists, and those who have more recently established their charitable foundations, were found to be more likely to pursue the logic of 'agenda setting' philanthropy, which has some similarities to the idea of 'new philanthropy'. However, whilst 'agenda setters' represent an increasingly significant logic, they are by no means dominant, despite their dominance in the public imagination.

In sum, my exploration of the emergence of 'new philanthropy' finds this involves more of a change in style than in substance, in which gifts of money are downplayed in favour of emphasising gifts of the self, and in which there is an emphasis on the enjoyment and pleasure gained by philanthropists in fulfilling their personal needs for meaning by meeting the material needs of others.

Conclusions on research questions

This thesis finds that, despite being essentially a financial transaction, philanthropy is about much more than money. Philanthropy is concerned with identity management, reputation building, legacy creation and helping individuals to meet modern standards of success. Philanthropists aspire to be perceived as significant, influential and authentic, and their possession of wealth enables them to use philanthropy to achieve these ends. However, this thesis also finds that there are incoherent and contradictory representations of philanthropy in the public imagination. As a society, we are not comfortable about wealth-making, we are unsure what status to give to the wealthy, we do not know how to characterise the act of wealth-giving and we are not even clear about the desirability of wealth-giving. This results in the complex and confusing character of philanthropy in contemporary UK society that has been documented in this thesis.

7.3 Reflections on methodological approach

The main methodology used throughout this thesis is secondary analysis, which was chosen as an alternative to the prior dependence on interviews, focus groups and surveys that dominate all other known studies on contemporary UK philanthropy. Rather than generate new data through primary research, I chose to analyse already-existing data that has been produced by philanthropists and journalists, and that appears in publicly available documents. This approach follows that advocated by Silverman (2007) who draws a distinction between 'manufactured' data, such as that produced by surveys and interviews, and data gathered in the 'everyday world'. The methodology of this thesis reflects a belief that the latter is superior for an investigation into topics, like philanthropy, that risk generating pre-scripted (albeit unintentionally so) responses. By basing my research on data that already exists in the public domain, I hope to have avoided stimulating yet more formulaic comments and erroneously analysing them as if they were an accurate reflection of the subject, rather than the 'appropriate script' expected of people who are occupying the role of a philanthropist. I also hope to have analysed this data in such a way that it is possible to generalise beyond personal experiences towards the broader social behaviours involved in philanthropy in order to identify the systemic nature and meanings of philanthropic acts. Further advantages of using this methodology include access to better quality and more extensive data, in terms of sample size and number of variables, than time and resources would otherwise have allowed (Robson 1993:282); ability to concentrate on

analysis and interpretation rather than data-collection (Baker 1988:254-60) and the opportunity to find new insights and bring a fresh perspective to existing data (Hakim 1987:31).

However, I am aware that this methodology involves a number of disadvantages including a lack of control over the content of the data, which was produced for purposes other than those pursued in this thesis (May 1997:78) and the time-lag between data-collection and publication. The material analysed in this thesis was almost all published in 2006 and the data lying behind some of those publications (for example the reports and accounts of foundations) would be a year or so older, from 2005 or even 2004.

It is also important to recognise that my focus on just one year (2006) has a number of limitations that must be acknowledged. There may be unknown reasons for that year being untypical - indeed the fact that Warren Buffett's multi-billion dollar donation to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation happened in June 2006 means it was certainly an unusual year for global philanthropy, although any knock-on effect in terms of encouraging UK philanthropists to follow suit would probably not have taken effect until 2007. Perhaps more significant was the impact of giving in response to the Asian tsunami on 26th December 2004. This disaster prompted a larger response than to any preceding disaster appeal and had an unknown effect on both levels and direction of giving (Pharoah, Walker et al. 2006:2). As donations made in early 2005 would appear in accounts published in 2006 (which were used for this study), it is possible that my data overstates the concern for international aid and that such donations temporarily displaced donations to other causes. The cross-sectional nature of the study (being just a 'snapshot' of 2006) means that it fails to isolate such contingent, time-specific, factors. Having a focus on just one calendar year means it is also unable to capture dynamic changes in philanthropic identities that develop over time: some of the significant philanthropists that appear in the database may have dramatically reassessed the scale or the direction of their giving in subsequent years. The only way to rectify disadvantages in cross-sectional studies is to incorporate longitudinal elements, which was not possible within the time and resource constraints of writing this thesis. However, as I intend to continue researching this topic into the future, I hope to revisit the findings of this study and therefore develop a more dynamic understanding of trends in the meaning and purpose of UK philanthropy over time.

Throughout the data collection stage I took precautions to guard against likely sources of bias. My decision to define 'significant philanthropist' using four different approaches (people who made donations worth £1 million or more, appeared in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index, ran one of the 100 biggest charitable foundations and/or appeared multiple times in national media reports about philanthropy) was driven by a desire to capture different types of significance in terms of the scale of donations and their impact on the public consciousness, and different types of donors, including those who undertake their philanthropy with and without attendant publicity. My decision to include every one of these significant philanthropists in my study, rather than just a sample, was also intended to ensure that my findings were more robust than previous studies that have involved self-selecting samples (notably Lloyd 2004; Handy 2006). It is undoubtedly true that some philanthropists are more transparent and accessible, but restricting studies to those who are willing to be studied means that findings may reflect only what 'publicity-friendly' philanthropists do and think. My determination to collect data on every significant philanthropist undoubtedly extended the time period of this study and the disproportionate amount of time and effort required to get any data on the most secretive cases (which included attempts to correspond directly with them) only resulted in my being able to confidently code eight philanthropists as 'Secret Operators'. But the decision to include this type as a particular logic, rather than as a troublesome aspect of data collection that is tempting to ignore, gives assurance that my typology is as comprehensive as my sampling.

Despite best efforts to avoid bias in my research design, the process of qualitative coding clearly creates potential for bias. Coding was necessary in order to organise the data and I undertook a two-fold process of coding, firstly coding individual donations and secondly coding the 'types' of donor. Both processes would be affected to some degree by my interpretation of the purpose of each gift and my interpretation of the collective logic behind those gifts. The process of coding each donation was complicated by the fact that some recipient organisations straddle multiple charity sub-sectors, for example 'World Vision' is both a religious (Christian) and an international aid charity, Jewish Care is a religious organisation that delivers domestic welfare and Moorlands Bible College is both religious and educational. When confronted with these coding decisions, I evaluated any problematic donations in the context of the donor's wider philanthropic acts, so if, for example, the donor to World Vision predominantly funded other religious or other international development organisations then I let that wider context influence my specific coding decision. Similarly, when coding the types of donor, there were cases that were less clear-cut and a number of alternative coding decisions could be justified, for example where a philanthropist appeared to follow a number of logics simultaneously I had to make judgements based on contextual information to decide which was the dominant logic. For philanthropists with extremely specific interests, such as environmentalism in one part of the world, I did my best to ascertain whether they had a global outlook (and were therefore 'Agenda Setters') or had a personal connection to that place (and were therefore 'Big Fish' or 'Kindred Spirits'). Ambiguous situations such as these would obviously benefit from research methodologies that involve direct contact with donors, such as interviews or surveys, which I did not undertake. However, efforts were made to increase the objectivity of coding decisions through consultations with academic colleagues with expertise in qualitative methods and with practitioner colleagues who study philanthropic giving and some minor modifications in coding were subsequently made as a result of feedback from this process.

Despite the comprehensive approach to creating my sample of significant philanthropists, there was minimal variance within variables relating to wealth and size of philanthropic acts as, by definition, they are all rich and notably philanthropic. Therefore it is not possible to draw any conclusions regarding the behaviour of richer people or those making larger donations in comparison to 'ordinary' donors. The absence of such variance has not prevented others from making claims about the distinctive features of rich people's philanthropy. This error in research design is most notable in claims making about 'new philanthropy' whereby a sample of entirely young, self-made, wealthy people is used to conclude there is something distinctive about younger, self-made, wealthy philanthropists. In my research work outside of this thesis I am now studying the philanthropic behaviour and opinions of mass affluent (rather than extremely wealthy) donors and early findings are supporting my hypothesis that they do not differ markedly from their richer counterparts as they appear to be equally concerned with factors such as retaining control, achieving impact and obtaining satisfaction from their donations.

7.4 Future research directions

Just as the wider topic of gift giving is said, *"to offer material for inexhaustible sociological reflection"* (Coser 1977:67), so too this thesis demonstrates that philanthropy is a field ripe for further study. Some ideas for further study were signalled within this piece of work. In chapter 3 it was suggested it would be useful to exploration the correlation between levels of giving and different logical approaches to philanthropy; in particular the finding that philanthropists making the smallest donations show no discernable pattern within their giving (i.e. those classified as 'Big Brands'), raises the hypothesis that a passionate interest in a particular cause, organisation or type of beneficiary is an important factor in increasing philanthropic contributions. The media analysis in chapter 5 generated a number of lines of potential future work, including further

study of the variation in the quantity of media coverage of philanthropy in different cities and regions of the UK, which it was suggested may be due to the presence or absence of a distinct historical tradition with notable 'sons and daughters' who serve as local philanthropic role models; and further research into how some rich donors gain a disproportionately large media presence, such as the six men[259] who account for a third of all UK media coverage of individual philanthropists, whilst others remain all-but invisible, such as the eight Secret Operators identified in the 'Eight Logics' typology.

During the course of undertaking this doctoral research I have formulated a number of other research questions that fall outside the remit of this piece of work, but may prove useful for pursuing in the future:

Firstly, the increased profile of private philanthropy raises important questions about its effectiveness, accountability and impact, which are not addressed in this study, but are clearly important for donors and beneficiaries alike and should be prioritised in future research. Secondly, It would be useful to explore how philanthropy interacts with both the public and private sectors because philanthropy is not a separate, bounded entity that exists in a vacuum, so future research ought to explore more fully the interactions and overlaps between sectors; for example: is private giving supplementary or complementary to government spending? Are philanthropy and government autonomous? Are they engaged in necessarily adversarial relationships or are genuine partnerships possible? Thirdly, it would be extremely interesting to isolate philanthropy from the other ways that rich people spend their money because philanthropy is only one element - often a very small element - of complex spending decisions and should be contextualised, especially in relation to spending on luxury items. Finally, I would like to examine more closely the relationship between philanthropy and leadership. During my data collection phase I noted in passing how many significant philanthropists hold multiple honorific positions in society, including chairs of public bodies, trustees of other charities, holders of honorary doctorates, owners of football clubs, high profile supporters of political parties and so on, but I did not systematically record these observations and can now only hypothesise that the meaning and purpose of philanthropy is in some way linked to the wider leadership practices of the wealthy; a network analysis to investigate the frequency and consequence of such inter-locking leadership positions might be a good topic for further research.

The academic study of philanthropy is a new and expanding area in the UK and I hope that the material presented in this thesis is helpful in drawing attention to the value of exploring these issues and that it will open the door to further studies.

[259] The analysis of 'Philanthropists named in the media', contained in section 5.3, found that Tom Hunter, Peter Lampl, Andrew Carnegie, Tom Farmer, Irvine Laidlaw and Peter Moores collectively accounted for 32% of all media coverage of named philanthropists in UK media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006.

Appendix A
Full list of sample and key identifying characteristics

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[260]	Source of wealth[261]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[262]
Jon Aisbitt (49)	RLGI, £M	Finance (Goldman Sachs) and Oil exploration	£98m (602=)	No known foundation (NKF)	Not applicable (NA)	£2m – Brighton City Academy	Big Fish (KS)
Rod Aldridge (58)	RLGI, £M	Computers and Public service delivery (Capita)	£68m (858=)	The Aldridge Foundation	2004	£2m – Darwen City Academy	Big Fish (PP)
Heather Barbara Allen (d)	£M	Not known (NK)	Not on Rich List (NRL)	The H B Allen Charitable Trust	1989	£2m -RNLI	Patriot & Player (BB)
Baron [David] Alliance (74)	Fdn	Textiles (Coats Viyella) and Mail order (N Brown)	£320m (187=)	Alliance Family Foundation	1968	£55k – Weizmann Institute of Science	Salvation Seeker (BF)
Sir Martin Arbib (56)	Fdn, £M	Finance (Perpetual)	£370 (170)	The Arbib Foundation	1987	£2m – Langley City Academy	Big Fish (PP)
KM Ball (d)	£M	NK	NRL	NKF	NA	£1.2m – Christian Aid	Salvation Seeker (SS)
Duncan Bannatyne (57)	Media	Nursing homes, fitness clubs (Bannatynes) and nurseries (Just Learning)	£168m (348)	Bannatyne Foundation	NK	£NK – Orphanage in Romania	Agenda Setter (PP)

[260] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[261] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[262] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[263]	Source of wealth[264]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[265]
Nicholas Baring (72)	Fdn	Banking (Barings)	NRL	The Baring Foundation	1969	£540k, Villiers Park Educational Trust	Agenda Setter (PP)
Adrian Beecroft (59)	£M	Finance (APAX)	£103m (545=)	NKF	NA	£2m – Pickering City Academy	Kindred Spirit (PP)
Alan Beit (d)	Fdn	Diamond mining (De Beers)	NRL	The Beit Trust	1906	£537k – Beit Hospital, Zambia	Agenda Setter (KS)
Bono [Paul Hewson] (46)	Media	Music	NRL	NKF	NA	£NK - Debt relief & Make Poverty History	Agenda Setter (KS)
Sir Richard Branson (56)	Media	Retail (Virgin)	£3.065bn (9)	Virgin Unite (corporate foundation)	1987	£103k – Branson School of Entrepreneurship	Agenda Setter (KS)
Arpad Busson (43)	Media	Finance (EIM hedge fund)	£100m (554)	ARK (fundraising foundation)	2003	£3.2m – HIV/AIDS projects	Agenda Setter (BF)
Barrow Cadbury (d)	Fdn	Chocolate	NRL	Barrow Cadbury Trust	1920	£905k – Inclusive communities projects	Agenda Setter (SO)
Earl [Charles] Cadogan (69)	Fdn	Inheritance/ Property	£2.15bn (15)	The Cadogan Charity	1966	£250k – Natural History Museum	Patriot & Player (BB)
Doris Campbell (d)	£M	NK	NRL	NKF	NA	£1m – Hampshire & Isle of Wight Community Foundation	Big Fish (BF)
Richard Caring (57)	RLGI, Media	Fashion (International Clothing Designs), Restaurants, Golf	£500m (129=)	NKF	NA	£NK - Children's charities, esp. NSPCC	Agenda Setter (BB)
John Caudwell (53)	Media, £M	Mobile phones (Phones 4U)	£1.6bn (29)	The Caudwell Charitable Trust	2000	£1.75m – Caudwell Children	Big Fish (BB)

[263] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[264] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[265] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[266]	Source of wealth[267]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[268]
A. Chontow	Fdn	Property	NRL	Achiezer Association Limited	1968	£NK – Unspecified Jewish charities	Salvation Seeker (SO)
Eric Clapton (61)	RLGI	Music	£135m (420=)	The Crossroads Antigua Foundation	1998	£396k – Crossroads Clinic	Kindred Spirit (AS)
John S. Cohen (d)	Fdn	Business	NRL	The John S. Cohen Foundation	1965	£35k – National Theatre	Patriot & Player (CV)
Ernest Cook (d)	Fdn	Inheritance/Travel (Thomas Cook)	NRL	The Ernest Cook Trust	1952	£50k – Game Conservancy Trust	Patriot & Player (CV)
Ann Cotton (d)	Fdn	NK	NRL	The Valentine Charitable Trust	1990	£65k – Red Cross	Big Fish (KS)
Clive Cowdery (42)	£M	Finance (Resolution Life)	£70m (817=)	The Resolution Foundation	2006	£1.3m – Resolution Foundation (low income earners)	Agenda Setter (AS)
Sir Tom Cowie (83)	RLGI	Transport (Arriva)	£60m (944=)	The Sir Tom Cowie Charitable Trust	2003	£75k – St. Cuthbert's Hospice	Big Fish (BB)
Mary Coyle (d)	Fdn	Inheritance	NRL	The Albert Hunt Trust	1979	£50k – Oxford Homeless Medical Fund	Salvation Seeker (BB)
Peter Cruddas (52)	£M	Finance (CMC)	£864 (61)	The Peter Cruddas Foundation	2006	£1m – Duke of Edinburgh Award scheme	Patriot & Player (PP)
Itzchok Meyer Cymerman	Fdn	Property	NRL	Itzchok Meyer Cymerman Trust Limited	1972	£50k – Telz Talmudical Academy	Salvation Seeker (BF)
Eddie Davies (59)	RLGI	Thermostats (Strix)	£99m (598=)	NKF	NA	£800k – Kew Gardens (Davies Alpine House)	Patriot & Player (BF)

[266] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[267] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[268] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[269]	Source of wealth[270]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[271]
Roger De Haan (57)	Fdn, RLGI, £M	Inheritance/Leisure (Saga)	£850m (62=)	The Roger De Haan Charitable Trust	1978	£1.05m – Red Cross	Big Fish (AS)
Peter De Haan (53)	Fdn	Inheritance/Leisure (Saga)	£850m (62=)[272]	The Peter De Haan Charitable Trust	1999	£469k – Abbeyfield Esk Moors (old people's home)	Big Fish (PP)
Richard Desmond (54)	£M	Publishing (Northern and Shell)	£1.9bn (22=)	NKF	NA	£2.5m – Moorfields Eye Hospital (The Richard Desmond Children's Eye Centre)	Patriot & Player (SS)
Albert Dicken	Fdn, £M	DIY (Dickens)	NRL	The Goshen Trust	1979	£1.4m – Angel Foundation (Christian media GodTV)	Salvation Seeker (AS)
Sir Harry Djanogly (68)	Fdn	Textiles (Coats Viyella)	NRL	The Djanogly Foundation	1980	£330k – University of Nottingham	Patriot & Player (BF)
Dame Vivien Duffield (60)	Fdn, Media, £M	Inheritance	NRL	Clore Duffield Foundation	2000 (merger)	£1m – South Bank foundation	Culture Vulture (PP)
Baron Dulverton [Michael Wills] (62)	Fdn	Inheritance	NRL	The Dulverton Trust	1949	£130k – Farmington Trust (Christian education)	Salvation Seeker (BB)
Herbert Dunhill (d)	Fdn	Tobacco (Dunhills)	NRL	Dunhill Medical Trust	1950	£500k – Connectsd (Communication Disability Network)	Kindred Spirit (PP)
Sir James Dyson (58)	£M	Household appliances (James Dyson Ltd)	£1.05bn (48)	The James Dyson Foundation	2003	£510k – Dyson School	Kindred Spirit (BF)
Robert Edmiston (59)	RLGI, Media, £M	Car sales (IM group) Property	£410m (154)	Christian Vision	1988	£9.5m – Christian Vision	Salvation Seeker (BF)

[269] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[270] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[271] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

[272] The wealth and Rich List position are given collectively for the De Haan brothers, so this figure is a repeat, not an addition to Roger De Haan's wealth and RL position

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[273]	Source of wealth[274]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[275]
Johan Eliasch (44)	RLGI, Media, £M	Investments, Sports Goods	£361m (171)	NKF	NA	£20m – purchase of 400,000 acres of Amazonian rainforest	Agenda Setter (AS)
Eliasz Englander (73)	Fdn	Property	£155m (370)	Keren Association	1962	£609k – Beis Aharon Trust	Salvation Seeker (BF)
Iain Fairbairn (d)	Fdn	Finance (M&G)	NRL	Esmée Fairbairn Foundation	1961	£450k – Henry Moore Trust	Agenda Setter (KS)
Sir Tom Farmer (66)	Media	Car repairs (Kwik Fit) and Property	£122m (456)	Sir Tom Farmer Foundation	2005	£240k – Mary's Meals (hunger alleviation)	Big Fish (AS)
L Faust	Fdn, £M	NK	NRL	Clydpride Limited	1986	£1.5m – Mercaz Beth Jacob	Salvation Seeker (BF)
Charles Feeney (75)	Fdn, £M	Retail (Duty Free Shoppers	NRL	The Atlantic Charitable Trust	1993	£1.54m – Disability Action	Agenda Setter (BB)
Stanley Fink (48)	RLGI, Media	Finance (Man Group)	£110m (551)	The Barbara and Stanley Fink Foundation	NK	£NK – Children & Medical charities	Kindred Spirit (AS)
Philip Fleming (d)	Fdn, £M	Finance (Fleming Family and partners)	£1.7bn (27)	P F Charitable Trust	1951	£2.16m – St Paul's Cathedral	Patriot & Player (BF)
Donald Forrester (d)	Fdn	Manufacturing (Films &Equipments Ltd) and Investments	NRL	Donald Forrester Trust	1986	£50k – DEC Tsunami appeal	Big Brand (AS)
Raphael Freshwater (d)	Fdn	Property	NRL	The Raphael Freshwater Memorial Association	1962	£348k – SOFT (support for families of babies with chromosomal defects)	Salvation Seeker (BF)
Benzion Freshwater (58)	Fdn	Inheritance/Property	£1.016bn (52)	Mayfair Charities Limited	1968	£2.9m – unspecified religious causes	Salvation Seeker (BF)
Lord [Robert] Gavron (75)	Fdn, RLGI	Printing (Folio Society)	£60m (944=)	Robert Gavron Charitable Trust	1974	£56k – Arab Israel Children's Tennis	Culture Vulture (PP)

[273] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[274] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[275] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[276]	Source of wealth[277]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[278]
J Paul Getty (d)	Fdn, Media	Inheritance	NRL	J Paul Getty Jr. General Charitable Trust	1985	£100k – St Martins in the Fields (welfare services)	Culture Vulture (KS)
Ann Gloag (63)	Media	Transport (Stagecoach)	£395m (163)	Gloag Foundation	2004	£NK – Mercy Ships	Salvation Seeker (SO)
Zac Goldsmith (31)	Media	Inheritance	NRL	NKF	NA	£NK – Environmental causes	Agenda Setter (KS)
Everard Goodman (74)	Fdn, RLGI, £M	Property (Tops Estates)	£140m (405=)	Everard and Mina Goodman Charitable Foundation	1963	£2m – British Friends of Bar-Ilan University	Salvation Seeker (PP)
Mike Gooley (69)	RLGI	Travel (Trailfinders)	£260m (227=)	The Mike Gooley Trailfinders Charity	1995	£400k – Alzheimer's Society	Kindred Spirit (PP)
Sir Donald Gosling (77)	Fdn, Media, £M	Car parks (NCVP) & Property	£510m (127=)	The Gosling Foundation Limited	1985	£1.15m – Trafalgar 200	Patriot & Player (KS)
Rivka Gross	Fdn, £M	NK	NRL	M and R Gross Charities Limited	1967	£3m – Atlas Memorial Ltd	Salvation Seeker (KS)
Helen Hamlyn (72)	Fdn, £M	Inheritance/ Publishing	£76m (762=)	The Helen Hamlyn Trust	2001	£1m – Imperial College (Paul Hamlyn Chair of Surgery	Culture Vulture (PP)
Paul Hamlyn (d)	Fdn, £M	Publishing	NRL	The Paul Hamlyn Foundation	1987	£261k – Awards for Visual Artists	Culture Vulture (AS)
Maurice Hancock (d)	£M	NK	NRL	NKF	NA	£1.3m – Imperial College	Kindred Spirit
Guy Hands (46)	RLGI, Media	Finance (Terra Firma), Hotels	£200m (295=)	NKF	NA	£NK – Oxford University	Patriot & Player (BF)
David Winton Harding (44)	£M	Finance (AHL, Winton Capital)	£145m (298=)	The Winton Charitable Foundation	2005	£3.35m – Cambridge University	Kindred Spirit

[276] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[277] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[278] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[279]	Source of wealth[280]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[281]
Baron [Philip] Harris of Peckham (63)	£M	Retail (Carpetright)	£285 (206=)	NKF	NA	£2m – Harris City Academy	Big Fish (PP)
Peter Harrison (69)	Fdn, RLGI, £M	Computers (Chernikeef)	£195m (314=)	The Peter Harrison Foundation	1999	£3m – National Maritime Museum	Kindred Spirit (PP)
Charles Hayward (d)	Fdn	Steel (Firth Cleveland)	NRL	The Charles Hayward Foundation	1953	£75k – Early Bird Diabetes Trust	Patriot & Player (KS)
Alan Higgs (d)	Fdn	House building	NRL	The Alan Edward Higgs Charity	1979	£560k – Alan Higgs Centre Trust	Big Fish (CV)
Michael Hintze (52)	Media, £M	Finance (Goldman Sachs, CQS)	£225m (275=)	The Hintze Family Charitable Foundation	2003	£1.5m – Victoria & Albert Museum	Patriot & Player (CV)
Sir Ronald Hobson (85)	Media	Car parks (NCP) and Property	£470m (143=)	The Hobson Charity Limited	1987	£150k – Historic Royal Palaces	Patriot & Player (BB)
Sir Julian Hodge (d)	Fdn	Banker	NRL	The Jane Hodge Foundation	1964	£266k – Catholic Archdiocese of Cardiff	Big Fish (SS)
Carol Hogel	Fdn, Media	Inheritance	NRL	The Dunard Fund	1987	£480k – Edinburgh International Festival	Culture Vulture (PP)
Christopher Hohn (39)	Media, £M	Finance (CIFF)	£75m (767)	Children's Investment Fund Foundation	2002	£2.3m – The Clinton Foundation (AIDS drugs for children)	Agenda Setter (BB)
Philip Hulme (57)	Fdn, RLGI	Computers (Computacenter)	£144m (403)	The Hadley Trust	1997	£859k – New Economics Foundation	Agenda Setter (PP)
Sir Tom Hunter (44)	RLGI, Media, £M	Retail (Sports Division) & Property	£780m (72)	The Hunter Foundation	1998	£55m – The Clinton-Hunter Development Initiative	Agenda Setter (BF)
Chris Ingram (62)	RLGI	Media agencies	£60m (944=)	The Ingram Trust	1994	£50k – World Wildlife Fund	Big Brand (AS)
H J Joel (d)	Fdn	Horse breeding	NRL	Childwick Trust	1985	£150k – Racing Welfare, Newmarket	Kindred Spirit (BF)

[279] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[280] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[281] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[282]	Source of wealth[283]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[284]
Sir Elton John (59)	RLGI, Media	Music	£205m (290)	Elton John AIDS Foundation	1993	£131k – Crusaid	Agenda Setter (KS)
Sir Paul Judge (57)	Media, £M	Business	NRL	NKF	NA	£8m – University of Cambridge (Judge Business School)	Kindred Spirit (BF)
M Kaufman	Fdn	NK	NRL	The MK Charitable Trust	1966	£NK – unspecified Jewish causes	Salvation Seeker
Donald Kahn	Media	NK	NRL	NKF	NA	£500k – Kelvingrove museum	Culture Vulture (PP)
Jemima Khan (32)	Media	Inheritance	NRL	The Hoping Foundation	2003	£4k – Shams Bladna childrens' magazine	Agenda Setter (KS)
John Kinross (d)	Fdn	Venture Capital (ICFC, now 3i)	NRL	The Mary Kinross Charitable Trust	1957	£61k – Oxford University – Weatherall Institute of molecular medicine	Kindred Spirit (PP)
Sir Cyril Kleinwort (d)	Fdn	Banking (Kleinwort, Sons & Co)	NRL	CHK Charities Limited	1995	£150k – Roundhouse Trust	Kindred Spirit (PP)
Ernest Kleinwort (d)	Fdn	Banking (Kleinwort, Sons & Co)	NRL	The Ernest Kleinwort Charitable Trust	1963	£70k – River Trust Sussex	Patriot & Player (KS)
Lord [Irvine] Laidlaw (64)	Media, £M	Conferences (IIR)	£730m (79)	Laidlaw Youth Trust	2003	£4m – unspecified youth projects	Patriot & Player (CV)
Sir Maurice Laing (88)	Fdn	Construction (John Laing)	£150m (378=)	The Maurice and Hilda Laing Charitable Trust	1996	£600k – Lambeth City Academy	Salvation Seeker (AS)

[282] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[283] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[284] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[285]	Source of wealth[286]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[287]
John Hedley Laing (47)	Fdn	Inheritance	NRL	The Rufford Maurice Laing Foundation	1982	£620k – Rufford small grants for nature conservation	Agenda Setter (KS)
Sir Kirby Laing (90)	Fdn	Construction (John Laing)	£150m (378=)[288]	The Kirby Laing Foundation	1972	£500k – St Lawrence College, Ramsgate	Salvation Seeker (BF)
Sir John Laing (d)	Fdn	Construction (John Laing)	NRL	The Beatrice Laing Trust	1952	£30k – Commonwealth Society for the Deaf	Salvation Seeker (BB)
Sir Peter Lampl (59)	Fdn, Media	Private Equity (The Sutton Company)	NRL	The Sutton Trust	1997	£894k – Belvedere school (open access programme)	Agenda Setter (KS)
John Lancaster	Fdn	Conservatories (Ultraframe)	NRL	The John and Rosemary Lancaster Charitable Foundation	1997	£560k – Christ for all Nations (missionary work)	Salvation Seeker (BF)
Sir Allen Lane (d)	Fdn	Publishing (Penguin)	NRL	Allen Lane Foundation	1966	£15k – Scottish Detainees Visitors	Kindred Spirits (PP)
Kennedy Leigh (d)	Fdn	NK	NRL	The Kennedy Leigh Charitable Trust	1984	£500k – Association for Children at Risk (Austism)	Salvation Seeker (AS)
Joseph Levy (d)	Fdn	Property	NRL	Joseph Levy Charitable Foundation	1965	£400k – Akiva school	Salvation Seeker (BF)
Noel Lister (78)	Fdn	Furniture (MFI)	£60m (944=)	The Lister Charitable Trust	1981	£60k – The Chemical Dependency Centre	Kindred Spirit (SS)
Louise T Blouin MacBain (48)	Media	Inheritance/ Publishing	NRL	Louise T Blouin Foundation Limited	2006	£NK – Arts projects	Culture Vulture (PP)
Sir Cameron Mackintosh (60)	Fdn	Entertainment	£400m (156)	The Mackintosh Foundation	1988	£75k – Eden Court theatre	Culture Vulture (KS)

[285] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[286] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[287] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

[288] [288] The wealth and Rich List position are given collectively for the Laing brothers, so this figure is a repeat, not an addition to Sir Maurice Laing's wealth and RL position

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[289]	Source of wealth[290]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[291]
John Madejski (65)	Media, £M	Publishing (Autotrader)	£350m (174=)	NKF	NA	£3m – Royal Academy of Arts (John Madejski Room)	Culture Vulture (BF)
Sir Paul McCartney (63)	Media, £M	Music	£825m (65)	NKF	NA	£1.6m – Adopt-a-Minefield	Agenda Setter (KS)
Leonard Medlock	Fdn	Engineering (Sitec Group)	NRL	The Medlock Charitable Trust	1985	£170k – Boston Grammar school	Big Fish (KS)
Sir Godfrey Mitchell (d)	Fdn	House building (Wimpey)	NRL	The Tudor Trust	1955	£200k – Hospice of Hope, Romania	Big Fish (AS)
Margie Moffat (70s)	£M	Travel (AT Mays)	£94m (626)	The Moffat Charitable Trust	1999	£1m – RNLI Scotland	Big Fish (KS)
Sir Peter Moores (74)	Fdn, Media, £M	Retail & Football pools (Littlewoods)	£1.16bn (42)	The Peter Moores Foundation	1969	£5.6m – Compton Verney gallery (purchase of Canaletto)	Culture Vulture (PP)
John Moores (78)	Fdn	Retail & Football pools (Littlewoods)	£1.16bn (42)[292]	John Moores Foundation	1967	£58k – Health@Work (stress amongst charity workers)	Big Fish (AS)
Patrick Moores	Fdn, £M	Inheritance and Littlewoods	NRL	The Freshfield Foundation	1991	£3.7m – Formby swimming pool	Big Fish (BB)
Jon Moulton (55)	RLGI, Media	Finance (Alchemy Partners)	£61m (940=)	Moulton Charitable Trust	1994	£663k – unspecified medical research	Kindred Spirit (AS)
Peter Murray	£M	Property	NRL	The Ormiston Trust	1969	£2m – Gateway City Academy	Kindred Spirit (BF)
Leo Noe (52)	Fdn, RLGI, Media	Property	£380m (168)	Rachel Charitable Trust	1978	£NK – unspecified Jewish causes	Secret Operator (SS)
Sir Gulam Noon (70)	Media	Food (Noon Products)	£65m (888)	The Noon Foundation	1994	£25k – Tower Hamlets college mentoring programme	Big Fish (KS)

[289] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[290] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[291] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

[292] The wealth and Rich List position are given collectively for the Moores family, so this figure is a repeat, not an addition to Sir Peter Moore's wealth and RL position

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[293]	Source of wealth[294]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[295]
Sir Peter Ogden (58)	RLGI	Computers (Computacenter)	£132m (424=)	The Ogden Trust	1994	£57k – Carleton high school	Kindred Spirit (PP)
Sir Christopher Ondaatje (73)	Media, £M	Finance (Pagurian)	£60m (944=)	The Ondaatje Foundation	1975	£1m – National Portrait Gallery	Culture Vulture (KS)
Arif Patel (38)	RLGI	Textiles (Faisaltex) & Property	£105m (535=)	The Patel Foundation	2006	£NK	Secret Operator (SO)
W M Peacock (d)	Fdn	NK	NRL	The Peacock Charitable Trust	1968	£105k – Cancer Research UK	Big Brand (KS)
Trevor Pears (42)	£M	Property	£1.15bn (43=)	The Pears Family Charitable Foundation	1992	£1.2m – TreeHouse (autistic education)	Salvation Seeker (SO)
Jack Petchey (80)	RLGI	Investments	£525m (119)	The Jack Petchey Foundation	1999	£321k – Tower Hamlets out of school learning project	Kindred Spirit (BF)
Sir David Potter (62)	RLGI	Computers (Psion)	£82m (707=)	NKF	NA	£NK	Secret Operator
Sigrid Rausing (44)	Fdn, Media	Inheritance	NRL	The Sigrid Rausing Trust	1995	£750k – Human Rights Watch	Agenda Setter (KS)
Hans Rausing (80)	Media	Food packaging (Tetrapak)	£4.95bn (4)	NKF	NA	£NK – Sigrid Rausing Trust & Arcadia Trust (daughters' foundations)	Agenda Setter (KS)
Lisbet Rausing (46)	Fdn, £M	Inheritance	NRL	Arcadia	2001	£1.3m – School of Oriental and African Studies (endangered languages)	Agenda Setter (KS)
Baron [Max] Rayne (d)	Fdn, £M	Property & Venture Capital	NRL	The Rayne Foundation	1962	£1m – Jerusalem Foundation	Kindred Spirit (BF)
David & Simon Reuben (67/64)	Media	Property	£3.25bn (8)	Reuben Brothers Foundation	2002	£NK	Secret Operator (SO)

[293] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[294] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[295] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[296]	Source of wealth[297]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[298]
Philip Richards (45)	RLGI, Media, £M	Finance (RAB hedge fund)	£95m (609=)	NKF	NA	£1m+ – Christian projects including The Gateway Christian Centre, Tonbridge	Salvation Seeker (SO)
Dame Anita Roddick	Media, £M	Retail (Bodyshop)	£132m (424=)	The Roddick Foundation	1997	£125k – National Labor Committee (slave labour)	Agenda Setter (KS)
Paul Rooney	£M	Estate Agents (Arun estates)	NRL	NKF	NA	£2m – Kent Community Foundation	Big Fish (BF)
Mrs L D Rope (d)	Fdn	NK	NRL	Mrs L D Rope's Third Charitable Settlement	1984	£102k – Society of St James (missionary)	Salvation Seeker (KS)
Martyn Rose	Fdn	Businessman	NRL	The Rose Foundation	1977	£531k – St Johns Ambulance	Big Brand (AS)
Sir Evelyn Rothschild (75)	Fdn	Finance (NM Rothschild)	£563m (112)	The Eranda Foundation	1967	£1.23m – unspecified charities	Secret Operator
Ferdinand Rothschild (d)	Fdn, Media, £M	Finance	NRL	The Alice Trust	1957	£1.65m – National Trust (Waddesden Manor (Rothschild seat))	Patriot & Player (CV)
James Armand de Rothschild (50)	Media	Inheritance	NRL	Rothschild Foundation	1956	£200k – National Trust (Waddesden Manor (Rothschild seat))	Kindred Spirit (BB)
Joanne K Rowling (41)	Media, £M	Novelist	£520m (122)	Children's High Level Group	2005	£1.7m – unspecified global child poverty	Agenda Setter (KS)
Ramesh Sachdev (60)	RLGI	Nursing homes (Lifestyle Care)	£279m (216)	NKF	NA	£NK – Mount Vernon Cancer appeal	Big Brand (KS)
Wafic Said (67)	Media, £M	Arms Sales (Said Holdings)	NRL	Karim Rida Said Foundation	1982	£7m – Oxford University (Said Business School)	Patriot & Player (BF)

[296] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[297] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[298] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[299]	Source of wealth[300]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[301]
Lord [Alan] Sainsbury (d)	Fdn	Supermarkets (Sainsburys)	NRL	The Alan and Babette Sainsbury Charitable Fund	1953	£70k – Islington music centre	Kindred Spirit (CV)
Sir John Sainsbury (79)	Fdn, £M	Supermarkets (Sainsburys)	NRL	The Linbury Trust	1983	£2m – Rambert School of Ballet	Culture Vulture (PP)
Lady Susan Sainsbury	Fdn	Marriage	NRL	The Jerusalem Trust	1982	£350k – Jerusalem Productions Ltd	Salvation Seeker (AS)
Simon Sainsbury (d)	Fdn, Media	Supermarkets (Sainsburys)	NRL	The Monument Trust	1965	£250k – Rambert School of Ballet	Big Brand (CV)
Sir Timothy Sainsbury (74)	Fdn, £M	Supermarkets (Sainsburys)	NRL	The Headley Trust	1973	£1.6m – Leukaemia Research	Big Brand (KS)
Jessica Sainsbury 36)	Fdn	Inheritance	NRL	The Staples Trust	1992	£50k – St Pauls Girls School	Kindred Spirit (AS)
Lord [David] Sainsbury (65)	Fdn, RLGI, Media, £M	Supermarkets (Sainsburys)	£1.6bn (29=)	The Gatsby Charitable Foundation	1967	£5.8m – University of East Anglia (Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts)	Kindred Spirit (BF)
Robert Sainsbury (d)	Fdn	Supermarkets (Sainsburys)	NRL	The Robert and Lisa Sainsbury Charitable Trust	1978	£719k – University of East Anglia (Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts)	Culture Vulture (BF)
Peter F Scott	Fdn	Insurance (Provincial)	NRL	Francis C Scott Charitable Trust	1963	£50k – Cumbria Youth Alliance	Big Fish (KS)
Lean Scully (d)	Media, £M	Property	NRL	NKF	NA	£3.7m – Edinburgh International Festival	Culture Vulture (KS)
Samuel Sebba (d)	Fdn	Property	NRL	Samuel Sebba Charitable Trust	1967	£575k – London School of Economics (PhD scholarships)	Salvation Seeker (KS)
Alan Shearer (36)	Media, £M	Football	NRL	NKF	NA	£1.5m – NSPCC	Big Brand (KS)

[299] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[300] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[301] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[302]	Source of wealth[303]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[304]
Archie Sherman	Fdn	NK	NRL	Archie Sherman Charitable Trust	1968	£268k – WIZO (social welfare in Israel)	Salvation Seeker (KS)
Brian & Marie Shuker (d)	£M	NK	NRL	NKF	NA	£2.2m Wiltshire and Swindon Community Foundation	Big Fish (BF)
Christopher Smith	Fdn	Property	NRL	Amanda Smith Charitable Trust	1996	£75k – Cedar school (physically disabled children)	Kindred Spirit (BF)
Brian Souter (52)	Fdn	Transport (Stagecoach)	£395m (163)[305]	The Souter Charitable Trust	NK	£NK	Secret Operator (SO)
Hugh Stevenson (64)	Fdn	Business	NRL	Stevenson Family's Charitable Trust	1986	£130k – Kew Gardens	Patriot & Player (BB)
Adele Stewart (d)	£M	Inheritance	NRL	NKF	NA	£2m – National Museum of Scotland	Kindred Spirit (BF)
R J Stobart	Fdn	Farming & Haulage (Eddie Stobarts)	NRL	Stobart Newlands Charitable Trust	1989	£250k – World Vision	Salvation Seeker (AS)
John Studzinski (50)	Media	Finance (HSBC/Blackstones)	NRL	The Studs Trust	2001	£114k – Genesis Opera project	Culture Vulture (PP)
Eric Thomson (d)	Fdn	Comics (DC Thomson)	NRL	The Northwood Charitable Trust	1972	£NK – various medical projects in Scotland	Big Fish (KS)
Harold Tillman (60)	£M	Fashion (Jaeger, Allders)	£250m (238=)	NKF	NA	£1m – London College of Fashion	Kindred Spirit (KS)
Lucille van Geest (d)	£M	Inheritance	NRL	The John and Lucille van Geest Foundation	1990	£4.16m – University of Cambridge	Big Fish (KS)
Paul van Vlissingen (d)	Media	Coal (SHV holdings)	NRL	NKF	NA	£100k – African Parks Foundation	Agenda Setter (BF)

[302] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[303] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[304] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

[305] The wealth and Rich List position are given collectively for siblings Ann Gloag and Brian Souter, so this figure is a repeat, not an addition to Ann Gloag's wealth and RL position

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[306]	Source of wealth[307]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[308]
Sir Peter Vardy (59)	Fdn, RLGI, Media, £M	Car Sales (Reg Vardy)	£150m (378=)	The Vardy Foundation	1989	£100k – Moorlands Bible College	Salvation Seeker (BF)
Prince of Wales (58)	Fdn, Media	Inheritance	NRL	The Prince's Charities Foundation	1979	£59k – The Prince's Foundation for Integrated Health	Patriot & Player (KS)
Sir Ronald, Norman & Allan Wates (d)	Fdn	Construction (Wates Group)	£120m (family: 465=)	The Wates Foundation	1966	£30k – Children's Law UK	Big Fish (KS)
Aubrey Weiss	Fdn	NK	NRL	A W Charitable Trust	1981	£940k – TET (Jewish charity)	Salvation Seeker (BF)
Duke of Westminster (Gerald Grosvenor) (55)	Fdn	Inheritance	£6.6bn (3)	The Westminster Foundation	1974	£250k – The Armed Forces memorial Trust	Patriot & Player (BF)
Garfield Weston (d)	Fdn, £M	Retail (ABF)	NRL	Garfield Weston Foundation	1958	£2m – Royal Festival Hall	Patriot & Player (CV)
George Weston (42)	RLGI	Retail (ABF) & Fashion (Primark)	£932m (57)	NKF	NA	£NK – Royal Shakespeare Company, National Theatre, Chelsea Pensioner	Culture Vulture (PP)
David Wilson (64)	£M	Construction (Wilson Bowden)	£520m (122=)	The David Wilson Foundation	1995	£1.5m – Leicester University (David Wilson library)	Big Fish (KS)
Harold Hyam Wingate (d)	Fdn	Property	NRL	The Harold Hyam Wingate Foundation	1960	£386k – Wingate scholarships	Big Fish (CV)
Lord [Isaac] Wolfson (d)	Fdn, £M	Retail (GUS)	NRL	The Wolfson Foundation	1955	£3m – University of Oxford Institute of Chromosome Biology	Patriot & Player (CV)
Lord [Charles] Wolfson (71)	Fdn, £M	Retail (GUS)	NRL	The Charles Wolfson Charitable Trust	1960	£3m – Royal Marsden Hospital	Patriot & Player (BF)
Sir Ian Wood (63)	£M	Oil (John Wood Group)	£634m (95)	The Wood Family Trust	2006	£18.8m – The Wood Family Trust	Agenda Setter (BF)

[306] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[307] *Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006*

[308] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

Name and age in 2006	Source of name[309]	Source of wealth[310]	Wealth and position in 2006 Rich List	Name of personal charitable foundation	Year foundation established	Value and destination of largest donation made in 2006	Ideal type of philanthropist (and secondary ideal type)[311]
Arnold Ziff (d)	Media, £M	Property (Town Centre Securities) & Shoes (Stylo)	£150m (378=)	I. A. Ziff Charitable Foundation	1966	£15m – Leeds University (Marjorie & Arnold Ziff building)	Big Fish (SS)
John Zochonis (77)	Fdn	Manufacturing (Paterson-Zochonis)	NRL	The Zochonis Charitable Trust	1977	£125k – South Manchester University Hospital NHS Trust	Big Fish (CV)

[309] Key to abbreviations:

Fdn = settlor/chair of one of the UK's 100 biggest personal or family charitable foundations, as listed in *Charity Trends* 2006

RLGI = one of the 30 names listed in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index 2006

Media = multiple mentions in major print media coverage of philanthropy and philanthropists in 2006

£M = made at least 1 donation worth £1m or more in 2006

[310] Information gained from foundation annual report, company websites and the Sunday Times Rich List 2006

[311] Abbreviations used to indicate secondary ideal types:

AS = Agenda Setter; BB = Big Brand; BF = Big Fish; CV = Culture Vulture; KS = Kindred Spirit; PP = Patriot & Player; SO = Secret Operator; SS = Salvation Seeker

Appendix B
Sub-sectoral categories for coding destination of philanthropic gifts

1. International Development
2. Arts and recreation
3. Welfare
4. Education – schools, universities and other
5. Religious
6. Medical: hospices, hospitals, research, support
7. Environment
8. Other
9. Don't know
10. No beneficiary (in cases where philanthropist made less than ten donations)

Appendix C
Variables recorded in SPSS database

Philanthropist's name

Appears in the Sunday Times Rich List Giving Index?

Included in the UK's largest 100 personal or family charitable foundations?

Receives multiple mentions in 2006 major print media coverage of philanthropy & philanthropists?

Made at least one single donation worth £1m or more?

Gender

Date of birth

Date of death

Education

Details of other public roles

Name of foundation

Is foundation eponymous?

Reason for naming of foundation if not eponymous

Is donor a trustee? (i.e. involved in grant-making decisions)

Number of donor's relatives that are trustees

Year foundation was established

Does foundation have general charitable objectives?

Details of any specific objectives

Does foundation employ paid staff?

Location of foundation office

Size of charitable assets held in 2006

Total value of known donations made in 2006

Charity Commission/Office of Scottish Charity Regulator registration number

Website address

Inherited wealth or self-made?

Source of wealth

Size of wealth (according to Sunday Times Rich List 2006)

Position on Rich List 2006

Was philanthropist born in Britain?

Which UK city/region or non-UK country of birth

Which of the areas of benefit described by the Charity Commission does the donor's foundation serve?

- General charitable purposes
- Education/training
- Medical/health/sickness
- Disability
- Relief of poverty
- Overseas aid/famine relief
- Accommodation/housing
- Religious activities
- Arts/culture
- Sport/recreation
- Animals
- Environment/conservation/heritage
- Economic/community development/employment
- Other

Which of the types of beneficiaries described by the Charity Commission does the donor's foundation serve?

- Children/young people
- Elderly/old people
- People with disabilities
- People of a particular ethnic or racial origin
- Other charities/voluntary bodies
- Other defined groups
- The general public/mankind

Religious affiliation (Christian, Jewish, Muslim, other, not known)

Value of 10 largest donations made in 2006

Destination of 10 largest donations made in 2006

Names of all trustees

Year of accounts consulted to gather this information

Date foundation website viewed to gather this information

Any further notes

Appendix D
Reasons for eliminating cases from the media analysis sample

Duplicate versions of articles - where article appeared in more than one edition of a newspaper, the latest one was retained for analysis.

Unrelated sections of articles that focused on entirely different topics, most often in gossip columns, and other columnists.

TV guides simply listing programmes about philanthropy or philanthropists.

References to the organisation 'New Philanthropy Capital' where neither philanthropy nor philanthropists were discussed.

Lists of names such as for Honours Lists, new additions to Who's Who, award winners of the Beacon Prize for philanthropy

Extremely passing or incidental references, for example, the report of a theft of gates paid for by an un-named local philanthropist or a discussion of hampers and reference to the tradition for giving them as philanthropic gifts.

Use of the words 'philanthropy' or 'philanthropist' as adjectives meaning 'unselfish', for example a sports report using the term to describe a generous pass or a report on a car-dealer using the term to imply he offers 'good deals'.

Other uses of the terms 'philanthropy' and 'philanthropist' that fall outside the remit of this thesis on charitable giving, e.g. a gardener who is described as following a 'philanthropic ideal'

Announcements of fundraising events or appeals for philanthropic support.

Announcements of philanthropists speaking or appearing at events.

Racing tips for a horse named Philanthropist

Reviews of the theatrical play, 'The Philanthropist'

Quizzes and crosswords that use the terms 'philanthropy' or 'philanthropist'

Use of the words in the negative, for example a spokesperson for Dunfermline Building Society is quoted as saying, "we are not philanthropists"; similarly Canongate publishers state, "publishers are not philanthropists" and a critique of a company's corporate responsibility programme which was said to only "look like philanthropy".

Book reviews in which characters are philanthropic.

Restaurant reviews of the Fifteen restaurant, that name the founder, Jamie Oliver, as a philanthropist.

References to unreal philanthropy, for example relating a dream that included a philanthropist.

Appendix E
Monthly analysis of articles and key stories in 2006 UK media coverage

Month	No.	Key stories
Jan	30	Cash (for Academies)-for-peerages scandal begins Sutton Trust report and launch of university summer school
Feb	25	Launch of Bono's new initiative RED Tom Hunter's donation for Scots youth not in education, employment or training
March	23	Anita Roddick pledges to give away half proceeds of sale of Bodyshop Tom Hunter criticises Scot Executive and withdraws school leadership funding
April	47	Sunday Times Rich List & Giving Index published Alberto Vilar (opera donor) trial for fraud begins New Philanthropy Capital (NPC) report suggest funding City Academies is risky
May	25	ARK (Absolute Return for Kids) dinner raises £18m Brookes Mileson and Gretna Green football club gain profile Sir Peter Moores saves two Canalettos for the nation
June	39	Bill Gates announces retirement from Microsoft to focus on his foundation, Warren Buffett's c.$30 billion donation Live8 & G8 take place in Edinburgh
July	28	Analysis of the Buffett gift and implications Launch of the Clinton-Hunter Development Initiative, funded £55m by Hunter Liberal Democrat donor Michael Brown trial begins Court case re Brooke Astor allegedly left in squalor by her son
Aug	28	Lean Scully leaves £3.7m to Edinburgh Festival in her will Paul van Vlissingen dies
Sept	42	The Clinton Global Initiative is held at which Branson pledges $3 billion Launch of Fortune Forum in London Glasgow council propose privatising philanthropically-donated city assets
Oct	45	Simon Sainsbury dies Tom Farmer donates £100,000 to the SNP Madonna adopts a Malawian baby Publication of 'The New Philanthropists' by Charles Handy Alan Shearer donates £400,000 from his testimonial to the NSPCC Children in Need and Tom Hunter's challenge to viewers to match his £1m pledge
Nov	47	St Paul's private school announces fundraising to achieve needs-blind admission David Sainsbury retires from government to focus on foundation, aims to donate £1bn
Dec	39	TV programme 'Secret Millionaire' first airs Elly Elliott dies

Appendix F
Regional distribution of 2006 UK media coverage in local newspapers

City/County/Nation	Number of articles	Names of local newspaper
Aberdeen	10	Express, Press & Journal
Birmingham	12	Mail, Post, Sunday Mercury
Edinburgh	4	Evening News
Glasgow	7	Evening Times
Liverpool	15	Echo, Post
Newcastle	7	Journal, Chronicle
Scotland (national)	60	Record, Herald, Scotsman, Scotland on Sunday, Sunday Mail
Wales (national)	7	Western Daily Press, Western Mail, Western Morning News
Yorkshire	5	Post, Evening Post
Other	39	-

Appendix G
All philanthropists named in 2006 UK media coverage

Total = 119 names. * Named more than once ** Named more than ten times

Adams, Tony
Agassi, Andre
Akroyd, Col Edward
Al Jaber, Mohammed Bin Issa
Archer, Jeffrey*
Bannatyne, Duncan*
Besant, Sir Walter
Bono [Paul Hewson]*
Botnar, Octav
Braddock, Bessie
Branson, Richard*
Brown, Michael*
Burdett-Coutts, Angela
Burnie, Brian
Burrell, Sir William
Busson, Arpad de*
Caring, Richard*
Carnegie, Andrew**
Caudwell, John*
Clore, Sir Charles
Cory, John
Dacre, Graham
Duffield, Dame Vivien*
Edmiston, Robert*
Edmonds, Winston
Eliasch, Johan*
Elliot, John & Elly
Emberton, Sam
Farmer, Sir Tom**
Fink, Stanley*
Getty, J Paul*
Gill, Charan
Gloag, Ann*
Goldsmith, Zac*
Gosling, Sir Donald*
Greville, Daisy
Guinness, Sabrina
Hands, Guy*
Harrison, Emma
Hill, Octavia
Hilton, Doug
Hintze, Michael*
Hobson, Sir Ronald*
Hogel, Carol*
Hohn, Christopher*
Hunter, Robert
Hunter, Sir Tom**
Inglewood, Lord
Janson, Charles
John, Sir Elton*
Jones, Lee
Judge, Sir Paul*
Juffali, Sheik Walid Ahmed
Kahn, Donald*
Khan, Jemima*
Laidlaw, Lord [Irvine]*
Lampl, Sir Peter**
Laslett, William
Laverey, Peter
Levison, Charles
Lindsay, David
MacBain, Louise T Blouin*
Madejski, John*
Makin, Rex
McCartney, Sir Paul*
McCartney, Stella
McGrath, Harvey
McGregor, Harvey
Mileson, Brookes*
Moon, Vivian
Moores, Sir Peter*
Morris, William [Viscount Nuffield]
Moulton, Jon*
Mulley, Charles
Naake, Judy
Naylor, Richard
Noe, Leo*
Noon, Sir Gulam*
Norman, Torquil
Ogden, Sir Robert
Oglesby, Michael
Ondaatje, Sir Christopher*
Peek Sir Henry
Power-Cobbe, Frances
Rathbone, William
Rausing, Hans *
Rausing, Sigrid *
Rawnsley, Canon Hardwicke
Reuben, David & Simon*
Richards, Philip*
Ritblat, John
Roddick, Anita*
Rothschild, Ferdinand*
Rothschild, Jacob
Rothschild, James A. de*
Rowling, J K*
Rowntree, Joseph*
Safra, Lily
Said, Wafic*
Sainsbury, Lord [David]*
Sainsbury, Simon*
Sainsbury, Tim
Scully, Lean*
Sharp, Granville
Shearer, Alan*
Shirley, Dame Steve
Stewart, Agnes
Studzinski, John*
Sugar, Sir Alan
Templeton, Sir John
Tillotson, Marcus
van Vlissingen, Paul*
Vardy, Sir Peter*
Vilar, Alberto*
Wales, Prince of [Charles]*
Way, Ben
Williamson, Joseph
Williamson, Paul
Wolfson, Isaac
Ziff, Arnold*

Appendix H
Adjectives used in conjunction with the term 'philanthropist' in 2006 UK media coverage

Neutral
Millionaire
Multi-millionaire
Billionaire
Wealthy/Wealthiest/Fabulously wealthy
World's richest
Super-rich
Rich
Mega
Bill-Gates-and-Warren-Buffet-scale
High-profile
Low-profile
Prominent
Reticent
Publicity-shy
Nouveau/New/New-style
Victorian/19th Century
Victorian-style
Footballing
Well-known
Female/Leading lady
Scottish/Scots
Local
Educational
Glasgow
Indian
Opera
Benign
Venture
Modern-day/Modern/Modern-style
Christian/Catholic
Banffshire-born
Eccentric
Chain-smoking
Saudi
Aspiring
Cultural
Wealthy/wealthiest
21st Century
Post-war
Biggest
Global
Full-time
British
Catholic
Christian
Busy
Dutch
Liverpool
A-List
Celebrity
Well-connected
Socialite
Rags-to-riches
American
Hedge-fund
Private
Private-sector
Late
Best-known
Keen
North-East
Tory
Foreign
Career
Sporting
Northern
Regional
Industrial

Negative
Austere
Self-styled
Disgraced
Dickensian
Philandering
Would-be
Tax-ruse
Ruthless
So-called
Arms-dealing
Smart-trousered
Designer-trousered
Saintly (sarcastically)
High-rolling
Well-meaning
Couture-clad
Status-seeking

Positive
Fervent
Influential
Eminent/Pre-eminent
Smartest
Legendary
Remarkable
Classic
Glamorous
Tireless
Renowned
Astute
Most generous
Formidable
Good old-fashioned
Other-worldly
Visionary
Famous
Great
Renowned
Prolific
Passionate
True
Celebrated
Major
Significant
Life-changing
Leading
Greatest
The world's greatest
Ragged-trousered
Notable
Thoughtful
Generous
Active
Best-loved
Discreet
Busy

References

Adam, T. (2004). Introduction. Philanthropy, Patronage and Civil Society: Experiences from Germany, Great Britain and North America. T. Adam. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

Andreoni, J. (1997). "Giving with Impure Altruism: Applications to Charity and Ricardian Equivalence." The Journal of Political Economy **97**(6): 1447-1458.

Andreoni, J. (2001). Economics of Philanthropy. International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences. N. Smeltser and P. Baltes. Oxford, Elsevier.

Andreoni, J. (2005). Philanthropy. Madison, WI, University of Wisconsin.

Andreoni, J. (2006). Philanthropy. Handbook of the Economics of Giving, Altruism and Reciprocity. S. Kolm and J. M. Ythier. North-Holland, Elsevier.

Andrews, F. E. (1950). Philanthropic Giving. New York, Russell Sage Foundation.

Arrow, K. J. (1972). "Gifts and Exchanges." Philosophy and Public Affairs **1**(4): 343-362.

Bailey, F. G., Ed. (1971). Gifts and Poison: The politics of reputation. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Baker, T. L. (1988). Doing Social Research. New York, McGraw Hill.

Bauman, Z. (2001). Foreword. Individualization. U. Beck and E. Beck-Gernsheim. Sage, London.

Bauman, Z. and T. May (2001). Thinking Sociologically, second edition. Oxford, Blackwell.

Beattie, J. (1964). Other Cultures: Aims, methods and achievements in Social Anthropology. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Beck, U. and E. Beck-Gernsheim (2001). Individualization: Institutionalized Individualism and its Social and Political Consequences. London, Sage.

Bekkers, R. and P. Wiepking (2007) Generosity and Philanthropy: A literature review.

Bell, D. (1976). The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism. London, Heinemann.

Beresford, P. (2006). The Rich List. London, The Sunday Times.

Beresford, P. (2007). The Rich List. London, The Sunday Times.

Beresford, P. (2009). The Rich List. London, The Sunday Times.

Berking, H. (1999). Sociology of Giving. London, Sage.

Best, J. (1999). Random Violence: How we Talk about New Crimes and New Victims. Berkeley, University of California Press.

Beveridge, W. H. (1948). Voluntary Action: A Report on Methods of Social Advance.

Bishop, M. (2005). The Business of Giving. The Economist.

Bishop, M. and M. Green (2008). Philanthrocapitalism: How the rich can save the world. New York, Bloomsburg Press.

Boorstin, D. (1961). The Image or What happened to the American Dream? New York, Atheneum.

Boudon, R. (1981). The Logic of Social Action: An Introduction to Sociological Analysis. London.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste. London, Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. Handbook of Theory of Research for the Sociology of Education. J. E. Richardson. Westport, CT, Greenwood Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). Social space and symbolic power. In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology. M. Adamson. Stanford, California, Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1997). Marginalia - Some additional notes on the gift. The Logic of the Gift: Towards an ethic of generosity. A. D. Schrift. New York and London, Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action, English translation, first published in French in 1994. Oxford, Blackwell.

Bowie, J. (1854). Report of a Meeting to consider the best method of extending the operation of the Metropolitan Association for Improving the Dwellings of the Industrious Classes. Healthy Homes.

Bremner, R. (1960 [1988]). American Philanthropy. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Bremner, R. (1988). American Philanthropy, second edition. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Brilliant, E. (2001). Patterns and Purposes of Philanthropic Giving. Philanthropy and the Nonprofit Sector in a Changing America. C. T. Clotfelter and T. Ehrlich. Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

Brooks, D. (2000). Bobos in Paradise: The New Upper Class and How They Got There. New York, Simon & Schuster.

Brown, E. (1997). "Altruism Towards Groups: The Charitable Provision of Private Goods." Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly **26**(2): 175-184.

Bryson, J. R., M. McGuiness, et al. (2002). "Chasing a 'loose and baggy monster': almshouses and the geography of charity." AREA **34**(1): 48-58.

Caille, A. (1998). Preface to The World of the Gift by Jacques T Godbout. London and Ithaca, McGill-Queens University Press.

Carnegie, A. (1899). The Gospel of Wealth. North American Review.

Cavallo, S. (1998). Charity as Boundary Making: Social stratification, gender and the family in the Italian states (Seventeenth - Nineteenth centuries). Charity, Philanthropy and Reform: from the 1690s to 1850. H. Cunningham and J. Innes. Basingstoke, Macmillan.

Cheal, D. (1988). The Gift Economy. London and New York, Routledge.

Cheal, D. (1996). Moral Economy. The Gift: An Interdisciplinary Perspective. A. Komter. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press.

Cheal, D. (1996). 'Showing Them You Love Them': Gift Giving and the Dialectic of Intimacy. The Gift: An Interdisciplinary Perspective. A. Komter. Amsterdam, Amsterdam University Press. **35:** 150-169.

Chernow, R. (1998). Titan: The Life of John Rockefeller, Sr. New York, Vintage Books.

Clegg, S., L. Goodey, et al. (2008). UK Giving 2008. London, CAF/NCVO.

Clotfelter, C. T. (2002). The Economics of Giving. Durham, NC, Duke University.

Clotfelter, C. T. and T. Ehrlich, Eds. (2001). Philanthropy and the Nonprofit Sector in a Changing America. Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

Cohen, S. (2001). States of Denial: knowing about atrocities and suffering. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Coser, L. A. (1977). Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context (2nd edition). New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Couldry, N. (2000). Media organisations and non-media people. Media Organisations in Society. J. Curran. London, Arnold.

Cunningham, H. and J. Innes, Eds. (1998). Charity, Philanthropy and Reform: from the 1690s to 1850. Basingstoke, Macmillan.

Damon, W. (2006). Introduction: Taking Philanthropy Seriously. Taking Philanthropy Seriously, Beyond Noble Intentions to Responsible Giving. W. Damon and S. Verducci. Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

Daunton, M., Ed. (1996). Charity, Self-interest and Welfare in the English Past. London, UCL Press.

David, M. and C. D. Sutton (2004). Social Research: The basics. London, Sage.

Davis, S. (1996). Philanthropy as a Virtue in Late Antiquity. Giving: Western Ideas of Philanthropy. J. B. Schneewind. Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

Deacon, D. (1999). Charitable images: the construction of voluntary sector news. Social Policy, The Media and Misrepresentation. B. Franklin. London, Routledge.

Deep, A. and P. Frumkin (2006). The Foundation Payout Puzzle. Taking Philanthropy Seriously: Beyond noble intentions to responsible giving. W. Damon and S. Verducci. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

Derrida, J. (1992). Given Time: 1. Counterfeit Money. Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press.

DiMaggio, P. J. and H. K. Anheier (1990). "The Sociology of Nonprofit Organisations." Annual Review of Sociology **16**: 137-159.

Ditchfield, G. M. (1998). English Rational Dissent and Philanthropy. Charity, Philanthropy and Reform: from the 1690s to 1850. H. Cunningham and J. Innes. Basingstoke, Macmillan.

Dorling, D., J. Rigby, et al. (2007). Poverty, Wealth and Place in Britain 1968 to 2005. London, The Policy Press.

Douglas, M. (1996). Losses and Gains. Giving: Western Ideas of Philanthropy. J. B. Schneewid. Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

Douglas, M. (2002). Foreword to The Gift by Marcel Mauss. London, Routledge Classic.

Durkheim, E. (1897). Suicide.

Durkheim, E. (1915). The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life. London, Allen & Unwin.

Dyer, R. (1986). Heavenly Bodies: Film Stars and Society. London, BFI Macmillan.

Edwards, L. (2002). A Bit Rich? What the wealthy think about giving. London, Institute for Public Policy Research.

Eldridge, J. E. T., Ed. (1970). Max Weber: the interpretation of social reality. London, Michael Joseph.

Ewart, J. (2000). "Capturing the Heart of the Region - how regional media define a community." Transformations(1).

Fenton, N., P. Golding, et al. (1993). Charities, Media and Public Opinion, Department of Social Sciences, University of Loughborough.

Fink, J. (1990). Philanthropy and the Community. Critical Issues in American Philanthropy. J. V. Til. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Fleishman, J. (2007). The Foundation: A Great American Secret. New York, Public Affairs.

Frank, R. (1996). Motivation, Cognition and Charitable Giving. Giving: Western Ideas of Philanthropy. J. B. Schneewind. Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

Frumkin, P. (2006). Strategic Giving: the art and science of philanthropy. Chicago and London, University of Chicago Press.

Fulcher, J. and J. Scott (2003). Sociology. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Fulton, K. (2005). Looking out for the future: an orientation for twenty first century philanthropists. Cambridge, MA, The Monitor Institute.

Furedi, F. (1997). Culture of Fear: risk-taking and the morality of low expectations. London, Continuum.

Godbout, J. T. (1998). The World of the Gift. London and Ithaca, McGill-Queens University Press.

Goffman, E. (1959). The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. Harmondsworth, Pelican.

Goffman, E. (1963). Stigma: Notes on the management of spolied identity, Prentice-Hall.

Gould, D., S. Lewis, et al. (2003). Truth on the Sidelines: Philanthropy and Foundations in the Media. New York, Douglas Gould & Co.

Gouldner, A. W. (1960). "The Norm of Reciprocity: A Preliminary Statement." American Sociological Review **25**(2): 161-178.

Gouldner, A. W. (1973). For Sociology: Renewal and Critique in Sociology Today. London, Allen Lane.

Gray, B. K. (1905). A History of Philanthropy: from the dissolution of the monasteries to the taking of the first census. London, Frank Cass & Co.

Gurin, M. G. and J. V. Til (1990). Philanthropy in its Historical Context. Critical Issues in American Philanthropy: Strengthening Theory and Practice. J. V. Til. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Hakim, C. (1982). Secondary Analysis in Social Research: A guide to data sources and methods with examples. London, Macmillan.

Hakim, C. (1987). Researc Design: Successful designs for social and economic research. London, Routledge.

Hale, M. (2007). "Superficial Friends: A Content Analysis of Nonprofit and Philanthropy Covergare in Nine Major Newspapers." Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly **36**: 464-486.

Halfpenny, P. (1998). "Review of 'Giving: Western Ideas of Philanthropy' by (ed) Jerome B Schneewind." Voluntas **9**(4): 385-393.

Halfpenny, P. (1999). "Economic and Sociological Theories of Individual Charitable Giving: Complementary or Contradictory?" Voluntas **10**(3): 197-216.

Hall, P. D., Ed. (1992). Inventing the NonProfit Sector. Baltimore and London, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hall, P. D. (1992). The Dilemmas of Research on Philanthropy. Inventing the NonProfit Sector. P. D. Hall. Baltimore and London, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hall, S. (1992). The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power. formations of Modernity. S. Hall and B. Gieben. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Hall, S. (1997). Introduction. Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices. S. Hall. London, Sage.

Halsey, A. H. (1997). Fat Cats and Top Dogs. Times Higher Education. London.

Handy, C. (2006). The New Philanthropists. London, William Heinemann.

Hart, C. (1998). Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the social science research imagination. London, Sage.

Havens, J. J., M. A. O'Herlihy, et al. (2006). Charitable Giving: How Much, by Whom, to What, and How? The Non-Profit Sector: A Research Handook. W. W. Powell and R. Steinberg. New Haven & London, Yale University Press.

Hewa, S. and D. H. Stapleton, Eds. (2006). Globalization, Philanthropy and Civil Society: Toward a New Political Culture in the Twenty-First Century. New York and Boston, Springer.

Himmelfarb, G. (1995). The Demoralization of Society: from Victorian virtues to modern values. New York, Vintage.

HM Treasury (2008). Public Expenditure Statistical Analyses. London, The Stationery Office.

Home Office (2005). A Generous Society: next steps on charitable giving in England. London, Home Office.

Hubert, H. and M. Mauss (1899). "Sacrifice: It's nature and function." Année Sociologique(2): 29-138.

Humphreys, R. (1995). Sin, Organised Charity and the Poor Law in Victorian England. Basingstoke, Macmillan.

Hurd, H. and M. Lattimer (1994). The Millionaire Givers: Wealth and Philanthropy in Britain. London, Directory of Social Change.

Hustinx, L. and F. Lammertyn (2003). "Collective and Reflexive Styles of Volunteering: A Sociological Modernisation Perspective." Voluntas **14**(2): 167-187.

Ilchman, W. F., S. N. Katz, et al., Eds. (1998). Philanthropy in the World's Traditions. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

Jencks, C. (1987). Who Gives to What? The NonProfit Sector: A Research Handbook. W. Powell. New Haven, Yale University Press.

Joffe, J. (2004). Foreword. Why Rich People Give. T. Lloyd. London, Association of Charitable Foundations.

Jones, C. (1996). Some Recent Trends in the History of Charity. Charity, Self-interest and Welfare in the English Past. M. Daunton. London, UCL Press.

Jones, G. (1981). Outcast London.

Jordan, W. K. (1959). Philanthropy in England 1480-1660: A Study of the changing pattern of English social aspirations. London, George Allen & Unwin.

Kendall, J. and M. Knapp (1996). The Voluntary Sector in the UK. Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Knapp, M. and J. Kendall (1991). Barriers to Giving. Personal Social Services Research Unit Discussion Papers, University of Kent at Canterbury.

Komter, A. (2005). Social Solidarity and The Gift. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Krass, P. (2002). Carnegie. Hoboken, New Jersey, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Krippendorf, K. (2004). Content Analysis: An introduction to its Methodology. London, Sage.

Lansley, S. (2006). Rich Britain: The rise and rise of the new super-wealthy. London, Politico's.

Lassig, S. (2004). Burgerlichkeit, Patronage and Communal Liberalism in Germany 1871-1914. Philanthropy, Patronage and Civil Society: Experiences from Germany, Great Britain and North America. T. Adam. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

Leeuwen, M. H. D. v. (1994). "Logic of Charity: Poor Relief in Preindustrial Europe." Journal of Interdisciplinary History **24**(4): 589-613.

Lloyd, S. (2002). "Pleasing Spectacles and Elegant Dinners: Conviviality, Benevolence, and Charity Anniversaries in Eighteenth-Century London." The Journal of British Studies **41**(1): 23-57.

Lloyd, T. (2004). Why Rich People Give. London, Association of Charitable Foundations.

Macadam, E. (1934). The New Philanthropy. London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

Mackenzie, S. (2005). A Guide to Giving, 2nd edition. London, Philanthropy UK.

Mackenzie, S., Ed. (2008). A Guide to Giving, third edition. London, Association of Charitable Foundations.

Markoff, J., G. Shapiro, et al. (1975). "Toward the integration of content analysis and general methodology." Sociological Methodology **6**: 1-58.

Marshall, G. (2005). Identity. Oxford Dictionary of Sociology, 3rd edition. J. Scott and G. Marshall. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Martin, M. W. (1994). Virtuous Giving: Philanthropy, Voluntary Service and Caring. Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

Mauss, M. (2002). The Gift, first published 1950. London, Routledge Classic.

May, T. (1997). Social Research: Issues, methods and Process. Buckingham, Open University Press.

McCall, A. (2007). Billion Pound Giveaway. Sunday Times Rich List 2007. London.

McCall, A. (2008). Sharing their good fortune. Sunday Times Rich List 2008, London.

McCarthy, K. D., Ed. (2001). Women, Philanthropy and Civil Society. Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

McCarthy, K. D. (2005). American Creed: Philanthropy and the rise of civil society 1700-1865. Chicago, Chicago University Press.

McCully, G. (2008). Philanthropy Reconsidered: Private initiatives, public good, quality of life. Bloomington, IN, AuthorHouse.

McGann, P. (1977). "Popular Education, Socialisation and Social Control."

McIntosh, I. (1997). Classical Sociological Theory. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

Mills, C. W. (1956). The Power Elite. New York, Oxford University Press.

Moore, S. (2007). Ribbon Wearing: A Sociocultural Investigation. School of Social Policy, Sociology & Social Research. Canterbury, University of Kent. **PhD.**

Morris, B. (1987). Anthropological Studies of Religion. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Morris, S. (2004). Changing Perceptions of Philanthropy in the Voluntary Housing Field in nineteenth and early twentieth century London. Philanthropy, Patronage and Civil Society: Experiences from Germany, Great Britain and North America. T. Adam. Bloomington, Indiana University Press.

Mulgan, G. (2008) The New Philanthropy: power, inequality, democracy. www.opendemocracy.net

NCVO & CAF (2009). UK Giving 2009: An overview of charitable giving in the UK, 2008/09. London, Charities Aid Foundation.

Nightingale, B. (1973). Charities. London, Allen Lane.

O'Clery, C. (2007). The Billionaire Who Wasn't: How Chuck Feeney secretly made and gave away a fortune. New York, Public Affairs.

O'Connor, J. (1987). "Philanthropy and Selfishness." Social Philosophy and Policy **4**(2): 113-127.

Odendahl, T. (1990). Charity Begins at Home: Generosity and Self-Interest Among the Philanthropic Elite. New York, Basic Books.

Odendahl, T. J. (1989). Charitable Giving Patterns by Elites in the United States. The Future of the NonProfit Sector: Challenges, Changes and Policy Considerations. V. Hodgkinson and R. W. Lyman. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Offer, A. (1997). "Between the Gift and the Market: the economy of regard." Economic History Review **3**: 450-476.

Offer, A. (2006). The Challenge of Affluence: Self-control and Well-Being in the United States and Britain since 1950. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Ortmann, A. (1996). "Review of 'Who Benefits from the Nonprofit sector?' by Charles T Clotfelter." Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly **25**(2): 248-258.

Orton, M. and K. Rowlingson (2007). "A Problem of Riches: Towards a new Social Policy Research Agenda on the Distribution of Economic Resources." Journal of Social Policy **36**(1): 59-77.

Osteen, M., Ed. (2002). The Question of the Gift: Essays across disciplines. London and New York, Routledge.

Ostrander, S. A. and P. G. Schervish (1990). Giving and Getting: Philanthropy as a Social Relation. Critical Issues in American Philanthropy: Strengthening Theory and Practice. J. V. Til. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Ostrower, F. (1995). Why the Wealthy Give: The culture of elite philanthropy. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.

Ottinger, R. J. (2008). Beyond Success: Building a personal, financial and philanthropic legacy. New York, McGraw Hill.

Owen, D. (1965). English Philanthropy 1660-1960. London, Oxford University Press.

Panas, J. (1984). Mega Gifts: Who gives them, Who gets them? Chicago, Bonus Books Inc.

Payton, R. (1984). Major Challenges to Philanthropy. Washington DC, Independent Sector.

Payton, R. (2001). A Tradition in Jeopardy. Philanthropy and the Nonprofit Sector in a Changing America. C. T. Clotfelter and T. Ehrlich. Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

Payton, R. L. (1988). Philanthropy: Voluntary Action for the Public Good. New York, American Council on Education/Macmillan.

Payton, R. L. and M. P. Moody (2008). Understanding Philanthropy: Its meaning and mission. Bloomington, Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

Peterson, P. G. (1970). Foundations, Private Giving and Public Policy: Report and Recommendations of the Commission on Foundations and Private Philanthropy. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Pharoah, C. (2009). Charity Market Monitor 2009. London, Caritas Data.

Pharoah, C., C. Walker, et al. (2006). Charity Trends 2006. London, CAF/Caritas Data.

Prewitt, K. (2009). Foreword: Social science and philanthropic studies. Globalization, Philanthropy and Civil Society: Projecting institutional logics abroad. D. C. Hammack and S. Heydemann. Bloomington, Indiana, Indiana University Press.

Prince, R. and K. File (1994). The Seven Faces of Philanthropy: A New Approach to Cultivating Major Donors. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Prochaska, F. (1990). Philanthropy. The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950. F. M. L. Thompson. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Reich, R. (2006). Philanthropy and its uneasy relation to equality. Taking Philanthropy Seriously: Beyond Noble Intentions to Responsible Giving. W. Damon and S. Verducci. Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

Reichardt, O., D. Kane, et al. (2008). The UK Civil Society Almanac 2008. London, NCVO.

Ritzenhein, D. N. (2000). "One More Time: How do you motivate donors?" New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising **29**: 51-68.

Robson, C. (1993). Real World Research: a resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers. Oxford, Blackwell.

Rodgers, B. (1949). Cloak of Charity: Studies in Eighteenth-Century Philanthropy. London, Methuen & Co Ltd.

Rooney, P. M. and H. K. Frederick (2007). Portraits of Donors: Bank of America Study of High Net-Worth Philanthropy. Bloomington, Indianapolis, The Center on Philanthropy at Indiana University.

Rosenthal, J. T. (1972). The Purchase of Paradise: Gift Giving and the Aristocracy 1307-1485. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Ross, E. (1996). "Human Communion" or a Free Lunch: School dinners in Victorian and Edwardian London. Giving: Western Ideas of Philanthropy. J. B. Schneewind. Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

Salamon, L. (1987). Partners in Public Service: toward a theory of government-nonprofit relations. The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook (1st edition). W. W. Powell. New Haven, Connecticut, Yale University Press.

Salamon, L. (1992). Social Services. Who Benefits from the Nonprofit Sector? C. T. Clotfelter. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Sargeant, A. and L. Woodliffe (2007). "Gift Giving: an interdisciplinary review." International Journal of Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Marketing **12**(November): 275-307.

Savage, M. and K. Williams (2008). "Elites: remembered in capitalism and forgotten by social sciences." Sociological Review **56**(4): 1-24.

Schervish, P. (1994). The Moral Biographies of the Wealthy and the Cultural Scripture of Wealth. Wealth in Western Thought: The Case for and against Riches. P. Schervish. Westport, CT, Praeger.

Schervish, P. (2001). Executive Summary of Hi-Tech Donors Study. Boston, MA, Boston College.

Schervish, P. and J. J. Havens (1995). "Wherewithal and beneficence: Charitable giving by income and wealth." New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising(8): 81-109.

Schervish, P. and A. Herman (1988). Empowerment and Beneficence: Strategies of Living and Giving among the wealthy. Boston, MA, Social Welfare Research Institute, Boston College, MA.

Schervish, P. G. (1992). "Adoption and Altruism: Those with Whom I Want to Share a Dream." Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly **21**(4): 327-350.

Schervish, P. G. (1994). "The sound of one hand clapping: the case for and against anonymous giving." Voluntas **5**(1): 1-26.

Schervish, P. G. (2000b). "The spiritual horizons of philanthropy: New directions for money and motives." New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising **29**: 17-31.

Schervish, P. G. (2005). "Major donors, major motives: The people and purpose behind major gifts." New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising **47**: 59-87.

Schervish, P. G. and J. J. Havens (2001). "The Mind of the Millionaire: Findings from a National Survey on Wealth with Responsibility." New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising **32**: 75-107.

Schrift, A. D., Ed. (1997). The Logic of the Gift: Towards an ethic of generosity. New York and London, Routledge.

Schwartz, B. (1967). "The Social Psychology of the Gift." American Journal of Sociology **73**(1): 1-11.

Sennett, R. (1977). The Fall of Public Man.

Silber, I. (1998). Modern Philanthropy: Reassessing the Viability of a Maussian Perspective. Marcell Mauss Today. N. a. W. J. Allen. Oxford, New York, Berghahn.

Silverman, D. (2007). A very short, fairly interesting and reasonably cheap book about Qualitative Research. Sage, London.

Simmel, G. (1997). Money in Modern Culture. Simmel on Culture. D. Frisby and M. Featherstone. London, Sage.

Simmel, G. (1997). On the Psychology of Money. Simmel on Culture. D. Frisby and M. Featherstone. London, Sage.

Smith, D. H. (2003). "Paved with good intentions." New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising **42**: 109-116.

Smith, J. A. (2006). In Search of an Ethic of Giving. Taking Philanthropy Seriously. W. Damon and S. Verducci. Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press.

Sugden, R. (1982). "On the Economics of Philanthropy." The Economic Journal **92**(366): 341-350.

Tarn, J. N. (1973). Five Per Cent Philanthropy: An account of housing in urban areas between 1840 and 1914. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, J., C. Webb, et al. (2007). Charitable Giving by Wealthy People. London, HM Revenue and Customs.

Taylor-Gooby, P. (1993). The Future of Giving: Evidence from the British Social Attitudes Survey. RSU Occasional Paper 4. Tonbridge, Charities Aid Foundation.

Til, J. V. (1988). Mapping the Voluntary Sector: Volunteerism in a Changing Social Economy. New York, Foundation Center.

Til, J. V. (1990b). Defining Philanthropy. Critical Issues in American Philanthropy: Strengthening Theory and Practice. J. V. Til. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Titmuss, R. (1970). The Gift Relationship: From human blood to social policy. London, George Allen & Unwin.

Tompson, R. (1979). The Charity Commission and the Age of Reform. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Toynbee, P. and D. Walker (2008). Unjust Rewards: Exposing greed and inequality in Britain today. London, Granta.

Trimmer, S. (1801). The Oeconomy of Charity. London.

TSIC (2010). Financing Revenue Generation in the Third Sector. London, The Social Investment Consultancy.

Turner, G. (2004). Understanding Celebrity. London, Sage.

Veblen, T. (1994). The Theory of the Leisure Class, first pub'd 1899. New York, Dover.

Vogel, A. (2006). "Who's making global civil society: philanthropy and US empire in world society." The British Journal of Sociology **57**(4): 635-655.

Waddington, K. (1996). "Grasping Gratitude": Charity and hospital finance in late Victorian England. Charity, Self-interest and Welfare in the English Past. M. Daunton. London, UCL Press.

Wagner, D. (2000). What's Love Got to Do With It? New York, The New York Press.

Walters, N. (1998). The New Feminism. London, Virago.

Weber, M. (1949). The Methodology of the Social Sciences.

Weisbrod, B. (1977). The Voluntary Non-Profit Sector: An Economic Analysis. Lexington, MA, DC Heath.

Whitaker, B. (1974). The Foundations. London, Eyre Methuen.

Wiener, M. J. (1981). English culture and the decline of the industrial spirit 1850-1980. Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Wilding, K., J. Clark, et al. (2006). UK Voluntary Sector Almanac 2006: The State of the Sector. London, NCVO.

Wilding, K., G. Collins, et al. (2004). The Voluntary Sector Almanac. London.

Williams, I. (1989). The Alms Trade: Charities Past, Present and Future. London, Unwin Hyman Ltd.

Wolpert, J. (1989). Key Indicators of Generosity in Communities. The Future of the NonProfit Sector: Challenges, Changes and Policy Considerations. V. Hodgkinson and R. W. Lyman. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Wood, J. R. and J. G. Houghland (1990). The Role of Religion in Philanthropy. Critical Issues in American Philanthropy: Strengthening Theory and Practice. J. V. Til. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Wright, K. (2002). Generosity versus Altruism: Philanthropy and Charity in the US and UK. Civil Society Working Paper 17. London, London School of Economics.

Wuthnow, R. (1991). Acts of Compassion: Caring for others and helping ourselves. Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press.