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Introduction

In the 1960s, when I was a student of international relations at the University of Wisconsin, the world was a simpler place, or so it seemed. It was the era of geopolitics. The Cold War created a structure for the international system. Sovereign states were the main international actors; these states sometimes worked together in international organizations like the UN or the IMF to address world problems or negotiate international rules; nuclear and traditional warfare were the main security threats; economic barriers limited international trade and finance; and there was no twenty-four hour news cycle and certainly no Internet.

Today, the world looks very different. States like the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia have broken apart. Borders are less meaningful and sovereignty is, well, less sovereign. New information and transportation technologies along with changes in public policy have created a global world where goods, services, money, people and ideas move easily and rapidly across national boundaries. Some see the new globalization as positive, opening economic and social opportunities; some focus on its downsides, including those left behind by globalization.

As we are seeing in Ukraine, the issue of borders, state sovereignty, and the use of military force have not gone away. But, today, states and multinational organizations share the world stage with financial institutions and corporations, non-profit organizations, terrorists, drug cartels, even pirates. Global flows of money, goods, people and information have made states less sovereign. Security threats include vulnerable financial markets, failed states, cyber threats, infectious diseases, terrorism, and climate change.
Tonight, I want to talk about the global role and reach of two of non-traditional actors: American private foundations and U.S. corporate philanthropies.

In the last two decades, there has been a huge increase in the number of private foundations, the size of their assets, and the scale of their international activities and funding. Many U.S. and some non-U.S. foundations operate at a global scale pursuing social, economic, and even political change around the world. At the same time, U.S. corporations are increasingly global. They are involved abroad not just in business and the economy but also in social, environmental, health, and other public issues in the countries where they operate. At home and abroad, American companies are adopting policies and practices known as “corporate social responsibility” or CSR. CSR includes financial contributions made directly by corporations as well as through the foundations they establish. It also involves business practices and non-financial contributions such as talent and technology that corporations make to advance social goals.

Of course, not all corporations are socially responsible and some may be socially irresponsible. However, more global corporations are integrating social responsibility into their business practices. Those are the ones I want to speak about tonight. So, let me describe what I see happening in global philanthropy—both private and corporate--and why I think philanthropy matters in international relations.

**History of philanthropy**
I’ll start with some definitions and a little history. Philanthropy can be defined as the use of private wealth to address social problems. The term “foundation” is used for many types of organizations. Private foundations are defined by U.S. law as non-profit organizations that have endowments, make grants, and
whose purpose is to serve the public good. Under U.S. law, corporate foundations are a type or category of private foundation whose purpose is to serve the public good by making grants. Corporate foundations may be endowed or may receive regular contributions from the profits of the business. Corporate philanthropy may also include ways of doing business and non-financial contributions that are socially responsible.

Tonight, I will use two terms. By private foundations I mean those that are independent of business. Think of the Ford, Rockefeller, Packard, or Gates Foundations. Corporate foundations are those linked to businesses, so the Citi or IBM or International Paper Foundations.

Modern philanthropy can trace its roots to the end of the nineteenth century and the era of wealthy industrialists like Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller. These businessmen wanted to do more than traditional charity which alleviates social ills. They wanted to apply new scientific principles to improve society and address the root causes of social ills like poverty, hunger, and disease. So, Carnegie built libraries and universities; Rockefeller supported medical research, public health, and higher education. Supporting social change and improving the human condition remains an important feature of today’s private American foundations and is also playing a role corporate philanthropy.

Foundations have a special place in American culture and law. For many cultural and historical reasons, Americans—more than Europeans, Japanese, or others—look to the non-profit sector including foundations to provide public services and to balance the power of government and business. As a result,

---

1 Other organizations called foundations like the Carter and Clinton Foundations are actually “public charities”. They make grants and serve the public good but they raise funds from multiple sources and do not rely solely on their own financial resources. Corporations also have “foundations” that are usually not endowed and are funded from company resources.
American law and tax policy have encouraged the creation of non-profits and foundations while law and policy in other countries have been less favorable. So, the United States has many more foundations with greater wealth than other countries.

**Rise of global philanthropy**

U.S. foundations have supported international activities from the beginning. Carnegie funded libraries and education in the United Kingdom; Rockefeller financed medical work in China. During the Cold War, American private foundations financed area studies at many American universities, international fellowships and cultural exchanges, agricultural research in developing countries, and human rights activities in Eastern Europe, Latin America, and South Africa. However, the dollar amounts were small. [IMAGE 1] In 1982, for example, total international grants were about $75 million, just 5% of total foundation grants.²

Corporate philanthropy has existed for a long time—Carnegie and Rockefeller began as corporate philanthropists. But it wasn’t until the second half of the twentieth century that corporate giving became part of doing business. Corporate philanthropy often supported local communities where employees or customers were located, building good community and employee relationships, and encouraging employees to become involved in their communities.

Philanthropy also helped branding and marketing. When I was at American Express we supported cultural programs that fit with our travel and entertainment brand and also provided opportunities for corporate events. Initially, corporate philanthropy focused heavily on grant-making: determining
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² The Foundation Center, *The Global Role of U.S. Foundations*, 2010. Based on all grants of $10,000 or more from a sample of approximately 1,000 larger U.S. foundations.
of areas of grant making, creating guidelines and soliciting grant proposals, and developing a process for deciding how to distribute available funding.

In the last two decades, there has been huge change in both private and corporate philanthropy and an explosion in international philanthropy. A surging American economy and stock market enriched the resources of existing private foundations and led to the creation of new philanthropies. Between 1990 and 2011, private foundation assets nearly quintupled from almost $143 billion to over $662 billion. Overall private foundation giving was up nearly six-fold from $8.7 billion in 1990 to $49 billion in 2011. Like the rest of us, foundation leaders became aware of the global nature of public health, economic well being, and environmental preservation. So, it has been natural for foundations to try to address the root causes of social ills at a global level.

Between 1994 and 2011, international giving by U.S. private foundations rose from $680 million to $6.7 billion. That $6.7 billion compares with total U.S. government overseas development assistance of $31 billion in 2011. With the financial crisis of 2007-9 private foundation assets and grants declined in 2010 but have now rebounded. International philanthropy now represents over 27% of all grants by large U.S. foundations. (Table 1)

At the same time, changes were taking place in the corporate world. In the late 20th and early 21st century, U.S. corporations increasingly operated at a global scale and more corporate leaders viewed the world as a global market. Businesses were affected by many interrelated forces: modern communications

3 OECD, Development Assistance Committee http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/aid-at-a-glance.htm
that informed publics about corporate policies and practices, changing public expectations about the social role of corporations, activists and investor groups with a social mission, as well as new regulations and legislation at home and abroad. Companies have also been influenced by business and public relations crises that threaten their brand or image—think of the Exxon Valdez and BP oil spills and the exposure of sweatshop labor practices in factories supplying sportswear to U.S. companies.

All these forces led corporations to approach philanthropy more strategically. Corporate leaders have come to see that they have a larger stake in the well being of the societies in which they operate. The best began to integrate their business goals with the goals of the societies where they are located. Thus, the emergence of corporate social responsibility or what some call the triple bottom line: benefitting people, the planet, and profit.

For example, companies began building environmental protection and climate change into their supply chain management and adopting improved labor policies and practices—both at home and abroad. Corporations also integrated business strategy with societal goals, combining business practice with philanthropic activities. The style of grant making also changed. Companies began to identify capable organizations working in areas of their strategic focus and then to work with them to develop a program that would leverage corporate interests, capacity and skills.
The new strategic business importance of philanthropy is reflected in the numbers. [IMAGE 4] Total corporate foundation assets increased from $5.9 billion in 1990 to $22.2 billion in 2011. [IMAGE 5] Total corporate foundation giving rose from $1.4 billion in 1990 to $5.2 billion in 2011. These numbers do not capture total corporate giving which often flows through business budgets and philanthropic funding that does not flow through a foundation. [IMAGE 6] International corporate giving also rose dramatically. In 1990, international grants made by larger corporate foundations amounted to $19 million or 3% of total grants; in 2011, that number was $312 million or 14% of all grants.

**Global Governance**

This rise of international philanthropy by private foundations and corporations has led to a new form of “global governance.” Let me explain. By “governance,” I mean the formal and informal institutions, laws, processes, and values that guide international relations. Traditionally, governance has been shaped by states, multistate organizations, treaties, and armies. Today, foundations are creating new national, regional, and international institutions; they are forming new public-private partnerships with governments, international organizations, and business; they are creating international networks of private and public officials; they are modeling and advocating for new policies, international norms, and global regimes; and they are engaging in new forms of diplomacy.

To explain what I mean, I’ll look briefly at the ways philanthropy is addressing three global challenges and how foundations and corporations are contributing to new forms of global governance. [IMAGE 7] I’ll focus on the three top areas of international giving: health, development, and the environment. I’ll try to bring insights from my days heading a private foundation, the Doris Duke
Charitable Foundation, and my current service on the board of three corporations that have active philanthropy programs: Citigroup, IBM, and International Paper.

**Health in Developing Countries**

The first challenge is health in developing countries. Health is by far the largest category of giving. It is important to note that the Gates Foundation plays a dominant role in both health and development and skew the numbers significantly.

Health problems of developing countries are a major global challenge. Access to healthcare is limited or non-existent for most people; research on and development of treatments for diseases of the developing world have been inadequate at best. With the rapid spread of HIV/AIDS and other epidemics like SARS, developed countries recognized their vulnerability to infectious diseases originating in developing countries. HIV/AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, and other diseases have weakened developing country societies and governments. So, foreign policy leaders came to realize that health disparities are an impediment to economic development and a threat to global security.

American foundations and corporations now play a significant role in addressing health problems in the developing world, especially in Africa. Private and corporate foundations fund research on drugs and health delivery systems, advocacy on behalf of people living with AIDS, and public health education about disease prevention.

Because the cost of health care programs is so great and health care delivery in low resources settings is so complicated, there have been many public-private partnerships in the health arena. Partnerships involve various combinations of
private and corporate foundations, non-governmental or non-profit organizations, governments, and multilateral organizations. These partnerships are of many types, ranging from joint funding to creation of new national, regional, or multilateral organizations. Let me give you one example of a public-private partnership addressing HIV/AIDS.

The African Comprehensive HIV/AIDS Partnership or ACHAP was launched in 2000 by the government of Botswana, the Gates Foundation and the pharmaceutical company Merck. ACHAP uses Botswana as a pilot program to test the delivery of AIDS prevention, care, treatment, and support in developing countries.

ACHAP’s main focus is to test the delivery of antiretroviral treatment or ART in developing countries. In the 1990s, antiretroviral therapy revolutionized AIDS treatment in the developed world. AIDS went from a death sentence to a chronic disease. However, many experts believed that ART could not be implemented in developing countries due to the cost of the medicines and the complexity of administering them. ACHAP set out to prove them wrong. It has trained thousands of new healthcare workers on ART, provided ART training to physicians, nurses and other health care professionals, and created thirty-two ART clinics and sixty satellite facilities that provide free treatment to 100,000 people in Botswana. ACHAP has proven that ART can be delivered in poor African countries. Since its founding, ACHAP has broadened its work with the government of Botswana to cover programs for HIV prevention for women, co-treatment of TB and HIV, and safe male circumcision.

ACHAP is one of several public private partnerships addressing healthcare delivery in low resource countries. Partners in Health and the Clinton Foundation are working with Rwanda and other governments on community
health and HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention. GAVI—the Global Alliance Vaccine Initiative—and UNAIDS are partnerships of foundations, governments, and corporations.

The goal of all these efforts is to provide seed funding for new and creative models to address health care delivery and to conduct experiments and demonstrations of new approaches and new models. All are gathering data to determine which approaches will work where and how the different models can be adapted to different countries and local circumstances. Foundations and their partners hope that successful ventures will be taken over by others: accepted by civil society and supported by local government and international organizations.

Another example of a public-private partnership is IBM’s Corporate Service Corps or CSC. In 2008, IBM created CSC with the goals of solving problems in poor countries, training and developing IBM leaders, and developing new markets. The idea was to put IBM’s top talent and its best technology to work to solve critical problems in the developing world. Each year, thousands of IBMers—that’s what they call themselves-- from all over the world compete for the opportunity to work with colleagues from around the world in a sort of multinational, technology savvy Peace Corps. Participants in CSC spend about a month on assignment working with local and foreign governments and businesses.

Local communities benefit from IBM talent and technology. CSC participants learn to collaborate with IBM colleagues from around the world as well as local citizens. They learn to innovate and apply technology to critical human problems and to operate in different cultures. And being in CSC makes them feel great about working for IBM. By the end of 2013, 2,500 IBMers had
participated in 850 CSC projects delivered in 34 countries touching 140,000 people.

In the health care field, CSC has worked with the Ministry of Health of Ghana to develop a supply chain system for health commodities and a risk management and mitigation system for the highest health risks. USAID and the Canadian government CDC were also involved in the project. In Nigeria, the CSC helped develop a large-scale database of child and maternal health resources to enable a state government to provide free health care to underprivileged women and children. CSC teams in Africa, Asia, and Latin America have worked on transportation and infrastructure problems, cervical cancer screening, and public safety plans, food and supply chain problems and water quality. And the list goes on.

IBM clients have become interested in CSC and some have asked to participate in CSC projects. Companies including Citi, J.P. Morgan Chase, John Deere, FedEx and Shell have joined IBM teams in places like South East Asia, Africa and Latin America.

**Development**
Funding for economic development is the second largest category of international grant making by major American foundations and also an important focus of corporate philanthropy. Philanthropy is financing a variety of experimental solutions to development and poverty. The intention is that research will inform civil society and public policy and that pilot programs, if successful, will be adopted and sustained by governments, international organizations, or other funders. Let me give you two examples of efforts to improve agricultural production in developing countries.
The last thirty years have seen a decline in food production in sub-Saharan Africa where 65% of the population depends on subsistence farming. There are many problems: droughts, poor soil, little infrastructure, poorly developed agricultural markets, bad government policies, and a dramatic decline in official foreign assistance for agriculture.

The Gates and Rockefeller Foundations are trying to address these problems through AGRA, the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa. In 2006, Gates committed $100 million and has since doubled that amount. Rockefeller committed $50 million and its expertise on agricultural programs. AGRA’s goals are to increase food production and sustainability of agriculture in Africa and to improve the plight of small farmers. It seeks to improve seeds, soil fertility, water use, and agricultural markets. AGRA has created a variety of partnerships with African governments, universities, and financial institutions; with the African Development Bank and UN organizations, and with foreign donors both public and private.

A different partnership seeks to improve the lot of the world’s 450 million smallholder farmers, in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Smallholder plots are less than two hectares and suffer from low yields, poor quality, weak linkages to markets, and little if any access to finance. Increasingly, food companies from the developed and developing world are turning to these small farmers to meet growing global demand for agricultural products.

A key barrier to improving productivity, market participation, and prosperity for smallholders is access to finance. So, the Citi Foundation and the Skoll Foundation commissioned a study by development experts to examine how to
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4 Rockefeller was the creator and major funder of the so-called Green Revolution which transformed agriculture in parts of Asia and Latin American in the 1950s and 60s.
catalyze smallholder agricultural finance. The study, published in 2012, identifies five ways to address inadequate financing and describes how both commercial and social lenders can finance smallholders.

Here’s one example. The study suggested that multinational buyers –think Cargill or Continental Grain or Pepsi--work with their lenders—banks and other financial institutions-- to give smallholders access to financing. The report suggests that smallholders could use purchase contracts with large firms as collateral or that corporations could help financial institutions build relationships with farmers to originate loans, assess risk, and collect payments.\(^5\) Today, in fact, Banamex, a Mexican bank that is part of Citibank, is partnering with its client Pepsi to provide financing for Pepsi’s network of agricultural suppliers in Mexico.

Microfinance is another theme of corporate philanthropy directed at development. Let me use Citigroup as an example. For over three decades, the Citi Foundation has supported the development of microfinance as it moved from being a social movement to an industry. Citi philanthropy has supported the capacity building of small microfinance institutions or MFIs in the developing world as well as the intermediary non-profit organizations like ACCION and Women’s World Banking that support MFIs.

Today, for example, the Citi Foundation is helping the China Foundation for Poverty Alleviation. CFPA is China’s largest microfinance institution. It serves the very large migrant population within China, providing loans and financial education to 180,000 clients. That is a drop in the bucket compared to the potential demand. Citi funding will enable CFPA to introduce new mobile
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banking technology and will also help create a financial training institute
designed to educate new microfinance providers.

Eight years ago, after more than 25 years of philanthropic support for
microfinance, Citi decided to set up a separate microfinance business unit. It
treats MFIs as customers just as other financial institutions are customers of
Citi. The Citi Foundation continues to support the evolution of microfinance
nonprofits in many markets around the world while the Microfinance business
supports the profit-oriented and larger MFIs. The two – Citi Foundation’s
microfinance philanthropy and Citi’s microfinance business - continue to exist
and prosper, side by side, learning from each other.

**Environment**
Environment is the third largest area of international philanthropic giving.
Private foundations have focused heavily on policy and advocacy around
climate change. They have funded scientific research, policy analysis, and
dissemination of information and policy recommendations at the local, state,
national, and international level—all with the goal of informing and shaping
public policy.

One example is the Energy Foundation. It was created in 1991 by the
MacArthur, Pew, and Rockefeller foundations and has received funding from
many private foundations since then including the TOSA foundation created by
John and Tashia Morgridge. The Energy Foundation’s goal is ambitious: to
shift the world from reliance on fossil fuel to clean energy.

The Foundation works at a technical level. In the U.S., it has designed
standards for renewable energy, efficient appliances, and utility efficiency;
developed regulations for vehicle emissions and energy efficient building codes;
and worked with advocacy organizations to press for the implementation of these standards and codes.

In 1999, the Energy Foundation used funding from the Packard Foundation to create the Energy Foundation China. China is a significant consumer of energy especially coal, a major carbon emitter, and an essential ingredient in any solution to global warming. China’s domestic energy policy will shape its ability and willingness to participate in international agreements to reduce carbon emissions.

The China program now has an office in Beijing staffed by over thirty Chinese nationals. As in the U.S., it supports the design, development, and implementation of sustainable energy standards and policies. CSEP makes grants to Chinese research institutes and international non-profits. It commissions research, convenes experts from around the world, and works with government officials. A number of CSEP’s standards have been adopted by the Chinese government. The foundation is now also working on a much greater challenge: assuring that those policies are actually put into practice in China.

Corporate environmental philanthropy has focused less on shaping public policy than on developing and modeling best practices in sustainable and efficient growth. International Paper is the world’s largest fiber based paper, packaging, and pulp company. At IP, sustainable forestry has long been a core value, business policy, and everyday practice. Sustainable forestry management assures that working forests can continuously supply the fiber that is required to make wood based products as well as provide habitat, protect biodiversity and maintain clean water and economic and social benefits in a never-ending cycle.
In 2012, IP announced twelve sustainability goals that it is measuring and intends to reach by 2020. They include: improving energy efficiency, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, reducing air emissions, reducing water use, improving water quality, using fiber efficiently, and increasing fiber recovery, i.e. recycling. All of this is good for business, the environment, and arresting climate change.

International Paper funds non-profit groups around the world that support the sustainable use of forestlands and other natural resources. It works with universities and scientific institutions on research and development to improve productivity and ecological conservation. IP supports and works with non-profits in the U.S. and abroad including the National Fish and Wild Life Foundation, the Nature Conservancy, the World Environment Center and the World Wildlife Fund to provide education and advocacy about socially responsible forest management and environmental sustainability.

Philanthropy and Global Governance

So--what is the significance of the new global philanthropy that I have described? What role does it play in today’s global system?

Philanthropy has long contributed to American “soft power”. It enhances America’s image and reputation abroad, promotes changes that align with American interests, and advances American objectives. In that sense, private foundations and corporate philanthropy contribute to America’s global leadership. They have also been a distinctive, American asset. Although new foundations are being created outside the United States and the international role of non-U.S. foundations is growing, no other country yet has private or
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corporate foundations with the resources and international reach of American philanthropy.

Apart from contributing to American leadership, philanthropy plays a growing role in global governance. As I noted earlier, issues high on today’s global agenda have expanded beyond traditional national security problems to include many problems addressed by private philanthropy—health, poverty, preventing climate change, and preserving our environment. Players on the global stage include a wide range of non-state actors. And the ways in which those players work together to address global challenges has become more complex.

Private foundations and corporation philanthropies work with governments at all levels, international organizations, non-profits, other businesses, and individuals to address contemporary global challenges. They also develop new models of multinational and multi sector cooperation on global issues, as with AGRA, CSC, and the Energy Foundation. Foundations and corporations have also helped develop new models of international cooperation including alliances, partnerships, and networks of governments, international organizations, non-profits, other foundations, business, and individuals.

Finally, foundations and the NGOs they support have helped to promote common global norms and values. By working to stop global warming, support people living with HIV/AIDS, educate women, or build financial systems for the unbanked, philanthropy brings visibility to these issues, helps to put them on national and international agendas, and foster the development of common global norms and values.

Foundations and corporate philanthropy have advantages in addressing such global challenges. They can address issues that governments cannot or will not
or do not have the resources to address. Private foundations are particularly able to tackle controversial issues. They supported work on AIDS at home and abroad when those with the disease were stigmatized; they addressed climate change when the U.S. federal government denied there was a problem; they are testing new agricultural ideas in poor countries a time when governmental agricultural aid is stagnating. Corporate philanthropy can bring special knowledge and expertise beyond money. IBM’s CSC, Citi’s work on mobile banking for the unbanked, and IP’s technology to reduce greenhouse gasses are examples of added value beyond philanthropic dollars.

Foundations and corporations are somewhat independent of national politics and political processes. So, they can act more quickly than governments; they can also be patient and take the long view. They have funded research on health care in developing countries, innovative approaches to agriculture in poor countries as well as best environmental and climate practices despite little promise of early returns on their investments.

Foundations and corporation philanthropy are able to engage foreign societies, which is often inappropriate, difficult or impossible for the U.S. government to do. Foundations and corporations often work directly with civil society organizations and individuals abroad. In fact, both foundations and corporations often see individuals or members of civil society, not governments, as their clients.

All of these efforts, in my view, enhance global governance. They also promote greater globalization. Indeed, the model of private foundations itself is becoming globalized. Private and corporate foundations based outside the United States are growing in number and size and becoming more active on the international scene. Governments, for a variety of reasons, are changing their
laws and policies to promote the creation of private foundations; many U.S. private foundations are encouraging and even incubating new foundations abroad. Many old and new foundations are working together across national boundaries on global issues, including, for example, climate change and health.

**Conclusion**

In closing, I want to emphasize that philanthropy alone cannot change the world. It will not eliminate poverty, cure HIV/AIDS, or stop global warming. Social, economic and political changes happen—or don’t happen—because of a variety of independent factors, most of them out of the control of philanthropy. Not all venture investments are successful; neither are all philanthropic programs.

At their best, private foundations and corporate philanthropies act responsibly. They provide venture capital for the global system; fund innovative ways to address global problems; find new ways of global cooperation and partnership; test ideas that may be adopted by other funders who will take them to scale; and bring attention to issues, particularly issues of equity that otherwise might go unnoticed. In that sense, private foundations and corporations help achieve what philanthropy is all about: improving the human condition.

Thank you.
**Image 1**

**INTERNATIONAL GRANTS VS. ALL GRANTS FOR SAMPLED FOUNDATIONS, 1982 TO 2011 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>INT'L. GRANTS (CURRENT)</th>
<th>ALL GRANTS (CURRENT)</th>
<th>INT'L. AS A % OF ALL GRANT DOLLARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>$74,873</td>
<td>$1,490,246</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>178,214</td>
<td>2,216,647</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>508,221</td>
<td>4,405,808</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>679,433</td>
<td>5,930,302</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,066,415</td>
<td>9,786,685</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,191,802</td>
<td>15,884,818</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,213,349</td>
<td>19,137,485</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6,175,117</td>
<td>25,265,887</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,258,470</td>
<td>20,545,820</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6,697,965</td>
<td>24,542,684</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: The Foundation Center, 2013. Based on all grants of $10,000 or more from a sample of approximately 1,000 larger U.S. foundations.

**Image 2**

**TOTAL U.S. FOUNDATION ASSETS, 1990 TO 2011**

Dollars in Billions

- 1990: $142.5
- 1994: $195.8
- 1998: $365.1
- 2002: $435.2
- 2006: $614.7
- 2008: $565.0
- 2010: $644.0
- 2011: $662.3

TOTAL U.S. FOUNDATION GIVING, 1990 TO 2011

![Bar chart showing total U.S. foundation giving from 1990 to 2011.](chart)
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INTERNATIONAL GRANTS VS. ALL GRANTS FOR SAMPLED FOUNDATIONS, 1982 TO 2011 (Dollars in Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>INT'L. GRANTS (CURRENT)</th>
<th>ALL GRANTS (CURRENT)</th>
<th>INT'L. AS A % OF ALL GRANT DOLLARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>$74,873</td>
<td>$1,490,246</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>178,214</td>
<td>2,216,647</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>508,221</td>
<td>4,405,808</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>679,433</td>
<td>5,930,302</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,066,415</td>
<td>9,786,685</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,191,802</td>
<td>15,884,818</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4,213,349</td>
<td>19,137,485</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>6,175,117</td>
<td>25,265,887</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,258,470</td>
<td>20,545,820</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6,697,965</td>
<td>24,542,684</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: The Foundation Center, 2013. Based on all grants of $10,000 or more from a sample of approximately 1,000 larger U.S. foundations.
### Image 4

**TOTAL CORPORATE FOUNDATION ASSETS, 1990 TO 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dollars in Billions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$22.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: The Foundation Center, 2013.*

### Image 5

**TOTAL CORPORATE FOUNDATION GIVING, 1990 TO 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dollars in Billions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: The Foundation Center, 2013.*
**Image 6**

INTERNATIONAL GRANTS VS. ALL GRANTS FOR SAMPLED CORPORATE FOUNDATIONS, 1990 TO 2011 (DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>INTL. GRANTS (CURRENT)</th>
<th>ALL GRANTS (CURRENT)</th>
<th>INTL. AS A % OF ALL GRANT DOLLARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>$19,061</td>
<td>$642,863</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>22,102</td>
<td>761,553</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>54,202</td>
<td>981,993</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>122,623</td>
<td>1,823,007</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>261,824</td>
<td>2,083,843</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>299,316</td>
<td>2,286,754</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>336,885</td>
<td>2,358,347</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>312,260</td>
<td>2,180,641</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: The Foundation Center, 2013. Based on all grants of $10,000 or more from a sample of approximately 1,000 larger U.S. foundations.

**Image 7**

AMOUNT OF INTERNATIONAL GIVING BY MAJOR PROGRAM AREA, 2011

 SOURCE: The Foundation Center, 2013. Based on all grants of $10,000 or more from a sample of approximately 1,000 larger foundations.