CHAPTER 2

Omnipresent yet invisible: A review of ‘African philanthropy’

Jacob Mwathi Mati

Imagine a typical low-income neighbourhood in an African town or a village with a dearth of economic resources for dealing with the ever-increasing challenges of poverty, welfare and underdevelopment. In such a neighbourhood, you are most likely to find myriad actors intervening in social development efforts. For example, you are likely to find a local or international non-governmental development organisation intervening, for instance, in catering for various needs of destitute children rendered vulnerable by disease and lack of opportunities. Among the donors of this non-governmental development organisation will be private indigenous business organisations and foreign (multinational) corporations, contributing either in the form of direct corporate donations, or as part of their corporate social responsibility programmes. The same non-governmental development organisation is likely to be receiving individual private donations of money, time and other in-kind resources from local citizens, or even international development workers, as well as grants from international development organisations. In the same community, the income poor, most likely to be depicted as beneficiaries of the development and philanthropic programmes of this non-governmental development organisation, will also be donating their time, money, food and clothes through small-scale self-help organisations to cater for some of these vulnerable children in their neighbourhood. This scenario captures the complex reality of philanthropy and development on the African continent in the 21st century.

More often than not, mainstream media and scholarly narratives of philanthropy by and large portray Africa as a continent of recipients. African nation-states, civil-society organisations and societies, are depicted as dependent on benevolent donations and aid from the rest of the world for their development. But that is only one side of the story of philanthropy and development in Africa, and it has attracted some criticism (See Atibil 2013; Wilkinson-Maposa & Fowler 2009; Wilkinson-Maposa et al. 2005; Moyo 2009; Muchie 1999; Easterly 2006). Indeed, the reality is different because Africans ‘are both givers and receivers’ (Wilkinson-Maposa et al. 2005: xi; Strassburg 2010; Atibil 2013; Nkopane 2016). Bolstered in part by an Africa ‘on the rise’, there are increasing levels of local/internal generation of resources fuelling her own socioeconomic growth and prosperity.

Written off by the influential The Economist magazine in May 2000¹ as the ‘hopeless’ ‘Dark Continent’ due to bad governance, war, poverty and disease, and heavy dependence on foreign aid four decades after independence, Africa has reached a tipping point. Many of the fastest-growing economies in the world are in Africa. Figures from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank show that many African countries are experiencing an unprecedented economic boom.² On average, Sub-Saharan Africa is the second-fastest growth region (after South Asia) since the 2008 global economic meltdown with some countries registering double-digit GDP growth in some years.³ In 2013, for
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instance, the African Economic Outlook (2014) of the African Development Bank reported that East and West Africa recorded the fastest growth averaging 6 per cent and above. Every day, we read of commissions of new major infrastructure development projects; we read of new mineral, gas and oil finds that will be key in fuelling growth over the next decades; we read of new technological innovations that are transforming African economies and livelihoods of her people. Africa’s human capital has also not been left behind in this rise.

Figure 2.1 Annual GDP growth (%)

These developments have led to a change of opinion, even among the Afro-pessimists. In this regard, the same *The Economist* magazine, in a debate published on 12 March 2013, for instance, observed:

Sub-Saharan Africa has made huge leaps in the last decade. Malaria deaths in some of the worst affected countries have declined by 30% and HIV infections by up to 74%. Life expectancy across Africa has increased by about 10% and child mortality rates in most African countries have been falling steeply. A booming economy has made a big difference. Real income per person has increased by more than 30%, whereas in the previous 20 years it shrank by nearly 10%. Africa is the world’s fastest-growing continent at the moment. Over the next decade its GDP is expected to rise by an
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4 While the credibility crisis of GDP growth as a measure of progress has reached unprecedented levels (see, for example, Fioramonti L (2013) *Gross domestic problem: The politics behind the world’s most powerful number*. London: Zed Books), I use the same here for illustrative purposes with no intention of delving into the merits and demerits of the same.
average of 6% a year, not least thanks to foreign direct investment. FDI has gone from $15 billion in 2002 to $37 billion in 2006 and $46 billion in 2012.\footnote{August O, Africa rising: A hopeful continent, \textit{The Economist}, 2 March 2013}

These developments have been attributed to a combination of improved political maturity and ‘better economic management by many governments, and a fast-growing population of young workers and consumers.’\footnote{Fletcher P, Analysis: Africa’s rise pays out dividends for democracy. Reuters, 5 April 2013, \url{http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/04/05/us-africa-elections-idUSBRE9340BN20130405}} A 2010 McKinsey Global Institute report argues that a combination of these economic and demographic expansions, projected to spur substantial wealth creation over the next 15 years, with GDP projected to rise to US$2.6 trillion in 2020 from US$1.6 trillion in 2008 (Roxburgh et al. 2010). On the whole, the debate on Africa’s development and economic growth ‘is no longer how to prevent the continent from sinking further into poverty, but rather how its wealth can be shared more equitably’ (Hodgson & Knight 2012: 1). These are encouraging stories, especially coming from quarters known better for their scepticism about Africa’s socioeconomic and political outlook.

That Africa has changed in the last decade is hard to dispute. But even with the emerging consensus of an Africa on the rise, there are still many challenges (Julien et al. 2014). One of the most prominent of these challenges is widespread poverty as 46.8 per cent of Sub-Saharan Africans still live below the poverty line.\footnote{World Bank, Poverty and equity data, 2012. Accessed 27 November 2014, \url{http://povertydata.worldbank.org/poverty/region/SSA}} Furthermore, political instability and scandals, unemployment, and income and gender inequality remain high; rising temperatures because of climate change and environmental degradation are devastating livelihoods of Africa’s poorest; disease such as the 2014–15 Ebola outbreak in West Africa, and hunger continues to ravage significantly higher percentages of the population compared to other regions of the world (Julien et al. 2014). This signifies that recent developments are yet to be consolidated for the benefit of a majority of Africa’s population.

However, accompanying the economic prosperity in the past decade has been the growth of indigenous African philanthropic institutions such as private, corporate, family and community foundations that are contributing to Africa’s development. These formations, together with social platforms that facilitate giving and volunteering, have become a permanent feature that complements indigenous forms of philanthropy, especially in their solidarity, self-help, mutual aid and reciprocity manifestations (Strassburg 2010; Wilkinson-Maposa et al. 2005). These manifestations of philanthropy are deeply rooted in long-standing traditions of social norms and conventions (Julien et al. 2014). Further, they reflect a collective philosophy of life that values communal wellbeing over individualism and emphasises individual responsibility to communal wellbeing as exemplified in the notions of African humanism in terms such as ubuntu, \textit{harambee} and \textit{ujamaa}.

Despite the prevalence of philanthropic practices based on these values, it is only recently that African philanthropy has begun to attract attention as an area of research and study. Nonetheless, social scientific knowledge on philanthropy as an ever-present social phenomenon in Africa remains unsatisfactory, elusive and difficult to harness because information is scattered ‘all over the place’. This is, in part, informed by the ‘challenges of meaning’, ‘relevance’ and ‘identity’ of African philanthropy (Trust Africa and WINGS 2008). The silences of African forms of philanthropy in mainstream narratives further exacerbate this low visibility. This silencing emanates from the fact that scholarship and discussions on African philanthropy are dispersed. The intellectual work on African

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{5} August O, Africa rising: A hopeful continent, \textit{The Economist}, 2 March 2013
\textsuperscript{6} Fletcher P, Analysis: Africa’s rise pays out dividends for democracy. Reuters, 5 April 2013, \url{http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/04/05/us-africa-elections-idUSBRE9340BN20130405}
philanthropy has mainly been driven in many instances by non-Africans, non-resident scholars and even those outside the academy. As such, while some writers of African philanthropy are in universities (in African and non-African countries), others are in government departments in African nations, in countries that provide official development assistance, or in development-assistance organisations in the non-profit or private sectors. This scenario is best illustrated by, for instance, the existence of only two centres dedicated to the study of philanthropy and associated civil society in universities in Africa (the John D Gerhart Center for Philanthropy and Civic Engagement of the American University in Cairo and Centre for Civil Society of the University of KwaZulu-Natal) at the time of writing this chapter. Recent attempts to establish a research chair for African philanthropy at the University of the Witwatersrand’s Business School is therefore a welcome addition.

This is not to understate the important role played by these efforts in at least surfacing what exists. Rather, it is to highlight the fact that individuals and organisations researching African philanthropy are not necessarily in Africa, nor are they in African academic institutions. Further, it is not always easy to assess what literature on African philanthropy exists. Indeed, the intellectual project on African philanthropy has been, at most, ad hoc, fragmented and disjointed – especially among African scholars. A lack of consistent and coherent local research funding has resulted in spasmodic, contract-driven academic engagement. An outcome of this is that there is little progress in forming a critical mass of Africans with dedication, experience, knowledge and specialisation in research on philanthropy from within the continent. Consequently, philanthropy in African terms remains largely under-researched and under-theorised. Where research findings exist, most rely on external theoretical and empirical models that may not always have relevance to African contexts. Moreover, there is little communication among African researchers in this field of study. Those pursuing this area of enquiry as researchers and reflective practitioners are often unaware of each other’s existence, work or achievements. Suffice it to say that the intellectual project on philanthropy in Africa is still at a level where ‘we do not know all that we know’.

Against this reality, the primary question addressed in this chapter is: what is known about African philanthropy across the continent? Secondly, what does literature on African philanthropy look like? The chapter is based on a scoping and documentation exercise of literature on African philanthropy.\(^8\) The exercise was aimed at identifying existing literature on African philanthropy. It also aimed to contribute to ongoing analysis with a view to surfacing the ‘meaning’, ‘relevance’ and ‘identity’ of African philanthropy and its prevalent manifestations. The chapter hopes to make modest contributions towards these aims by offering what is essentially work in progress on the overview of the diversity, forms, expressions and models of African philanthropy in some of the identified existing literature. These include formal and institutionalised, as well as non-institutionalised and informal forms that go beyond monetary donations and are ever-present in the everyday social lives of Africans.

The chapter is divided into four sections. In what follows, it will provide the conceptual parameters of the project and, especially, the conception of African philanthropy as employed in this study. Next it explains the methodology utilised in the scoping exercise before

\(^8\) The chapter is based on and draws from a report, *African Philanthropy Project Resource Base* by Jacob Mwathi Mati and Bev Russell (Social Surveys Africa) for Trust Africa with contributions from Gerard Tchouassi, Erma Cossa, Sherine El Traboulsi and Mpho Mchaza. As such, it is not a typical book chapter as it reflects on the process of implementing a project whose brief was to gather literature on African philanthropy and set up a database of what was discovered.
providing an overview of the key findings. Finally it reflects on the limitations of this project before offering concluding observations.

**African philanthropy or philanthropy for Africa? Unbundling a conceptual quagmire**

The premise of this inquiry was that ‘we do not know what we know’ about African philanthropy. Further, the inquiry was also premised on an assumption that African philanthropy is not homogenous across the continent. While it is more likely that countries and subregions – north, southern, east, west and central – have shared features, it is equally probable that there are peculiar ‘flavours’ or emphasis of the meanings and manifestations of African philanthropy that differentiate the regions. For instance, humanistic concepts and philosophies such as *harambee*, *ubuntu* and *ujamaa* are bundled together with religious and faith-based giving, corporate donations, solidarity and reciprocity, as manifestations of philanthropy (see for example Moyo 2011), but do these practices portray a similar phenomenon? The multiplicity of contexts, cultures, practices and religions inform the pluralities of existing realities of African philanthropy. As such, it is arguably more apt to talk of ‘varieties’ of African philanthropy. Against this background, the primary research question was: what does the universe of African philanthropy across the continent look like?

The meaning of African philanthropy is a primary challenge in studying philanthropy in Africa. This is because of scope creep and lack of clearly demarcated conceptual and definitional boundaries in existing literature (academic or otherwise). It is therefore not uncommon to see activities of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in Africa highlighted in the same breath as those of the foundations of Aliko Dangote, Mo Ibrahim, Patrice Motsepe, and Manu Chandaria (see for example, Kamau n.d.). But are these reflections of African philanthropy, or of philanthropy in Africa? This was a key question in unbundling this conceptual quagmire, which is further accentuated by the fact that, even globally, what constitutes philanthropy is contested. As Nxumalo (citing Glenn Ashton) argues, ‘…philanthropy is a strange beast: readily defined, more difficult to ring-fence and impossible to control. Founded upon altruism, it becomes invariably entangled with ideology, politics and ego, all tied up with differing degrees of alienation.’

In conceptualising African philanthropy, this chapter accommodates the faith-induced factors as well as geospatial and class parameters that influence the reality of philanthropy on the continent. That is to say, African philanthropy is framed in a way that appreciates that African philanthropy has many forms, expressions and models (Joseph 1989; Wilkinson-Maposa et al. 2005; Wilkinson-Maposa & Fowler 2009; Moyo 2011). These may include formal and institutionalised, as well as non-institutionalised and informal manifestations, and are practised by the poor and the rich alike (Moyo 2011; Everatt & Solanki 2008; Habib & Maharaj 2008; Wilkinson-Maposa et al. 2005). As such, African philanthropy is broadly conceived as encompassing extragovernmental and private ways through which resources (including money, material goods, time and labour) are mobilised/harnessed by and for Africans, to address a public need, interest or cause.

Such philanthropic resource mobilisation in Africa is usually driven by a desire to promote the welfare of others or private initiatives for public good, but can also be shared and includes solidarity and reciprocity entailed in collective or individual efforts towards a social or public good (Moyo 2011). Accordingly, this conception goes beyond monetary donations. African philanthropy is distinct from ‘philanthropy for Africa’, which refers to extragovernmental and
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private resource mobilisation by ‘non-Africans’ for ‘Africans’ on the continent. For the purposes of this review it was deemed necessary to broaden the focus to philanthropy in Africa. African philanthropy and philanthropy for/in Africa intersect and are mutually reinforcing. Accordingly, to understand ‘African philanthropy’ (by and for Africa), we cannot overlook ‘philanthropy for Africa’ (for Africa by others).

This bundling of the two concepts – African philanthropy and philanthropy in Africa – is a conscious decision that acknowledges the complexity of the manifestations of philanthropy in Africa where charitable impulse is universal and culturally and religiously rooted (Joseph 1998; Wilkinson-Maposa et al 2005; Wilkinson-Maposa & Fowler 2009). This is the main driver of individual charitable giving and does not depend on the amount of wealth that one may have (Joseph 1998; Wilkinson-Maposa, et al 2005; Wilkinson-Maposa & Fowler 2009). There is universal giving throughout Africa, though levels of giving differ across regions, countries and socioeconomic groups. In this scenario, horizontal philanthropy, or what Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler (2009) refer to as ‘philanthropy of community’ (that is, poor-to-poor philanthropy), is an ever-present phenomenon in African communities. Indeed, even the poor do not just wait to be targeted and co-opted in development. Rather, as Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler (2009) note, the low-wealth individuals are as likely to systemically mobilise resources for their own development, through a system of self-help and mutual assistance and mobilisation, as are those with higher wealth. In Africa, therefore, charitable giving is a phenomenon in the worlds of rich and poor (Everatt et al. 2005; Everatt & Solanki 2004; Everatt & Solanki 2008, Habib & Maharaj 2008; Julien et al. 2014; Moyo 2011).

But such practices co-exist with vertical philanthropic activities. Here, richer individuals as well as modern forms of philanthropy, such as corporate giving and donations, have fuelled the growth of the non-profit sector organisations, such as non-governmental development organisations, foundations and trusts (Julien et al. 2014).

**Methodology**

The next step in undertaking this review was to design the process for gathering, capturing and cataloguing existing literature on African philanthropy. This was guided by the objective of obtaining as much information as possible about philanthropy in Africa. The methods and strategies for this review were multipronged, which, taking cue from Hagen-Zanker and Mallett (2013) commenced with developing a keywords search string. This exercise revealed that the complexities and the multifaceted nature of practices and African philanthropy are represented in existing literature in various studies as illustrated in the list of keywords that follows.

**Keywords search strings**

**Philanthropy**: African philanthropy; community philanthropy institutions; community foundations and trusts; foundations and trusts; crisis philanthropy; relief aid; humanitarian aid; corporate foundations

**Giving and volunteering**: volunteering; service learning; in-kind contribution; service contribution; donations of time; donations of labour; donations of knowledge; donations of influence; donations of visibility; employee volunteering; corporate giving; individual giving; diaspora giving and volunteering; care giving; HIV and AIDS; environmental conservation; *ilima/letsema*; high net-worth givers; palliative care
Faith-based giving: faith-guided giving; zakaat; sadaqah; tithe; lillah; fitrah; tzedakah; dana; punya

Fund, foundation or trust: women funds; youth funds; community/family foundations/trusts; grassroots grant makers

Corporate: corporate social investment/responsibility; corporate giving; corporate philanthropy

Indigenous forms of philanthropy: ubuntu; harambee; ujamaa; burial societies; mutual aid; merry-go-round; self-help groups; reciprocity; social solidarity; community social solidarity; takaful; stokvels; ilima; susu and social safety net

Livelihoods: asset-based community development; community asset building

Social justice funding

Development aid

[end list]

Using these search strings, searches were made from databases of master’s dissertations and doctoral theses, especially from African universities known to have open-access databases of the same. The keywords were also instrumental in guiding a broader web search for literature that was specific to African philanthropy. Special attention was given to popular existing databases from organisations that have philanthropy research programmes or are likely to have publications touching on African philanthropy. Key examples here include the John D Gerhart Centre at the American University in Cairo, the European Foundation Centre, the Global Fund for Community Foundations, the Ford Foundation, the World Bank, the African GrantMakers Network Conference, Alliance magazine, the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD) and the Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa (CODESRIA).

A key restriction of doing any Africa-wide research is the limited amount of data available online. Aware of these potential drawbacks, the review also reached out to several academics, researchers, practitioners and organisations known to work on African philanthropy issues. Some of these provided additional resources such as articles, reports and unpublished conference papers that might not necessarily be on the web and/or in publicly searchable databases. Here, examples of individuals within the research and philanthropy networks approached included, among others, the ISTR Africa regional network, the African Grantmakers Network, and the East African Association of Grantmakers.

Snowballing, usually recommended for undertaking systematic reviews (see for example Hagen-Zanker & Mallett 2013; Jalali & Wohlin 2012; Freeman 2011; Lecy & Beatty 2012), was also deemed necessary. This started with what we knew as key publications in the field of philanthropy in Africa and snowballed through the reference lists and citations. African philanthropy plays out at various levels, such as a community, a region and district, within a country, a subregion of the continent, and even across countries and continents (i.e. diaspora giving and foreign donations). This diversity, as with any Africa-wide research, presented geospatial as well as linguistic challenges. Aware that it would be impossible to gather the entire universe of all that exists in all the possible languages, the project was limited to the languages most widely used in scientific publishing in Africa. These are English, French, Arabic and Portuguese.
One of the key considerations was the choice of what to include in terms of whether the literature identified had been formally published and/or peer reviewed, or whether it was unpublished, grey literature. In Africa, where funds are not as readily available for research and publication, and where historically much of what has been commissioned is done so by exogenous analysts, much of the local literature tends to be grey literature and less accessible in academic circles. On the other hand, much of what is published and more accessible through academic media such as journals and books is exogenous. The import of this is that when exploring the comprehensive narratives of African philanthropy from endogenous perspectives, considerable attention needs to be paid to grey unpublished literature. This review was acutely aware of the need to approach this task with this in mind.

**A preliminary map of what exists**

This literature search was structured to ensure that it was possible to extract as many distinctions and nuances as possible through content and text analysis of abstracts, introductions, blurbs and/or key headings in the articles, chapters and books to determine that the literature was on African philanthropy. Further keywords, especially in articles, papers or chapters that did not provide for the same were developed and used in ‘tagging’ or ‘coding’ these articles or chapters. With a view to capture the universe of what is written about the various socioeconomic groups’ involvement in African philanthropy, the relevant literature was organised by wealth ranking (poor, middle class, wealthy and ultra-wealthy).

The information in relevant literature was captured in MS Excel spreadsheets and organised in the following order: Keywords (tags)/Summary of what the literature is about/Author/Date of publication/Title of publication/Publisher/Region (organised into Arabic North Africa; Eastern and Horn of Africa; francophone Central Africa; Anglophone Southern Africa; Anglophone West Africa; Francophone West Africa; Lusophone Africa and African diaspora)/Country/Structure of philanthropy (i.e. formal or informal)/Philanthropist class/Type of philanthropy/Type of resource/By or for Africans/DOI number (where available).

As this exercise was not a literature review per se, but a preliminary mapping of existing literature, the analysis presented here is at a meta-level. A total of 1281 different pieces of relevant literature covering all but two of the 54 countries on the continent were gathered and a preliminary analysis of the same done. Table 2.1 summarises the percentages of articles found in each of these countries.

Table 2.1 [Distribution of articles/books dealing with philanthropy in different African countries]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage of total articles in category</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage of total articles in category</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percentage of total articles in category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Africa</td>
<td>20.92</td>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Africa</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>0.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglophone West Africa</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>1.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francophone West</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>5.152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While this is definitely not the universe of all the literature on African philanthropy, it gives a sense of what might exist out there. Even though at this stage of the analysis the interest was on the synopses of the literature, preliminary observations made on this literature provide only a partial overview of the picture on existing literature on philanthropy in Africa. It has also made it possible to start identifying gaps where further work is necessary.

Preliminary analysis of the literature was collected and organised along three key thematic parameters: geospatial, class and levels of institutionalisation of philanthropy in Africa. It revealed the following key observations:

**Geospatial parameters**

The keywords used for this review yielded philanthropy-related literature in 52 of the 54 countries on the African continent. There were, however, cases where certain forms of philanthropy are more prevalent than others. For instance, in economies with heavy extractive industries, corporate social investment/responsibility is more prevalent. In this case, countries such as South Africa, Namibia, Nigeria, to mention but a few, come to the fore. Further, care-based self-help forms of philanthropy are also recorded in countries with higher HIV and AIDS prevalence (southern African countries), while in countries with larger Muslim populations (especially North Africa), the literature registered higher religious-inspired forms of philanthropy such as *zakaat* and *sadaqah*. The search also yielded new words for

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>East Africa and the Horn</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
<th>Rwanda</th>
<th>Sao Tome and Principe</th>
<th>Senegal</th>
<th>Sierra Leone</th>
<th>Somalia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>2.966</td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lusophone</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaspora</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>1.483</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>1.327</td>
<td>Guinea Bissau</td>
<td>1.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>5.932</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>2.107</td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>1.405</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>1.327</td>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>0.702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>1.0928</td>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>1.717</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data presented in this table was collected by Mati et al. 2013*
indigenous forms of philanthropy-related practices, such as *hawalaad* in Somalia and *citemene* in Zambia.

There were some unexpected findings in terms of some countries either yielding very little, or too little. Based on trends in other countries, Algeria, for instance, with a significant natural gas extractive industry, should have yielded some literature. The same applies to Mauritius with arguably higher levels of industrial capitalism than the rest of Africa. This may have to do with the inherent weaknesses in search criteria utilised as, generally, countries where researchers in this project came from tended to register more resources. As such, it is probable that the search missed some existing literature on corporate philanthropy in Algeria and Mauritius. Further, it might also be a pointer to the regulatory mechanisms or their absence in these countries. Following Fioramonti and Regelbrugge (2008), it is probable that in countries with greater and more efficient regulatory frameworks such as South Africa, corporate organisations are likely to use corporate social responsibility to meet some of the requirements for their operations licensing. The same cannot be said of Mauritius, notoriously famed as an offshore tax haven in Africa.

But the concentration of certain manifestations of philanthropy are also linked to the ideology of development in the different countries. Specifically, as further argued below under the levels of institutionalisation, greater neoliberal economic thrust in countries such as South Africa, Kenya and Nigeria has generated higher levels of precarity in these countries than in others. In this regard, some critics charge that philanthropy and its attendant neoliberal humanitarianism are just palliatives or conduits in the continuing exploitation of Africa (see for example Mati 2014; Daley 2013; Nxumalo 2013;\(^{10}\) McGoey 2015; McCauley 2015; Curtis 2016). Nxumalo (citing Ashton) captures this cynicism best when he argues: ‘Modern philanthropy is little more than the illegitimate privatisation of state planning, aid and redistributive policies. Philanthro-capitalism is a misleading smoke screen for business as usual.’\(^{11}\) Moreover, for Africans living in communities where the state is virtually absent in the provision of social welfare benefits, mutual aid and self-help could well be the only reliable coping strategy.

**Class parameters**

People of all walks of life are involved in philanthropic work. But, as already noted, in many instances, the analysis in the literature tends not to be concerned with class issues. The reality is that most aspects of African philanthropy are not necessarily class conscious. The few exceptions here are studies of philanthropic activities of the high-net-worth individuals in Africa and the rich (see for example BoE Private Clients 2011; Nedbank Private Wealth 2013; Julien et al. 2014), or ground-breaking work on self-help and mutual aid forms of giving and philanthropy in poorer communities (Strassburg 2010; Wilkinson-Maposa et al. 2005; Wilkinson-Maposa & Fowler 2009; Everatt & Solanki 2004; Everatt & Solanki 2008; Everatt et al. 2005). Moreover, some literature also cuts across various socioeconomic groups. However, it was particularly interesting to note that around two-thirds of the literature identified related in some way to wealth or the lack thereof. Of those two-thirds, the majority of the literature was concerned with ‘the poor’ although a fairly high proportion was also concerned with the philanthropy of the wealthy or ultra-wealthy. As such, both aspects of horizontal (the poor as contributors to both the supply and demand sides of philanthropy as
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they assist each other) as well as vertical philanthropy (the rich giving to the poor) are present in all African communities (Everatt et al. 2005; Everatt & Solanki 2004; Everatt & Solanki 2008; Moyo 2011).

Vertical philanthropy is manifested as corporate philanthropy or philanthro-capitalism (Edwards 2011; Bishop & Green 2008; Nxumalo 2013; McGoey 2015). It may also manifest through the work of private foundations and donations by the wealthy to the poor (Julien et al. 2014; Nedbank Private Wealth 2013; BoE Private Clients 2011; Kamau n.d.), as community foundations (Hodgson & Knight 2012), or donations from external sources. Under corporate philanthropy, business entities donate or give to communities mainly through citizens’ organisations and non-governmental development organisations, but also, in some instances, through the state (Fioramonti & Regelbrugge 2008). In some instances, such giving is organised around corporate social responsibility where businesses organisations undertake activities in communities, with or without civil society organisations (CSOs) to mitigate the impact of their activities and contribute towards a better quality of life for citizens from local to global communities (Fioramonti & Regelbrugge 2008). As already indicated, motivations and impacts of corporate philanthropy, especially on their engagement with civil society, have been portrayed in a negative light in some of the literature. In this regard, Fioramonti and Regelbrugge (2008: 291), for example, argue that ‘business tends to look at CSOs with indifference or as an instrument to improve its public image while furthering its corporate goals.’

**Extent of African philanthropy’s institutionalisation**

African philanthropy has many forms, expressions and models. Some are formal and institutionalised while others are non-institutionalised and are often referred as ‘informal’ giving. Much of what has been written on African philanthropy is heavily skewed towards the formal or vertical manifestations of philanthropy in Africa, although increasingly attention does appear to be turning more towards informal forms of philanthropy, such as community-based giving. Indeed, these horizontal forms of giving and philanthropic behaviour have arguably attracted greater scholarly attention in southern Africa than elsewhere in Africa (see for example Wilkinson-Maposa et al. 2005; Wilkinson-Maposa & Fowler 2009; Everatt & Solanki 2004; Everatt & Solanki 2008; Everatt et al. 2005).

The split, however, is still predominantly formal, with 65 per cent of the literature concerning itself with formal philanthropy and only 18 per cent of the literature concerning itself with the informal nature of philanthropy. A further 17 percent was a mix of formal and informal. Specifically, this means that, for example, there are literatures that describe how an institutionalised community foundation received funding both from an international donor, as well as mobilising funds through local self-help and mutual-aid initiatives, touching on both formal and informal aspects of philanthropy. This split between formal and informal might be an artificial one that does not necessarily reflect the actual profile of philanthropy in African countries. The existing literature is more considerably concerned with formal, institutionalised philanthropy compared to informal philanthropy that is often undertaken by poorer communities and in non-institutionalised settings.

Institutionalisation of philanthropy in Africa is both a product of and a manifestation of the phenomenal growth of the non-profit sector as well as increasing regulation and scrutiny of businesses in the continent that has forced many private corporations to start philanthropic
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foundations. Institutionalisation of philanthropy has also been pushed by an emergence of community foundations in Africa in the last two decades, especially in Kenya, Zimbabwe and South Africa. In most African countries, however, corporate support to non-governmental development organisations remains low (Fioramonti & Regelbrugge 2008). From the available literature, a common trait noted to cut across Africa is that large companies (particularly multinational and foreign companies) are more accustomed to philanthropy and are generally keener to involve CSOs in these areas. This does not always mean that their commitment to corporate social responsibility is as strong or impactful. Moreover, as Fioramonti and Regelbrugge (2008) argue, corporate support to CSOs only happens where there is alignment of broad values of both business and civil society. In many instances, such alignment happens in a utilitarian and monetised manner where business ‘corporations provide funding for CSO projects and staff, while CSOs’ charitable image helps corporations show a socially acceptable face while benefiting from tax breaks’ (Fioramonti & Regelbrugge 2008: 291. See also van Wyk n.d.).

Limitations

African philanthropy is studied from a multiplicity of disciplines including economics, sociology, anthropology, law and development studies. Each of these has its way of naming and describing philanthropic activities. As a result, some of the literature is explicit on African philanthropy while other literature is less so. Accordingly, in addition to the obvious literature targeting the term ‘philanthropy’ as a named phenomenon, a comprehensive literature review should identify implicit sources. As this project was exploratory in nature, the process was very iterative and evolved as the search developed. Therefore, although the search undertaken concentrated on the more immediate philanthropy terms, it is evident from the results that more focused searches on specific areas and disciplines would result in the identification of additional sources of philanthropy literature not yet discovered. In reviewing what was identified through this process, there are areas that are clearly missing or under-represented in the resource base. Areas that immediately come to mind include the Arab Spring, around which considerable resources would have been mobilised. Other areas that possibly require greater attention include: violence against women and children and related gender issues, orphans and vulnerable children, education and child feeding, health, legal aid, and conservation-related philanthropy – particularly anti-poaching efforts that are receiving so much media attention at present. In addition, literature relating to community resource mobilisations in provision of low-cost housing and service delivery, fighting crime, land redistribution, language and culture, require more focused searches. Although social justice and development aid were specific search terms used, these areas are multidimensional with a whole host of terms that could be used to describe related philanthropic activities. They, therefore, require an expanded search if they are to be fully explored.

By its sheer nature, there were levels of spill-over and many borderline issues, because parameters for determining what is or is not philanthropy are not always clear. The most prominent of these borderline issues include foreign aid and public participation in development and governance processes, where donation of time is essential.

The literature gathered was by no means exhaustive. There will be much literature that escaped the study radar. Part of the reason for this is because snowballing has the potential to grow at an exponential rate (Lecy & Beatty 2012), and a clear timeline to guide the limits of the study was drawn to allow completion within the set time. That the number of documents identified was not exhaustive becomes clear when looking at the disproportionally high number of documents located in countries such as Kenya, South Africa, Cameroon or
Mozambique where one or more of the researchers on the project were either based or born. It is possible that had the study employed researchers from all the 54 countries, higher numbers would have been gathered. It does, however, provide a substantive base from which to progress and explore further. Moreover, the predominantly desktop nature of the research was an impediment.

Additionally, as indigenous African philanthropy has not been an area of study for very long and is often found outside of many formal institutions, it is likely that this important aspect of the African narrative is under-represented. Greater emphasis and further analysis downstream may be able to yield more.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has attempted to offer preliminary reflections of three main parameters of the nature of literature on African philanthropy: geospatial, class and levels of institutionalisation. By its very nature, the review had a limited scope and, as such, yielded results that fed to specific objectives, whose core was to begin a consideration of literature on African philanthropy and initiate a database of what was discovered. While this was largely achieved, the resultant database\(^{13}\) from this exercise is not definitive. Nonetheless, it is indicative of what exists in this field.

The preliminary findings confirm the study’s view that socioeconomic class and religion are less of determinants as to who gets involved in philanthropic activities across the different African countries (Everatt & Solanki 2004; Everatt & Solanki 2008; Everatt et al. 2005). As such, African philanthropy is broadly practised by diverse religious and socioeconomic groups and classes, in different parts of Africa, be they visible or not to us as researchers. Various aspects of philanthropy, including giving through recognised charities and NGOs as well as organic acts of reciprocity that are part of everyday life practices that may emanate from human impulses that privilege a collective life philosophy, are a reality throughout Africa. In this regard, Wilkinson-Maposa and Fowler (2009: x) have observed that ‘the relative neglect of the poor as agents of change brought about through their own acts of giving and receiving, points to a critical paradox’ of current development approaches that needs to be redressed. Indeed, the current findings point to the need to correct this situation. As Africa rises, the long-term sustainability of her development efforts must remain deeply embedded in the participation of all her people, irrespective of their socioeconomic status.

There is an upsurge in what may loosely be referred as new forms of institutional philanthropy that are, in part, fuelled by the new wave of Africa’s economic growth. These new forms, including corporate philanthropy, corporate social responsibility programmes, and high-net-worth giving, have cross-fertilised the African philanthropic field, and further seem to rejuvenate the philanthropic spirit in Africa. Of course, in certain countries, some of these forms of philanthropy are far more developed than others. The good thing is that others can learn from the experiences of what exists. Further, although both corporate philanthropy and corporate social responsibility are incipient phenomena in most countries in Africa, philanthropic strategies are more common and developed than initiatives aimed at strengthening social responsibility (Fioramonti & Regelbrugge 2008). The key question for further analysis is: why is this the case?

There is, as suspected, a large amount of literature that has been produced by non-African scholars that is quite influential in the field. However, at the same time, such influential

\(^{13}\) See http://trustafrica.org/en/philanthropy-database
literature may occasionally be blind to the local realities in Africa. But there is an opportunity for African scholars to seize the moment and direct the nature of philanthropic studies so that they can document all forms and manifestations of philanthropy on the continent through an African lens, in the process making visible these ever-present practices of giving and, in so doing, challenging the dominant neo-colonial narrative that Africa is a continent of recipients.
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