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SYNOPSIS

A paper with concise texts and extensive footnotes is not amenable to a condensation or précis as an Executive Summary. Therefore, to assist readers with little time, this page offers a synopsis of key areas of substance and their sectional location, allowing more directed access for those with specific interests.

This paper – revised from a version in May 2016 - establishes the scholarly foundation of new academic chair with practical intentions that a business school is meant to provide. It draws on a year and a half of experience in defining a profile for a Chair devoted to African Philanthropy, not philanthropy in Africa, which is under-researched, often poorly or prejudicially understood as ‘traditional’ and anti-modern as well as developmentally under-appreciated. These conditions are overlain with imported vocabularies and meanings not adequately emanating from the continent’s history and lived experience of deeply rooted pro-social behaviour of giving or ‘gifting’, increasingly complemented by social investment. Much of today's discourse misses a deep understanding of African Philanthropy in its own right with what it can tell us about better ways to tackle the continent’s many problems by building on its inherent potentials. Establishing such an ‘operational’ narrative is one purpose of the joint initiative between the Wits Business School and the Southern Africa trust; a story which must have relevance and traction in the lives of Africa’s people.

A theoretical framework in section two introduces a complexity view of social, cultural, economic, political, linguistic and other processes leading to a contemporary African landscape where gifting is expressed through three institutionalised gifting practices: endogenous, exogenous and blended. An ontological approach in section four explains a pre-colonial, colonial and post-colonial trajectory, concentrating on a period starting around the beginning of this millennium. Readers most interested in this era could start by looking at Section five which describes the contemporary scene on the continent. When doing so, please note that section three draws attention to the power of words. To be ontologically coherent, new narratives often require suitable nomenclatures, in this case a choice of ‘gifting’ rather than ‘giving’ or of ‘philanthropy’ which is a poorly translatable term and concept in an African languages and moral philosophy of ubuntu. From a communications point of view, the choice for a distinctive terminology will continually call for justification and explanation until there is recognition of its narrative value for comprehending Africa’s story and its contribution to the long story of human evolution.

Since the start of the millennium, practices of gifting by and on the continent are undergoing rapid changes inviting excitement at their innovation and concern about their effects in, for example, areas of public policy, rights, social justice, universal access to public services and democratic governance. Discussing these and similar issues can be found in section six which is followed by a detailed review of local resource mobilization from private sources for public benefit derived from within the continent and its Diaspora. Across the three institutional types, uncertain but indicative estimates of their monetary value are in the order of US$ 55 – 85 billion per annum.  Including the non-monetary and non-material value of gifting could take this (much) higher. Counting foreign aid, both official and private, would add to the monetary value by almost the same amount again.1 An increasing attention to local resource mobilisation in African gifting will contribute to reducing dependency on an aid system not known for its reliability.

The concluding section seven switches focus to embedding the Chair of African philanthropy at the Wits Business School. By using an inclusive methodology and open combination throughout, ideas and content have been inspired by participants at a pan-African inaugural seminar held in March 2016 and a research agenda workshop, which took place in Kenya in December. The former event helped to create a 10 year profile and value proposition for the Chair at WBS located in its Vision 2022, with guiding principles of excellence, a research-intensive agenda, a deeper business reading of African countries, transformation and more. The challenge is to translate these and other contributions into a viable delivery and business model centred on a Master’s Degree and an Executive Education programme. The profile of the Chair, which is informed by this Foundation Paper, sets out the substance of the task.
Concepts and Framework for Teaching, Research and Outreach of African Philanthropy

“For in these ‘early’ societies, social phenomena are not discrete; each phenomena contains all the threads of which the social fabric is composed.”

“The gifts of the mogels. Extreme Philanthropy is the upside of a worryingly unequal distribution of wealth.”
The Economist, December 12th 2015, p. 66

1. INTRODUCTION
The following pages set out a scholarly foundation for a Chair in African Philanthropy at the Wits Business School (WBS). It is a further revised version of a Foundational Paper resulting from the Chair’s inaugural seminar held in Johannesburg in March 2016 with thirty seven participants from across the continent. This latter point is important because, while hosted in South Africa, this academic position is meant to be guided by and serve Africa as a whole: from Cape to Cairo.

The opening quotations give an idea of the breadth, depth and history of the terrain that Chair in African Philanthropy must take into account. The way of doing so is to locate an African narrative of its philanthropy within an institutional interpretation of the evolution of people’s generosity when endogenous practices interact with external ideas, norms and economic systems which are imposed by brute force and cooption. This process has given rise to a particular plurality of ‘gifting’ practices, as a preferred nomenclature for the continent’s own experience. The section which follows establishes an overarching theoretical framework of societies as complex adaptive human systems. From and within this frame, an ecological perspective explains how, over long historical time, a repertoire of people’s pre-dispositions and lived geo-historical contexts generate a variety of institutions understood as patterns of rules and norms that are generated from and, in return, influence the behaviours from which they emerge as a never ending process of societal unfolding.2

An ontological approach serves as a way, in section three, to critically appraise the imported notion of philanthropy, a foreign concept and vocabulary which is difficult to marry with the continent’s endogenous philosophy, world views and languages. It is argued that, globally seen, modern philanthropy, now complemented by social investment models, has emerged as one type of gifting and not the other way around. With this in mind, as a contemporary international concept and practice, philanthropy and social investment are treated as ‘vertical’ variants of gifting, often now associated with individual capital accumulation generating high personal wealth. There is an implied ‘altruistic’ morality in gifting - as well as in philanthropy – which is problematic in terms, for example,
of assumptions about human pre-dispositions towards selfishness, co-operation versus competition and so on. Consequently, points of departure, or positions, in respect of human behaviour need to be set out. Section three therefore ends with axioms or behavioural propositions to guide the Chair in debating, theorizing, researching, teaching and practically applying African gifting.

Section four uses the preceding conceptual framing and terminology to explore and explain where African gifting came from and why it looks as it does today. It takes the reader step by step through concepts and ontologically defining eras of pre-colonial, colonial, early post-colonial and ‘New Age’ framework of gifting, the latter period starting around the beginning of this millennium. The first three periods provide the empirical grounding and depth to African gifting today and tomorrow.

Inevitably, the rich diversity of countries and the character of the populations within them make generalisations both inevitable and challenging. Where possible, differences across the continent are recognised and spoken to, but paucity and uneven documentation make this difficult and not consistent for all the topics covered. In addition, systemic biases in western-financed research have tilted the knowledge field towards external interests, theories and ideological frames.

Section five is devoted to the contemporary era of African gifting, starting around the beginning of the millennium. It concentrates on unpacking local resource mobilization in terms of potential sources and their financial value. A specific subsection is devoted to a review of ‘New Age’ philanthropies and social investment, locating them in a typology with other models of gifting that Africa can consider and study.

The field of African gifting, philanthropy and social investment internationally, are characterised by rapid growth, diversification and many critical debates. The issues involved are the subject of section six, including doubts about the transferability of an essentially Euro-American concepts and practices, as well philosophical arguments about the moral incompatibility of economic processes generating great individual wealth and the values of personalised giving back. Here, an article in The Economist asks two thorny questions of extreme philanthropy:

“The first concerns how such a staggering fortune could ever have been accumulated; the second whether philanthropy can salve the sting of the increasingly unequal distribution of wealth that it exemplifies.”

Other voices are raised about the impact of personalised and poorly accountable mega-philanthropy on public policies and governance, blurring public and private realms. Ethical debates are also in play in relation to ways in which tax avoidance strategies and illicit flows of money out of the continent by corporations contradict their public relations investment in social responsibility. An ongoing concern is a subordination of African gifting to external definitions, perspectives and initiatives. One effect is to overshadow, if not undermine, a full understanding of how gifting operates beyond ‘elite’ money. Another questioning is about the interface between African gifting and politics in ways that may work against democracy and social justice. In addition, where and how does volunteering fit in to resourcing on the continent? The Chair would be expected to engage in these and other areas of public discourse affecting African gifting.
In section seven, the discussion moves from definition, explanation and debates to implications for a Chair in African Philanthropy that is located within the Wits Business School (WBS). What does the Chair, with its pan-African remit, have to offer WBS? What must be done to attract African students and scholars on and from the continent to recognise and choose WBS as the centre of excellence for the study of African philanthropy? What sensitivities must it deal with, for example, in relation to criticisms of South Africa’s foreign policy and corporate behaviours post nineteen ninety four that have been characterised as ‘bullying’ and arrogant respectively? From addressing these and similar questions, a ten year future vision for the Chair - formulated at the inaugural seminar - gives both an idea of priorities, direction and metrics for assessing its performance.

As a choice of style, the main text of this discussion paper avoids academic referencing and elaborations, which are located in comprehensive end notes.

2. PHILANTHROPY – A COMPLEX ADAPTIVE SYSTEMS PERSPECTIVE

There is increasing interest and study of the dynamics involved in societies’ evolution and functioning as complex adaptive systems (CAS). One reason for interest is dissatisfaction with an increasingly inability of societies – for convenience let us say countries - to understand and deal effectively with the uncertainties that they create for themselves as they develop and interact with others. The seventeen sustainable development goals (SDGs) and their one hundred and indicators for sixty nine targets illustrate world problems requiring remedy.

A complex adaptive system is an essentially a dynamic relational model for comprehending how social institutions, such as those of markets, marriage, philanthropy or banking or justice or gender differences, are formed and are reformed through human agency over time. The first part of this section therefore explains what a complex adaptive systems looks like in terms of defining characteristics. This explanation is then taken further into examining the emergence of types of institutions within society which are driven by the pro-social principle of philanthropy - at this stage defined as caring for others - as an enduring human behaviour found across the world. Given, the location of the Chair in WBS, the orientation is towards gifting in relation to the evolution of economic relations. This does not prejudice against the value of other disciplinary perspectives.

Complexity and the Emergence of Institutions

A complex adaptive system treats people as interacting agents, currently seven billion on the planet with more to come, unevenly distributed across the globe. Human interactions create energy flows between them that are not random. Individuals learn from context-sensitive experience which, over time, feedback on their behaviour, that is there is selective attraction toward patterns of relations that works better. Attraction-selection often reflects innate human behavioural predispositions, for example towards wanting inter-generational continuity; an aversion to anxiety and risk; an asymmetry of feelings between losing what one has as opposed to what might be gained, expressed in the adage ‘a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush’; a higher probability of trusting information from those personally known as opposed to unknown sources; opting for processes which reduce transaction costs; avoiding conflict, and so on. What cannot be predicted is how these patterns interplay over generations to form institutions which emerge as ‘rules of the game’ that create incentives and disincentives to particular courses of people’s action in a society.
Rules shape repetition and habit, reinforcing patterns into social structures which, while not set in concrete, are enduring enough to be valued for the relative predictability they bring to daily life by becoming socialized into meaning, language and ways of upbringing. Institutions are sustained by the extent to which, in any situation, they allow a reliable enough expectation of the likely behaviour of others. When this fails for enough people in enough instances innovations to institutions can be energised and reacted against with outcomes determined by relative access to resources and the distribution of power. For example, in some countries the institution of heterosexual marriage has succumbed to challenge by those demanding equal recognition of same sex unions. In others, stricter legislation against such relationships has been enacted.

Rules can and are often are codified as respected traditions and laws which provide:

... ‘prescriptions ‘ that are used to organise all forms of repetitive and structured interactions within families, communities, organisations and markets, across social, cultural, political and economic realms. Institutions present possible paths of action for economic agents to decide about employment, production, exchange and the options between abiding by rules and shirking.  

Institutions exhibit a variety of ‘presence’ in society. Often inspired by faiths and beliefs, or secular reactions to them, some institutions become deeply embedded as values allied to habituated, normative expectations about, for example, respect of those who are different and not doing unto other what you would not want them to do to you. These rules are lived as a second nature that does not require conscious thinking. Institutions also function in the form of networks and sites of social heritage that whose rules and sanctions are ‘formal’ for those belonging to them, while remaining ‘informal’ in the sense of not seeking public recognition or registration. Formalised institutions are those populated by entities – typically registered organisations, associations and corporations - accorded an administrative or legal status within a jurisdiction. In sum, there are three types of institutions: those embedded as norms and values; those functioning ‘informally’, in the sense of operating ‘below the public radar’ of registration functioning according to their own rules, so to speak; and those formally constituted, registered and operating subject to public rules.

Another feature of institutions are their rules ‘nesting’ within others as social complexity gains in scale requiring hierarchy to maintain order and coherence. Constitutions overlay laws, which overlay regulations, which overlay social conventions and so on. In a similar sense, the three types of institutions noted above are not separate silos, but co-function in what they bring to a society and its people. As a relational behaviour, the institution of African gifting and philanthropy as a practice within it need to be looked at in these three ways.

Philanthropy and Gifting as an Institution

The humanities rely on theories of human behaviour to explain the evolution of contemporary societal conditions and institutions. That which is observed is typically accorded a contextualised and acculturated moral meaning. With a spelling adopted in English in the sixteen hundreds, the Latin etymology of philanthropy is a love of humanity. Understanding why this behaviour exists and became institutionalised as part and parcel of a society’s human relational patterns is much researched. For a long time, economics was a dominant discipline in this field because it needed and relied on particular assumptions about human relational behaviour to understand how wealth was generated. An aspiration was to model economic theory on numerical methods used by natural
The initial result was to assign human beings with a self-seeking rationality as *homo economicus*, leaving little space for other reasons why people choose to interact.

Part-inspired by Adam Smith’s *Wealth of Nations*, economics took a self-serving, selfish and materialist view of the human norm. Somewhat lost in application of his insights are writings about moral sentiments which introduced a more nuanced view. This work offered ideas about why people’s behaviour and transactions between them would include generosity and altruism even to the point of self-sacrifice for others. Over time, testing the *homo economicus* hypothesis based on self-interest as the human behavioural norm proved unsatisfactory in answering some fundamental questions, such as why generosity, what does altruism do for society, why does voluntary action and non-profit organisations exist? What, then, is an alternative explanation of people’s relational behaviour if it is not pure rationality?

A common economic behaviour research method relies on game theory. This approach has moved from university social laboratories to the real life settings of multiple countries and types of communities. Findings from this work invalidate the canon of people being an inherently predisposed to optimising the personal utility of transactions in life. Instead, a picture of human behavioural predispositions is emerging around variations within and distributions across patterns of altruism, reciprocity and free-riding.\(^{20}\) Gifting is associated with altruism, compassion and generosity – acts promoting someone else’s welfare - informed by a human capacity for empathy, i.e., a capability to place oneself in another’s position.\(^{21}\) Reciprocity infers a quid pro quo situation where the value of the transaction is an exchange considered by each of the parties involved to be sufficiently equivalent and fair. Free-riding is a selfish behaviour exploiting the efforts and assets of others.

Our hominid ancestors spent 2 million years of their existence living in small bands for which cooperative behaviour and survival were highly correlated. Today, people inhabit networks of social survival…. We are all better if we help each other out, but this creates the potential for abuse by those who take benefits without giving back. A small amount of free-riding can be tolerated, but if it becomes wide spread, then the system of mutual back scratching collapses making everyone worse off. Thus it makes sense that we have deep rooted behaviours that reward cooperation and punish free-riders.\(^{22}\)

Human beings are neither inherently altruistic or selfish; instead they are what researchers call conditional co-operators and altruistic punishers. ... a behaviour of strong reciprocity, and define it as a “predisposition to cooperate with others and to punish … those that violate the norms of cooperation … People have a highly developed sense of whom they can trust and whom they cannot, to whom they owe favours and who owes favours to them, and whether they are being taken advantage of.\(^{23}\)

Over long historical time, from internal forces the relative weighting of the three behavioural types evolves, differentiating societies as they do so, also due the arrival and influence of faith and other forms of external penetration. The ‘unselfish’ or altruistic findings of this type of research align with recent investigations in neuroscience suggest a ‘hard wiring’ of pro-social behaviour that permeates society. This does not imply that acculturated norms are standardised, but points to pro-social behaviour, such as gifting and caring, as a foundational feature of people’s lives.\(^{24}\) At some time or the other people everywhere give or receive gifts (even if they do not want them).

---

\(^{19}\) sciences.

\(^{20}\) Gifting is associated with altruism, compassion and generosity.

\(^{21}\) Reciprocity infers a quid pro quo situation where the value of the transaction is an exchange considered by each of the parties involved to be sufficiently equivalent and fair.

\(^{22}\) Free-riding is a selfish behaviour exploiting the efforts and assets of others.

\(^{23}\) Human beings are neither inherently altruistic or selfish; instead they are what researchers call conditional co-operators and altruistic punishers.

\(^{24}\) Over long historical time, from internal forces the relative weighting of the three behavioural types evolves, differentiating societies as they do so, also due the arrival and influence of faith and other forms of external penetration.
Institutionalised philanthropy emerges from relational principles self-selected through trial and error by demonstrating adequate value for a society. Gifting practices that work for enough people enough of the time are reinforced and can become encoded as laws and rules seen, for example, in the tax incentives for charities, foundations and other forms of philanthropy found in countries of Euro-America.\textsuperscript{25} In Africa, they can also derive from customary laws with a constitutional status - seen in Ghana, South Africa and other countries - creating complicated conditions of legal pluralism around, for example, gender-based land rights and polygamy.\textsuperscript{26} Relational behaviours that do not serve their users well enough are eventually selected down or out of the human relational repertoire, where 20:63:13 is taken to be fairly socially stable ratio of free-riding, reciprocity and gifting respectively.\textsuperscript{27} The table below provides illustrations of behaviour/institutional combinations.\textsuperscript{28}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relational Behaviour</th>
<th>Free-Riding</th>
<th>Reciprocal</th>
<th>Altruistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered (Vertical)</td>
<td>Ponzi Schemes</td>
<td>Producer Cooperatives</td>
<td>Charities / Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Registered (Horizontal)</td>
<td>Plagiarists</td>
<td>Self-Help Groups</td>
<td>Personal Volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded (Guiding Values)</td>
<td>Exploitation Greed</td>
<td>Mutuality Solidarity</td>
<td>Compassion Kindness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A differentiator between gifting as a moral imperative and reciprocity as a mutual exchange is an asymmetry between the value of the gift for the giver and receiver in favour of the latter. A premise of gifting is that the transaction’s anticipated value to the recipient(s) is greater than the value to the giver(s). In other words, gifting has a non-reciprocal premise serving a different relational purpose, such a redistribution of assets for the public good. In and of itself, altruism does not necessarily mean that the gift provider gains nothing in return. His or her or their feelings of justice can be rewarded, egos can be boosted, a sense of self-worth reinforced, etc.

Later sections problematize gifting, for example when the recipient accords a different value to the gift than that anticipated by the giver and many others. In addition, this definition says nothing about the motivation for gifting, nor the calculus employed against which a decision to gift or not to gift and to receive and not to receive are made. This, as we will see when discussing debates, is a problematic issue bound to contending values and world views. At this stage the task is to provide grounds for reviewing the presence of gifting in how Africa’s societies have evolved and function.

3. TERMINOLOGY - WHY FROM GIVING TO GIFTING?

A simple reason for speaking of gifting rather than giving is that the former is premised on a positive moral element while the latter needs to be qualified to understand its value. One can give someone a cold shoulder, influenza, misinformation, a helping hand, a job contact, an introduction which expands a social network and so on. Without the qualifier, giving is not, \textit{a priori}, a pro-social act.\textsuperscript{29} The \textit{Economists} choice of ‘gift’ in relation to an article about mega-philanthropists illustrates the importance of paying attention to the normative connotation of what they are doing with their wealth.
A more complicated and substantive argument for gifting is that, from an ontological point of view, it is preferable because of its place in the evolution of the human behavioural repertoire, detailed above, that is cooperative rather than competitive. In other words it is a type of transaction that co-determines the collaborative nature of the social order to be found within and across continents and countries. Section three now takes this perspective further. It argues that the strong reciprocity in giving, which characterised the continent in the long past, was overlaid by colonial penetration. For economic and political reasons, the advent of colonial rule brought non-reciprocal gifting, such as charity, into the African relational landscape. The effects of the dualism of giving as mutual solidarity and gifting as ‘other serving’ is a pluralising feature of African Philanthropy that needs to be fully appreciated and worked with.

This being said, a contemporary reality of relevance for a business school is that firms, corporations and entrepreneurs seldom see or refer to their pro-social gifting as ‘philanthropy’ but as a form of social investment with a variety of names and models detailed in section six. For practical reasons, therefore, philanthropy as referred to in this paper contains both gifting and social investment in their many forms and practices.

**Gifting in Relation to Africa’s Evolution**

The ontological argument so far is that gifting is one type of human behaviour that is primordial and over long historical time – about 100,000 years - has co-determined how societies across the world function. That gifting behaviour is found everywhere suggests that its origins are not cultural, pointing to a co-evolution between genes, mind and culture generating diversity between groups.

Given that the Chair has an Africa-wide remit, is there anything about this continent when compared with others to suggest how altruism has evolved with reciprocity and free-riding here as opposed to elsewhere? In other words, is there a way of ‘seeing’ how institutionalised gifting is in Africa with respect to other prevalent behaviours? Put differently, how have these elements of human nature interacted to shape Africa’s ways of living together, structuring to their society to arrive at social contracts guiding their governance?

A proxy way of identifying and differentiating behavioural patterns in societies is by analysing and comparing cultures as a form of ‘collective programming of the mind’ which reflects deep grained, human nature with ‘innate’ personal world views, values and framing. Researcher Geert Hofstede originally used four cultural traits to compare societies in this way. With these measures the various profiles of West Africa and East Africa are all located in similar analytic domains oriented towards collectivism and sensitivity to membership of a group. These features are predominant in poorer countries, with greater individualism seen in those which are richer. In sub-Saharan Africa, collective orientation combines with large power distances, where patriarchy determines role distributions between genders while both rely on family life for security against uncertainties. He acknowledges that these coarse, national readings need to be disaggregated by region, religion, gender, generation and class. With necessary cautions, Hofstede’s cultural profile of mutuality suggests that giving and gifting would be expected as prevalent relational norms on the continent.
By way of a note: a picture of country and regional variations can also be built up from the vast array of indices – human development, corruption, governance, ease of doing business, press freedom, competitiveness, etc. - used to classify, rank, compare and contrast countries. However, they do not focus on causes and are less amenable to teasing out similarities and differences in gifting profiles as opposed, for example, to financial giving. We will return to this point below, closing this section by summarising the propositions, or axioms, providing points of behavioural departure for gifting of and in Africa.

Working propositions
Teaching and researching philanthropy will involve assumptions about why humans behave the way they do: why do they gift rather than give, or not, to whom, with what rules, etc. At this stage it is helpful to spell out working propositions on which the Chair will initially rely. They will continually evolve when challenged and tested.

African gifting expresses itself through three types of institutions, embedded, informal and formal, the latter most closely corresponding to philanthropy as internationally understood. Institutional embedding is expressed though the moral philosophies and values that people live by day to day, informing the other two. Gifting informal institutionalism is predominantly ‘horizontal’ in nature, while its formal institutionalisation is predominantly ‘vertical’ with both endogenous and imported hybrids and blended variants between the two.

Within the normative moral premises of altruism, gifting is an asymmetric relational transaction where recipient(s) are anticipated to value the gift more than the gifter(s). The point of gifters’ anticipation is essential to leave open the use of gifts for reasons that are not altruistic. In other words, gifting can have shadow sides of the gifter using gifting as, for example, a political or manipulative tool. Put another way, and more philosophically, is there such as thing as a pure gift?

An ontological take on gifting is that it has evolved as a universal practice with acculturated features: what works well for groups and societies is reinforced, what does not is eventually selected down or out of the human relational repertoire. A percentage ratio of 20:63:13 free-riding, reciprocity and altruism respectively is taken to be a ball park starting point with significant variations that stabilize but are never static. Stable relational strategies emerge over time because they prove to work well enough for the population in enough instances over time to become institutionalised as social norms.

Africa exhibits deep rooted collective behavioural norms and pre-dispositions that can be reasonably considered to inform the continent’s pattern of behavioural relations over time. While the continent’s and country behavioural ratios are not known, how they have been influenced historically can be described, the topic of the next section.

4. AFRICAN GIFTING – AN ONTOLGICAL ENQUIRY
Continuing an ontological journey, Figure 1 sets out a conceptual approach used in this section to root the Chair in African Philanthropy on the continent. It poses and seeks to answer the question: is there a distinctive African philanthropy or a generic philanthropy with African characteristics? Subsequent sections take this query into an analytic frame work of three thematic strands –
endogenous, exogenous and blended - over time bound stages or eras: pre-colonial; colonial penetration; post-colonial self assertion; and New Age gifting starting around the beginning of this Millennium. Africa’s externally enforced incorporation into the world order brought with it foreign norms, ideas, institutions and practices of gifting. Over some three hundred years African philanthropy today has evolved as a plural, layered system of gifting that includes mixes and blending of endogenous and exogenous practices.\textsuperscript{42}

Description and explanation of rootedness moves era by era as experienced on the continent. This approach enables a dynamic view of interplays between internal and external influences on gifting as centuries unfold. For practical and forward-looking reasons, the time period given most attention, in section four, is the past 15 years or so. The earlier eras provide insights that inform interpretations of what is happening today as well as the grounds for teaching and research: what needs to be known and what has to be found out if gifting Africa is to become a mainstream discourse and feature of the continent’s development? When reading what follows it is important to appreciate that each era contains what preceded them. In other words, gifting on the continent is built up from complicated overlays rather than practices being completely left behind in one era as the next takes hold.

**Pre-Colonial: Gifting as Social Institution**

One preoccupation of anthropologists is to understand groups by means of human inter-relations operating within and between them and society more widely. A typical method is to observe and map exchanges to discern the rules in play. That is, to see exchange not as an act, but as a complex, adaptive relational system which, while based in the past, is oriented towards the future. In this era, gifting is an obligation tied to identities that underpin biological kinship and social belonging.\textsuperscript{43} In other words, pre-colonial gifting is a form of “obligatory altruism” that serves both cohesion and hierarchy. In this era economic anthropologists argue that it may be a misconception that life was poor rather than abundant.\textsuperscript{44} Consequently, there is no reason to assume that gifting was not part of an endogenous relational repertoire serving social and strategic functions.

In this extended time period, pre-state societies formed from family and kinship groups into communities and more complex socially integrated structures – bands, tribes, chiefdoms, primitive states and archaic civilizations - with increasingly sophisticated rule making around forms of cooperation and social control. In the early stages, the role of gifts within family bonds becomes central to socio-political life, its organisation, the functioning of lineage systems and the economics of survival and growth. Gifting is thus a practice with an integrating function of caring where ‘presentations’ which bond and tie under a voluntary guise are actually strictly obligatory with sanctions which are private or open.

In these total social phenomena, as we propose to call them, all kinds of institutions find simultaneous expression: religious, legal, moral and economic.\textsuperscript{45}
Figure 1. Ontological Schematic
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Hence in this reading ‘gifts’ are a transaction of social caring which is simultaneously bound up with self-interest in mutual survival and reproduction. In other words, what is treated as gifting are in fact acts of strong reciprocity. What are exchanged are not only material goods, wealth and personal property and items of economic value. To serve both collective and self-serving purposes, exchanges include:

... courtesies, entertainments, ritual, military assistance, women, children, dances and feasts; and fairs in which the market is but one element and the circulation of wealth but one part of a wide and enduring contract.  

With the development of higher order social organisation such as chiefdoms and kingdoms, intrinsic to gifting are three obligations: giving, receiving and repaying. In the first, for example, a Chief can keep authority and position if favourably regarded by the spirits, has fortune and that he is possessed by it. The demonstration of a Chief’s fortune is by way of expending that puts others ‘in the shadow of his name’. Refusing to receive a gift is itself problematic as it may show a fear of having to repay, so losing face or weight in advance or be interpreted as putting forward a challenge to the incumbent. The obligation to repay is seen to be essential for retaining face and entitlement to further support, where repaying more than is received can build relational capital and preference with those in power. Set against this asymmetry is an accountability of those with power who must meet people’s expectations day by day and consult to retain their blessing on authority over matters affecting the whole.

We may then consider that the spirit of gift-exchange is characteristic of societies which have passed from the stage of ‘total prestation’ (between clan and clan and family and family) but have not yet reached the stage of pure individual contract, the money market, sale proper fixed price and coined money.

Bonding and exchange in this era has a psycho-social effect on identity conceived as a moral philosophy of Ubuntu, that is a profound mutualness of being as humans. This entrenched ethic of a person as an expression of African humanism is the substrate on which moral judgements about gifting were made and institutionally embedded. Migration to Africa of Coptic and Muslim faiths and teachings from the Middle East, seen in Ethiopia and countries bordering the south of the Sahara, introduced additional moral imperatives associated with alms, tithing and zakat. This natural migration was politicized and contained by colonial action in favour of Christianity.

In sum, facing colonial incursion is a customary narrative and morality in gifting as an embedded practice of strong reciprocity in social relations and collective identities. Giver and recipient are mainly known to each other. Their social capital is tied to their giving behaviour. A transactions’ economic value is not monetised, while the obligations involved serve to hold structure and authority in place but with direct accountability. In this era, the notion of gifting is not primarily an asymmetric form of altruism but a ‘horizontal’ bonding mechanism.

**The Colonial Period: Customary-Modern Adaptations**

Colonial penetration and subordination of the continent’s population brought with it economic, political, psychological and cultural forces, disrupting pre-existing embedded relational processes which demanded adaptation, endogenous gifting included. The legitimacy for governing was that of conquest. The Berlin Conference of 1884-1885 codified the geography of the territorial Scramble for Africa at a time when European economies where industrialising, allied to accelerating mercantilist
expansion. Territorial certainty aided incorporation into the economy of the Metropolis, justifying expenditure on colonial administration and pacification. As far as possible, these costs had to be financed locally, increasing economic demands on the populace. Prior to this, and continuing, the moral intentions of colonialist European countries were to ‘civilize’ backward populations. Christianity was a psychological handmaiden in this endeavour founded on caritas, or love for others. It is here that gifting as an institutionalised asymmetric and vertical interaction gained hold. For the population, evolution of gifting in this era of rural-urban displacement and monetization served four broad purposes: risk spreading, reputational maintenance, political resistance and continuity in reproduction.

Gifting as charity was introduced to Africa as an expression of Christian faith in practice. We need not dwell on debates about Christianity’s role in ameliorating sharper, dehumanising facets of colonial rule or its prophetic role in standing up against injustices, such a slavery, which reached into the ruling power’s political decision-making process. The point is that caritas introduced a form of gifting that did not rely on personal obligation between parties as such. Rather, theology decreed that all those suffering had a right to succour and comfort by the church. The advent, in England in the early sixteen hundreds of charity legislation established an institutionalised form of gifting that conforms more closely with asymmetry in relative value between gifter and recipient. This British legislative history usually became incorporated in the legislation of colonized countries as it did in those of France with the Civic Code.

Gifting also expanded with the European notion of voluntarism – giving ones time for free. This concept can be confused with African traditions of labour sharing. It also can be confused with an association of volunteering outside of one’s work place in formalised economies and as ‘gift’ of the well-to-do as a form of paternalistic benevolence to show that one cares. This era started to see a ‘connected separation’ in treating volunteering as: (i) citizen engagement in public affairs and as (ii) an economic contribution of business to society, a division to which we will return.

By the end of the colonial period, ‘charitableness’ had become part and parcel of gifting in its full asymmetric sense. Populated and propagated by missionaries, Christian gifting was increasingly provided by donations from growing middle classes in the colonial homeland, enabling faiths and non-profit and international non-governmental organisations (INGOs) across Africa and elsewhere to globalize social welfare as a non-state system, such as medical clinics and hospitals, schools, institutionalised care for orphans, the destitute and others that both communal and official support were ignoring or leaving behind. This process of institutionalised gifting on the continent was both accelerated and expanded by emergence in the late nineteenth century and most notably in America, of secular, endowed philanthropies. These non profit entities - enjoying tax benefits for bequests – were initiated and endowed by ultra-rich capitalists like Carnegie, Rockefeller and Ford who bequeathed their personal wealth for the public good. This impetus gave rise to a practice and profession of grant making that took an international turn as countries gained independence from colonial rule.

In parallel, on economic and political fronts, a peasant mode of production with subordinated livelihoods tied to insecurity and uncertainty about generating a surplus for sale, had to accommodate the economics of colonialism which were essentially extractive. Enforced
monetization and internal dislocations provided the labour required to take out raw materials for value added use in metropolitan economies. That which was ‘traditional’ - including values - was treated as an obstacle to be transformed into the image of a modern country. Consequently, individuals and their relations required a modernizing change in personal qualities and norms.\textsuperscript{56} Pressures in these directions and population growth acted inter-generationally in ways that could work against, but also reinforce, endogenous dimensions of social relations, such as kinship ties.\textsuperscript{57} In relation to gifting, these processes are difficult to assess and weigh against each other but history does point to a sort of pan-African patterning.

One review of a response to colonial penetration across the continent shows adaption of customary gifting practices by forming an \textit{economy of affection}, which has nothing to do with fond emotions per se.\textsuperscript{58} By this is meant:

... a network of support, communications and interactions among structurally defined groups connected by blood, kin, community or other affinities, for example, religion. It links together in a systematic fashion a variety of discrete economic and social units which in other regards might be autonomous. ... These are ‘invisible organisations’ which tend to be readily forgotten in the development debate, yet they constitute both opportunities and constraints for efforts to change African societies in the years to come.\textsuperscript{59}

Genealogical ties are extended from rural to urban areas as well as diversifying income away from the uncertain seasonality of subsistence household production: giving now helps to spread and attenuate family survival risk. With forced displacement of males, migration and loss of face to face interaction on a daily basis, social status and reputation maintenance become tied to the quality and frequency of giving and gifting in both directions. Remaining a respected member of your group means that attention to customary obligations matters, perhaps even more than before. Education and wider access to information foster political awareness and disaffection. Resistance to colonial rule spreads through affection networks and embedded social institutions operating below the view of the authorities, resourced by giving of privileged information, time for mobilization, organising materials and providing funding.\textsuperscript{60} In addition, reproduction, both physical and social, draws on a reciprocal and gifting economy to gain recognition and support for separated offspring: a communal obligation seen today, for example, in grandparents looking after HIV/AIDS orphans of others than their own family. The overall point is that throughout the colonial era adaptations to giving and gifting generated resilience as a system of social protection among the indigenous population, with its own accountability, self-financing and self-governing mechanisms.\textsuperscript{61}

A dynamic of adaptation also held true for populations imported by colonial powers: Asians in East Africa Levantines in West Africa. Their modus of gifting oriented towards charity and making good welfare failures of the colonial government found it morally incumbent as well as politically expedient not to limit gifting to their own communities.\textsuperscript{62}

The degree to which colonial penetration reached deep into endogenous society and giving practices varies. For example, sedentary economies and populations often proved easier to administer than pastoral. The resources attractive for extraction – agricultural or mineral - made different demands on labour needs, on the speed of urbanization, on the geography and intensity of family separation and communications country by country. Consequently, how networks of an economy of affection operated are unlikely to have been ‘standardized’. Whatever the case, the legacy of social
obligation, reciprocal and gifting was, if anything, probably reinforced as economic survival and political mobilization mechanisms than it was eroded by the demands of a modernizing economy.

So, as colonialism drew to a close, what did African gifting look like? It was basically dualistic and pluralising. The strong reciprocity of endogenous giving was now paralleled by externally driven and codified forms of gifting that separated the giver from knowing or relating to the recipient. In the latter, anonymity between the two gave decision-making power to professionals with their ideas and norms – usually in their own image - about what value for the beneficiary means. Over a long time span, often bounded by ethnic affinities, mixed with religion and nascent class differentiation, customary adaptations to demands of the colonial order and modernity had self-established relational webs of giving and gifting permeating a country. This ‘invisible system’ was a safety net for the still high proportion of mainly poor and oppressed populations and was to play a significant role in the post-colonial order and philanthropy as it operates in Africa today. Charitableness arose as a sort of intermediary blending that was increasingly Africanised as Christian or Muslim religious affiliation grew. In doing so, charity itself became imbued with the use of pre-existing symbols, references, values and African religious thinking.63

Post-Colonial I: (Inter)National Presencing

This period spans about forty years from the independence of many African countries to the start of this Millennium. The latter date is selected because it roughly corresponds to major changes and additions to the thinking and practice of foreign philanthropy and African gifting detailed in the next section. In this era, Africa sought to become present on the world stage in its own way in its own right. This agenda called for an authentic standing, vision and voice in the continent’s global affairs; a reinstatement of indigenous norms and values accommodating African cosmology. A legitimacy in governing called for a re-inscription of an African identity often overlaid with that of Christianity and Islam and other faiths colonial powers.64 Given Africa’s subordination in the world economy, foreign control on many investments and an impoverished population this indigenising agenda needed to be realised with the helping hand, or gift, of foreign aid.

What transpired in this process is a story of gifting which, while gaining in scale, became highly politicized, sowing seeds of mistrust in the motives of foreign givers and Africa’s leaders. Three major interacting factors led to this outcome: the behaviours of international aid; the politics of post-independence ‘nation-building’ and governing; and a reinforcement of communal mechanisms of survival and resistance crafted during the colonial era. We start with the nature of dependency on international aid its effects, politically and psychologically.

The Gift of Aid for Development

“Foreigners bear strange gifts to the host.”
African Proverb65

“The hand that gives is always on top.”
Nigerian Proverb66

From the outset, official foreign aid was and remains an instrument in the armoury of international relations. Deployed during the years of the Cold War, foreign assistance was distributed to reward
and bind those on the continent aligning with the West or the East. Subsequent to the implosion of the Soviet Union, geo-political motives gave way to assistance premised more strongly on economic growth and trickle down of benefits to poor people, which started to incorporate and impose political, governance and institutional requirements on recipients, referred to as second generation conditionality. Post-colonial bi-lateral interests and donors’ ideological pre-dispositions saw an uneven distribution of aid to more or less favoured regions and countries as well as economic benefits for donor countries themselves. Even within Least Developed Countries (LDCs) – many in Africa – the amount of assistance was not strongly correlated to degree of poverty in a recipient country, nor to its level of corruption. In this respect, donor governments were culpable in what was (not) going on with their finance, such as leaders ‘gifting themselves’ by placing public aid money in overseas private bank accounts. The notion of ‘partnership’ as the relational quality between official aid givers and their recipients masks this systemic failure to act.

Patricia Adams of Probe International, a Toronto-based environmental group, charged that, “in most cases, Western governments knew that substantial portions of their loans – up to 30 percent, says the World Bank – went directly into the pockets of corrupt officials, for their personal use.” Aid retains an institutionalised asymmetry in incentives between giver and receiver abetted by a lack of trust on both sides identified in a SIDA study. The amount of financial resources and technical assistance to the continent during this period is substantial. The years 1960-1997 saw more than US$500 billion allocated to the continent, yet per capita GDP declined. “Extreme generosity can ruin a person.”

Ghanaian Proverb

African disillusionment with gifting and the gifting was in play.

Most Africans are sceptical. They have heard those righteous calls before. Every decade or so, a throng of Western donors, African governments, and international organizations gathers to announce grand initiatives to pull the world’s poorest continent out of its economic miasma. Congratulatory pats on the back are exchanged. Delegates return home and then nothing much is heard after that. Back in 1985, the United Nations held a Special Session on Africa to boost aid to Africa. In March 1996, the United Nations launched a $25 billion Special Initiative for Africa. They all fizzled. Why should Africans place any faith in the current initiatives to reverse Africa’s economic atrophy?

The degree of recipient government dependency on official aid varied enormously but remained a significant issue with repeated calls for this situation to change. Its effects on politics of citizen and state will reappear after a discussion of the private aid community. The point is not that aid was unable to produce gains in welfare and well-being of African people – albeit very unreliable at doing so – but that its neo-colonial behaviour was generating negative psychological effects.

Alongside official aid, particularly starting around 1980, were an array of non-state actors committed to the continent’s development each bringing their own motivations and gifting practices. By and large, private foreign aid complemented the official line, often arguing it was more cost-effective at micro-level interventions than recipient governments. These private efforts were spurred by both concerns about long term development as well as by humanitarian crises, such as conflicts, drought, famine and floods.
In the form of grant making, private philanthropy to Africa came from churches, individuals, charities, Foundations and international businesses, the latter often guided by local managers towards the interests of local communities in which their employers lived.

With an eye of for public relations and for the contentment of their stockholders, they generally wish to gain some legitimate benefit from their philanthropies and, at the very least, to avoid controversies.\textsuperscript{80}

Outside of corporations with profits, the source of money for grants or charitable works required ‘marketing’ in their home countries which, too often, portrayed the continent in a pathetic light. Sources also included grant making from endowments giving rise to issues of public accountability prevalent today. While to some extent remedied in the later years of this period, the imagery projected into the minds of a giving public in rich countries is seeks to trigger an altruistic / generous response. The potential private gifter is informed and educated about Africa with an anticipated value for recipients over which they have little, if any, effective say or control.\textsuperscript{81}

Across Africa, international nongovernmental organisations INGOs have been a significant part of the private gifting landscape. A recent estimate is that they collectively raise and disburse anything ranging from US$ 50.8 – 76 billion with some $20 billion sourced from official agencies and much of the total deployed to African countries.\textsuperscript{82} With the concept of partnership, they have sought to work with recipient counterparts and communities in ways that attenuate the inherent power asymmetry involved. Success in this regard has been limited – the viability of INGOs would be weakened if African NGOs took direct hold of the funding reins.\textsuperscript{83} A consequence is recipient ‘partner’ frustration with a rhetoric-reality gap undermining confidence in the gifter’s ostensible motivations.

One major reason for this Northern dominance is the perception of professionalism, and thus legitimacy. Yet this perception of professional superiority creates a system in which well-established international organizations view themselves as wholesalers, expanding their footprint by distributing globally produced human rights products for a donor to domestic NGO retailers. The job of local activists is then simply to publicize and distribute, rather than to co-produce. This is not only humiliating and disempowering for local NGOs, but also devalues the special wisdom of local activists, local histories of rights seeking, and the uniqueness of regional cultures.\textsuperscript{84}

The expansion of non-state actors from NGOs to civil society widened aid interest in unions, faiths, social movements and other types of organisations with members and whose functioning was less based on playing an intermediary role. However, this shift did not deepen an understanding and valuation of the ‘indigenous’ forms of associational life on the continent. Moreover, the aid system found it difficult to adapt its practices to accommodate civil society actors with roots that did not operate along the lines of projects. In short, expanding the discourse to civil society did little to recognise the organic nature of associational life, the economy of affection being but one example.\textsuperscript{85}

It is probably fair to say that few if any Africans have not been ‘recipients’ of foreign inspired policies – like structural adjustment – or firsthand experience of on-the-ground poverty-alleviation projects and programmes both official and private. By the end of the past Millennium Africa’s experience of continual dependency was eroding confidence in the morals and efficacy of grant aid from almost whatever source.\textsuperscript{86} Examples of where this feeling was not held, such as those moving out of poverty through micro-finance,\textsuperscript{87} were exceptional cases far from the relational norm. The issue was
becoming a recipient question: could foreign gifting be trusted to be in the interest of Africa’s people? A query sharpened by the post-independence behaviour of African leaders.

**Gifting in Post-Independence Politics**

With pan-Africanism as an inspiration, leaders of post-independence countries voiced powerful aspirations for the continent to regain its own identity, function by its own values and norms and re-inscribe into consciousness that which had been denied as knowledge if it did not correspond to Western post-Enlightenment rationalities and prescriptions. These intentions translated into a programme for ‘nation building’ that, after an encouraging start, led to economic setbacks in the mid-seventies entrenching single party-political systems and virtually unaccountable Big Man leaders, conditioned towards the *Politics of the Belly*. Fanon’s warning came to pass. The initial post-colonial period reproduced the structure of colonial governing which preceded it, a break occurring in the mid nineteen eighties when a ‘second liberation’ of multi-party politics appeared as the new dispensation, albeit unevenly adopted. But, by then a major alteration had occurred in the public-private gifting landscape.

The Nigerian political scientist, Peter Ekeh observed that post-colonial African countries were structured as two publics: a ‘primordial’ and a ‘civic’. Institutions of state are separate from the population, a situation part-enabled by flows of international aid which reduced reliance on and sensitivity to the people as tax payers with rights. Often with a sense of entitlement from roles in anti-colonial struggles, or the advantages of colonial appointments deployed in systems of (in)direct rule, social formations were reproduced by new African elites, trading ideologies with their elite colonial counterparts.

The “primordial” public realm has been distorted and reconfigured by both colonial, apartheid and white-minority regimes, but also by self-interested African traditional authorities. Colonial, apartheid and white-minority governments in Africa deliberately ran a dual governance system.

Sadly, at the end of colonialism, apartheid and white-minority regimes, African liberation and independence movements adopted the dual system from these regimes, this time allowing traditional authorities to rule their local “subjects”, on condition they get their “subjects” to vote for the independence or liberation movement governments.

Africa’s new rulers effectively continued the system of governance which they inherited, but building on the latencies of customary practices where personal affinities and gifting were ‘expected’ of chiefs and kings. A difference in gifting became one of extracting, controlling and allocating public resources for personal wealth and political power. Bringing trade unions and producer associations under the wing of the single party undermined alternative member-based sites of resistance. Requiring sales of agricultural products to parastatal corporations ensured capture of surplus into government coffers while controlling their distribution to favoured constituencies. Economic and political elites intertwined to create barriers to entry of others, continuing the process of wealth accumulation from the population by refining the state as a predatory instrument, but in the name of people’s own development. Gifting thus became a political instrument buying allegiance and punishing dissent by denial of public resources. Tade Aina describes in detail, for example, of processes where the communal self-help principle of *Harambee* in Kenya was co-opted and then enforced as a sort of tax.
Faced with this state behaviour, people resorted to economies of affection initially crafted under the yoke of colonial rule. These trusted, informally institutionalised affinity networks deepened, thickening social formations. Mechanisms included: establishing and registering ethnic-based organisations; registering local NGOs enabling resource transfer from the formal to the informal economy as well as opening pathways to voice in governance; forming networks facilitating access to state employment and attracting public resources. Uncaptured peasants created parallel market denying the state revenue. A sort of internal Diaspora socio-political and economic structuring operates alongside the formal systems of (decentralising) public administration at a scale which was hard to determine in value or effectiveness. Perhaps paradoxically, innovation to better avoid state predation for personal enrichment by the elite actually ‘modernises’ and pluralises the customary, horizontal gift economy and its social welfare provisioning which a government is too stressed to provide. It could be argued that this subsurface gifting system has prevented people falling into greater deprivation as population growth outstripped per capita GDP.

Broadly expressed and varied country by country, towards the end of the first forty post-colonial years, aid as a ‘partnership’ gift had been unable to reduce structural dependency or alter a psychology of recipient countries as supplicants that was fostering growing irritation. Over the years, and despite changes in Euro-American political leaderships and ideologies, the asymmetric nature of the gifting relationship had been institutionalised for official aid agencies as well as for INGOs and their local offspring. The fact that a principle of local ownership and leadership was placed in the Paris Agenda for Aid Effectiveness in 2005, reconfirmed that blending exogenous assistance with local realities and practices had, if not totally failed, left very much to be desired.

The situation for grant making foundations differed, in part because the notion of partnership was not in the discourse or mutual understanding. A grantee was responsible for the effective realisation of grant outcomes. Put another way, unbound by the rule of an aid chain and inter-governmental relations, Foundations could and did start it explore alternative ways to pluralise, hybridize and blend endogenous and exogenous, illustrated in financing of Community Foundations and investment in African philanthropic institutions, such as local foundations.

Within the continent, endogenous gifting followed two interacting tracks. One was ‘horizontal’ based on updated customary norms, organisational forms and practices. The range of resources available widened, as were the types of value sought and given. Money was but one form of support, alongside prayer, voluntary time, advice, access to contacts and mechanisms to maintain and gain social capital through gifting behaviour within ones means. The other track was ‘vertical’ in terms of the state as an elite-serving untrustworthy intermediary to resource allocation of external aid and predatory taxation, where gifts – essentially money - served patrimonial and voter allegiance purposes. Gifting was imbued with (distributional) politics. From a poor person’s point of view, survival required judicious decision making to optimize being a recipient of both. The subsequent period was to see the start of a significant shift in part of this landscape.

5. THE CONTEMPORARY SCENE – LOCAL RESOURCE MOBILIZATIONS

From the perspective of African gifting the past fifteen years or so has seen marked alterations in thinking and practices, both endogenous and exogenous. One is the economic upliftment of many national economies allied to the China effect on access to development capital, with its geo-political
dimensions. The emergence of a growing African middle class and of Africa’s super-wealthy is another factor in play. In addition, the 2008 financial crisis in Euro-America has caused a negative impact on many aid budgets and on how Africa regards old donor countries as models. The Paris Declaration and Millennium Development Goals had brought some degree of donor focus with balanced dialogues between gifters and recipients.\textsuperscript{106} It remains to be seen if that process can be maintained with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). This section reviews these and other factors as pointers to how African gifting might evolve as an \textit{economy of affinity}, concentrating on building from within a continent where identity - premised on deep rooted belongingness as opposed to atomised family life and social alienation - can be an exceptional resource.

\textbf{Towards an African Gift Economy}

The following paragraphs review the numerous factors that are likely to co-determine the size and shape of an African gift economy in the short to medium term. They include: (1) the stance of African regimes; (2) the current scale and profiles of gifting by external aid and new donors; (3) Africa’s economic trajectory; (4) the gifting behaviours of the emerging middle class and High Net Worth Individuals; (5) Diaspora flows; and (6) corporate gifting.

\textit{Regimes:} Regimes in a number of African countries are showing a growing intolerance of foreign funded civil society organisations when their ‘gift’ to society is critical advocacy, building pressure for social justice and equality rather than provision of social welfare services.\textsuperscript{107} At first sight, a general trend of governments towards closing civic space would bode ill for pro-gifting laws and public policies which could open up new, autonomous, sites of social influence.\textsuperscript{108} This political factor is complicating local resource mobilization coming into Africa’s gifting space. Regime stance towards increasing incentives for local gifting is relatively unknown and important territory to explore.\textsuperscript{109} Country-by-country approaches to understanding this dimension of mobilization will be necessary.

\textit{External aid:} With the SDGs now approved, their implementation in Africa and impact on gifting are anyone’s guess, which calls for systematic tracking. A similar uncertainty is in play as China’s footprint – and BRICs more generally - enlarges on the continent, which cuts in two ways.\textsuperscript{110} One is China as an aid and development agency which does not want to interfere in a country’s internal affairs. The other is effects on recipient-country politics towards non-state actors and their agendas.\textsuperscript{111} On the one hand, China’s aid programme is expanding from infrastructure development to include capacity and human resource development, i.e., towards social welfare. The South-South analogous experiences and current conditions of rural poverty may offer affinity with and support for enhancing the customary ‘horizontal’ gifting system. On the other hand, China’s approach to non-state actors, such as NGOs and Foundation is a delicate balance of encouraging while constraining, which may be motivating African leaders to pay less and less regard to Western concerns about shrinking space for civil society. Declining aid dependency on traditional donors reduces their leverage. China’s impact on the gifting landscape invites attention.

On the traditional aid front, Euro-America’s 2008 economic crisis and its negative effect on development assistance allocations has been lauded by some as a way to break out of a dependency syndrome.\textsuperscript{112} A question, then, is will a shortfall in aid flows spur governments to provide incentives for domestic gifting that can help make good reductions in external support?
Africa’s potential: The image and adage Africa Rising signals a recent (now flagging?) expectation, or hope, that the continent is on an economic pathway similar to Asia. That is, a trajectory which will imbue new confidence and energy into the populations’ ability to lift itself out of poverty, ending Africa as a special case and its dependency on foreign aid.\(^{113}\) A pivotal feature of this expectation is that economic expansion above the rate of population growth will enable a (younger), more entrepreneurial middle class to take hold of the continent’s future. What a middle class means in the context of Africa is far from settled.\(^{114}\) Also uncertain is what this will mean for their gifting behaviours. For example, will there be preferences for gifting towards social welfare intermediaries and charities, or towards communal affinities and networks, or towards newly created civic entities? Beyond personal consumption, to what extent will gifting feature in African middle class expenditures and to what ends?

A landmark study marks a significant step forward in estimating the potential of what local resource mobilization on the continent might mean. Doing so, introduced four categories of gifting: community-based; personal in-kind services, such as volunteering; mobilized resources from many people to many people; High Net Worth Individuals; and Corporate.\(^{115}\) This exercise, summarised in Table 1., relied on many proxy measure and extrapolations as well as confirming the limits of available information associated with the value of an economy of affection (community based and personalised). These latter transactions involve forms of gifting – such as prayer and emotional support -that are difficult, if not impossible to monetise or commoditize.

Yet, as section four argues, their gifting value is intrinsic to social capital, cohesion and resilience of poor people and extended communities. Just because horizontal systems of gifting are difficult for outsider to see, does not mean insignificance for the continent’s well-being and development.\(^{116}\) For example, a case study imputing value of community contributions in 2009 found that: “The impressive sum of R371, 150 was generated by 4,343 people across 378 households where 60 per cent of families are considered by local government as living in poverty.”\(^{117}\) But, as the table shows, this type of data and robust methods of imputing the value of horizontal gifting are major gaps to be filled.

**Table 2. Pan-African Gifting – Value estimates by category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Gifting</th>
<th>Estimated Annual Amount US$ Billion</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community-based (Needs Within)</td>
<td>no estimate</td>
<td>p. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-kind and services (Personalised Gifting)</td>
<td>~&gt;2.6 bn</td>
<td>p. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilized (Many to Many)</td>
<td>2.61 bn</td>
<td>p. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Net Worth Individuals (One to Many)</td>
<td>2.8bn - Conservative case 7.0bn - High case</td>
<td>p. 13 Potential, not actual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate</td>
<td>3.2 bn</td>
<td>p. 13, fn. 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AGN 2013, Sizing the Field

A very crude valuation of the continent’s economy of affection is an estimate of the income per capita of the continent’s poor which circulates to fulfil community based needs - an annual equivalent of US$2.8 bn\(^{118}\) – plus the in kind services that can be non-financial, totalling some US$5 billion. There is obviously no way of estimating dual counting between the two. In addition, networks of the economy of affection are not, a priori, populated only by people who are poor.\(^{119}\)
As a heuristic exercise, using Africa’s average annual incomes arrives at some US$30bn circulating as ‘invisible gifting’ within the economy of affection.\textsuperscript{120} Obviously these figures are little more than speculative, but can give some sense of what a more inclusive approach to African gifting might look like in monetary terms.

A 2008 study in South Africa, painted a detailed picture of gifting.\textsuperscript{121} Bearing in mind the country’s distinct socio-economic circumstances and post-apartheid legacies, the picture is of active gifting but dispelling any idea that this financial effort is ever likely to be on a par with the state. The work supports an economy of affection thesis. Also offered are case insights of community resource mobilization, dependencies and the micro roles of external agents that illustrate blended gifting.\textsuperscript{122}

Using three types of gifting: money, voluntary time and helping a stranger, the World Giving Index 2016 ranks African countries from Kenya highest at 1\textsuperscript{2}, with Morocco lowest at 1\textsuperscript{23}. This survey will be a critical comparative resource between countries and over time as well as a guide to research. What the survey does not do, however, is consider the relationship between gifting and its performance within (groups) in society.

These findings offer country-specific evidence of gifting that do not resolve the unknowns of pan-African middle-class behaviour as they become richer and even join the economic super-elite. For example, are there potentially contrary effects of a growing middle class being outstripped by expansion in number and assets of high net worth individuals (HNWI) while, in sharp contrast, African economic refugees are risking life and limb to reach Europe. Will such blatant inequalities spur gifting which counters political unrest and instability? A ten year old study of elite perceptions of inequality in South Africa suggest not:

Let us return to our question: do elites possess a more immediate and compelling sense of obligation to the poor within their own social segment? In most cases the answer is ‘not to any great degree’.\textsuperscript{124}

We do not know what might have shifted in terms of obligations since then. Simply put, across the sub-Sahara, the jury is out with respect to Africa’s middle class profile and their gifting behaviour. The story is becoming somewhat less uncertain when it comes to Africa’s growing number of HNWIs and how they ‘Give Back’.\textsuperscript{125} Table 1., shows estimates of their gifting amounts between US$2.8 and 7 billion per annum. Their:

Giving takes several forms. Monetary giving scored the highest, but most wealthy individuals gave time, skills and experience as well as in-kind donations, with many confirming that they are investing more of their time, social capital and skills to help the causes they support.

Giving of assets, making social investments and providing access to networks also take place, though at lower levels. (AGN: 2014: 10)

Recipients are, by and large, registered secular non-profits or individuals, with religious entities as one third. One conclusion is that Africa’s HNWIs, need to be more strategic in their approach with more attention paid to the actual performance and impact of what they contribute. The good news is that for welfare-oriented non-profit organisations HNWIs may be a prospective source of local resources. The picture is less good for organisations more directly dedicated to sensitive issues of social justice and rights. The business-related risk taking of HNWIs seems not translate into their gifting.
Diaspora: The scale and application of Diaspora financing is gaining better scrutiny, raising issues, amongst others, of appropriate public policies. With some 30 million Africans living overseas the estimated scale of remittances, some US$ 40 bn transferred annually in 2008, outstripped foreign direct investment and official development assistance. These resources are mainly used for household consumption and investment reducing the severity of deprivation and poverty.

Migrant remittances have become a major source of financing for developing countries and are particularly important in Sub-Saharan Africa. The increasing role of remittances, especially their ability to remain resilient during periods of economic and financial crises, has spurred an interest in development practitioners who wish to understand the nature, potential development impact, and policy implications of remittance flows.

Remittances are finely targeted to recipients based on geo-ethnic origins and affinities. Motivations for remittances include pure altruism, exchange, investment, insurance and pure self-interest. At a macro-economic level, rather than being counter-cyclical providing support when growth slows down, remittances tend to go with the flow of a country’s growth path.

... even though REM may be small as a share of GDP, it may amount to a large share of the income of recipient households and may therefore have a substantial impact on the stability of these households’ income and play a role in insuring the families against transitory shocks to income.

From an Africa gifting point of view, this type of resourcing blends the values of accumulation and surplus generation with those of customary obligations. In so doing, they need to be explored as potential pathways to local resource mobilization beyond kith and kin and for agendas that expand beyond provision of social welfare.

Corporate gifting: The international profile of corporate gifting is multi-faceted. It comprises corporate social responsibility and investment (CSR/CSI); discounting products and making in-kind contributions for ‘good causes’; employer-supported volunteering; secondments; and partnerships, typically with non-profit organisations. It includes grant funding by a corporation’s own foundation, such as one for Africa established by the Heineken company. As noted previously, transnational corporations can also mandate their subsidiaries to undertake CSR/I, particularly in jurisdictions like South Africa where it is a requirement for stock exchange listing. The value of what transnational corporations’ gift as CSR/I across the continent is not known for sure.

From a local resource mobilization point of view, African gifting needs to focus on businesses that are part and parcel of the national economy. Their giving or gifting is estimated at US$3.2 bn per year. Because businesses generate their own gift revenues, a critical issue where the amounts are actually allocated and why: what attracts corporate giftings attention with what decision-making calculus? It is beyond the scope of this section to summarise what the African CSR/CSI literature says and the debates it provokes, other than to reiterate a difference between large corporations and SMEs in their gifting behaviours found in South Africa as they moved from a Chairman’s whim to a professional approach within corporate life.
In this study, a major beneficiary for corporate gifting is education probably tied to self-interest in an improved work force on the one hand, with the legacy of apartheid on educational segregation another. For SMEs the picture differs.

... What SMEs give is not peanuts.  
... small business giving is often directed at the micro level – money for book prizes and trophies ate schools ... there is often a thin red line between individual and corporate giving.  
...There is no heroism here but sheer charity. By contrast, many big corporate see CSI as an opportunity to get a spanking annual report, a photo opportunity.133

The extent to which this study reflects the wider continent is obviously open to question, as does its portrayal of CSR and CSI as operating today. Be that as it may, from an African gifting point of view this work suggests that business behaviours are better viewed through an expanding lens of stakeholder interests and their capabilities to engage rather than as beneficiaries. A detailed look may help identify the ‘affinities’ or ‘attractors’ that underlie CSR/.

**African gifting: towards an economy of affinity:** It is some forty years since an economy of affection was identified as a self-sustaining system deployed by communities. The continent’s development since points to a need to update this concept to take into account the socio-economic stratification, geographical dispersion, the shifts in corporate thinking and a pluralising evolution in philanthropic practices that are now underway, all of which are attracted by something worth gifting to. Put another way the affections of kith and kin around which socio-political life revolves is being incorporated into a broadening to affinity – to a cause, to an institution, to a faith, to a population group. As a working idea, an economy of affinity may be a useful concept to hold together the disparate nature of this dedicated field of study, now influenced by rapid movement in philanthropic forms, norms and practices described next.

**African Gifting and New Age Philanthropies**

Outside the continent, state welfare provision in many donor countries is both shrinking and being privatized or NGO-ized or a combination of the two made possible by new legal structures. The advent of living mega philanthropists is associated with the application of more commercial and entrepreneurial principles to their grant making. Additionally, a plethora of other ‘New Age’ philanthropies are altering the rules of the game which is taking social enterprise in novel directions. The presence and expansion of New Age philanthropies on the continent is already in play. But what ‘gifts’ do they bring, on what terms, to whose benefit? These changes in philanthropic thinking and practices occur alongside reforms in the older grant-making foundations as they adapt to the evolving world order with a newer set of counterparts that, to greater and lesser degrees, challenge the models of old. Will their institutional nature and practice towards Africa alter by, for example, taking on board the character of Africa’s own gifting traditions rather than assuming that they have little to learn from them? Conversely will Africa’s own gifters be attracted to what these new models have to offer?

A signature feature of the past fifteen years has been the arrival of philanthropies premised on both grant-making and non-grant making investment models. In terms of the former, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation heralded the advent of ‘mega-philanthocapitalism’ with relatively young living owner-philanthropists at their helm. Mega-philanthropies, as the name implies, typically involve an individual accumulation of vast wealth made possible by a capitalist economic system
which is then returned to society according to priorities set by those who govern the entity, appointed by those providing the resources. Their modality of gifting deploys business thinking, concentrating on market mechanisms to create social gains at a significant scale. Discussed in the next section, and alluded to in a quotation at the start of this paper, their arrival has energised a number of debates. Corporate gifting is also on the move, discussed after a review of new approaches to philanthropy with a variety of principles and labels.

Alongside mega-philanthropies is an array of innovations where non-grant makers seek to invest in ways which marry social and economic returns. The array carries a number of labels suggesting different approaches to the same issue: how to create social good that is simultaneously economically viable. One stimuli in this development has been the create of new legal structures – Limited Liability Companies (LLCs) in the United States and Charitable Incorporated Companies (CIOs) in Britain - designed to better enable a combination of social and technical goals, used for example for the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative.  

Below is an illustrative list of types under a broad category of self-sustaining social investing.

Social Investment: Social investment is the use of repayable finance to deliver social impact as well as a financial return. This broad category is often ‘twinned’ with social enterprise and social entrepreneurship, but it is also a category populated by social investment funds and professional investment houses mandated to invest ‘owner’s money in entities with social goals in ways that ensure their financial sustainability.

Creative philanthropy: “By this we mean the unique capacity of foundations to spot innovative solutions to problems, to jump-start and then help sustain the innovation process, and to help disseminate and implement results. Specifically: Creativity is the act of finding an approach to a solution of a perceived problem or need, and for generating or making possible some kind of innovation in response. An innovation is an idea, practice, or object that is perceived as new.”

Venture philanthropy: Venture philanthropy works to build stronger social purpose organisations by providing them with both financial and non-financial support in order to increase their societal impact. The European Venture Philanthropy Association (EVPA) purposely uses the word societal because the impact may be social, environmental, medical or cultural. The Venture Philanthropy approach includes both the use of social investment and grants.

Catalytic philanthropy: “Catalytic philanthropy is an approach practiced by innovative funders to create transformative change beyond writing the check. Truly catalytic philanthropists often ‘punch above their (financial) weight’ by leveraging their voice, community relationships, and non-grant making skills such as convening and capacity building to drive social change.”

Impact investing philanthropy: “Impact investments are investments made into companies, organizations, and funds with the intention to generate social and environmental impact alongside a financial return.”

Strategic philanthropy: “Strategic philanthropy works to identify opportunities for leveraging change much greater than the size of the investment — small amounts of money that start making large impacts. These investments tend to be long-term in nature, upstream focused and come with a higher risk for a higher potential return. These are often focused on changing systems and regularly have an influence or public policy connection.”
A feature of these last four variations an implicit premise that any investment which is not dedicated
to and optimised purely for a financial return is some sort of philanthropic act. This Euro-
Americanised understanding of philanthropy cannot, a priori, be equated with gifting.

These innovations in philanthropy are not as distinctive as the labelling would imply. Some are
variations in practice: catalytic to stimulate the work of other actors; strategic to concentrate on
root causes, using systems analysis and complexity thinking. Consistent is the idea that economic
viability and social gains for society can go hand in hand. The figure below portrays this as a
spectrum of priority focus.

This observation does not detract from the issue of revising the definition of gifting used earlier in
this paper to something like: *the anticipated social/societal value to the recipient(s) is at least equal
to or greater than the economic value to the giver(s).* If this is not the case, then the exchange is not
a gift but a (social) money making enterprise. This threshold points to the significant attention being
given to measuring performance and assessing results, which is technically demanding. If the
social gain cannot be demonstrated to exceed the financial return one can better speak of social
self-enterprise than philanthropy. Consequently, from the perspective of African gifting, a certain
positive caution is required when thinking about adding them to the family of approaches. Though
providing developmental value, they may or may not be gifting in practice.

These ways of thinking are further stimulating corporate gifting from ‘box-ticking’ corporate social
responsibility (CSR) into, amongst others, creating shared value (CSV) and adopting ethical
practices which may or may not constitute gifting. There is also questioning of the merits of an
overall pro-social profile and reputation of a corporation which stresses its CSR credentials while
seeking to avoid paying taxes which would also support social welfare. Deeper integration of
social gains into for-profit business models is likely to make the element of gifting, *per se,* harder to
identify and treat as such.

A critical economy of affection interface perspective and knowledge gap is gifting related to small
and medium enterprises that are the economic and employment engines of the African continent.
As the South Africa study suggests, their scale and geography makes them more likely to be sensitive
to the economy of affection anticipating, for example, the reputational gain to be made by paying
attention to local gifting. This hypothesis will merit testing more widely than the South Africa study.

Innovations in the gifting landscape on and off the continent bring debates to which an African Chair
in Philanthropy must be sensitive in terms of positions and contributions. The following section
scans a number of debates where taking positions would be premature because, for example, they
call for (additional) research. Perhaps a rule of thumb at this formative stage is for a Chair in African
Philanthropy to adopt a critically reflexive stance which seeks to systematically expand and
appreciate the concept of African Philanthropy beyond a monetized pre-occupation and western
modelling.
6. CONTEMPORARY DEBATES

Section two provides the theory, section three a language and section four an overview of the institutional evolution of gifting in colonial and post colonial Africa. Section five is devoted to the recent past and future signalling issues concerning the function and value of philanthropy for giver and receiver. The contemporary notion of African gifting and of international philanthropy practices cannot be taken at face value as ‘good’ for the beneficiaries or for society.

This section fast-forwards to a critical view of a gifting narrative to discussions and disputes that a Chair in African Philanthropy needs to be aware of and will be expected to engage in. The treatment is not exhaustive, but indicative of the conversations surrounding philanthropy today. At this stage, positions on the issues are not set out.

**Philanthropy and moral responsibility for public welfare**

Debates – partly triggered by contending views about philanthro-capitalism – range from the moral to the (geo) political to governance and public policy, to the strategic and to the practical. The discussions below largely follow this sequence.

A philosophical angle to debate argues that the amoral nature of market capitalism and the social disincontents to which its excessive personal accumulation give rise, contradict the moral imperative underpinning philanthropy.  

The idea that underpins these examples is ‘doing good and doing well.’ there’s no conflict between making money and making change. It’s an old idea that goes back to a misreading of Adam Smith, but one that’s been given new energy by the rise of ‘impact investing’ and socially-conscious billionaires. Smith knew that however efficient it might be in directing
money towards its most ‘productive’ use, the market’s ‘invisible hand’ wouldn’t be able to reconcile individual self-interest with collective welfare unless it was guided by some deeper moral force.

The argument is that the ethics of an accumulation imperative one cannot be offset the ethics of self-determined redistribution. The sleight of hand involved in what is being communicated should be exposed. The era of Big Man mega-philanthropy – there are few if any women – must lose a social and political high ground to which it has no right.¹⁴⁹

One of most pernicious effects of philanthrocapitalism is to make gifts and gift relationships somehow seem suspect, second-rate or backward. But these relationships—expressed through community and solidarity and social movements—are the basis of all healthy human interaction. Our imaginations have become so colonized by market thinking that we no longer know or care what it means to be fully human in this sense—to give freely with no expectation of return; to show solidarity without the need for a reward; or to hold a conversation that doesn’t degenerate into a transaction or a deal.¹⁵⁰

This quotation speaks to a concern and incipient debate about whether or not new variants of philanthropy will, when it comes to the Africa’s own profile of gifting, replicate a past experience of the endogenous phenomenon not being accepted on its own terms. From this perspective, for the Chair, an afro-centric stance is required to fully flesh out an African narrative.

The Economist article quoted at the beginning touches on the same issue, but without the ethical argument. The writer takes a generally positive position on the application of private wealth for public benefit, but is circumspect about the potential for the distributed social costs of extreme wealth accumulation to be offset by the giving back required if gifting is to be cost-effective. In other words, philanthropists can cherry pick the public goods which they are interested in which a government cannot. The public purse bears an unfair burden of responsibility for public welfare.

With political economy at its root, a wider debate is about a general trend to privatize public welfare, shifting responsibility for a population’s well-being from the state to individuals, civil society organisations, corporate gifting and the like. At issue is erosion of social justice where poorer groups have less access to even poorer quality services, if at all.¹⁵¹ Unlike government, private gifting does not have a national mandate. Picking and choosing among gifting agendas and recipients, introduces a lottery of chances amongst the poor. Will this trend reinforce an African scenario of uneven access to social services?

Philanthropy, accountable governance and biases

A political debate ties philan thro-capitalism to an erosion of democratic governance. A line of argument runs as follows. Today’s world and its problems call for better transnational governance, seen for example in addressing negative effects of climate change. Mega-foundations are too poorly accountable to have a legitimate seat at governance tables, yet their wealth opens the door to excessive influence around their agendas at the cost of others. They pull power towards themselves with too little in the way of effective public oversight. Put another way, they are part and parcel of a privatization in the redesign of international governance – promoted by the World Economic Forum¹⁵² – sharpened by gifting which takes up risks that should belong to businesses.¹⁵³ Generally speaking the issue of power asymmetries in gifters’ favour allied to structural accountability weaknesses apply across the philanthropic board, but is elevated into the public realm by today’s
scale, which is attracting critical commentary.\textsuperscript{154} In the name of protecting the public interests against charlatans, a poorly accountable power of gifting by HNWIs can invite and justify unwarranted political intrusion.\textsuperscript{155}

While less of a debate as such, there is a concern that a focus on ‘philanthropy = finance’ misses the significant value of non-financial components of philanthropy – time, advice, prayer and volunteering which characterises how poorer continents and their people’s interact day by day. Expanding an appreciation of what gifting contains in daily life rather than a pre-occupation with its more easily measured forms is a necessity that calls for debate.

The advent of mega-philanthropies is having disrupting and sometimes discomforting strategic effects with the gifting community. If a large philanthropy move into a particular area of gifting with very big money, say in health, or dolphin protection, others can be squeezed out. This may or may not be a bad thing, but over time it can lead to monopolistic situations in a ‘market’ for recipients. This group includes those whose work is critical of philanthropy. They may choose self-censorship to avoid creating obstacles to their own access to grants.\textsuperscript{156}

A last and very critical debate is around measurement.\textsuperscript{157} An updated definition points to the importance of ‘calculating’ social gains set against economic returns if the criterion for being a ‘gift’ is to be satisfied. Before the advent of new age philanthropy, the fields of development studies and social enterprise were marked by, often quite bitter, disputes about methods and ‘gold standards’ for evaluating outcomes and impacts of interventions – read investments as grants. The issues involved are not just technical.\textsuperscript{158} They are also conditioned by the political-economy of evaluation for the type of philanthropy in play.\textsuperscript{159} For example, catalytic and strategic philanthropy will have different metrics that need to be negotiated with recipients as much as they do within the gifter. The sharp debates and contentions around ‘evidence’ and performance assessments of philanthropy – new or old - should not be underestimated.\textsuperscript{160}

With all the foregoing in mind, how best to craft a Chair in African Philanthropy at the Wits Business School?

7. A CHAIR IN AFRICAN PHILANTHROPY AT THE WITS BUSINESS SCHOOL

The Chair’s addition to the WBS academic repertoire resonates with a perspective on the future of the continent’s business schools beyond the prevailing ‘Western centre-African periphery’ model which is put forward in an article for the European Foundation for Management Development: “What does it mean to be an ‘African’ management school?”\textsuperscript{161} The ontological approach adopted to redefine African philanthropy as ‘gifting’ gives a substantive response to the preposition that:

“African” schools could draw on the philosophy of Ubuntu the belief in a universal bond of sharing that connects all humanity. Based on this philosophy, one could ask serious questions about who has access to business schools, who benefits and whose interests are served?\textsuperscript{162}

Put another way, the ethical dimensions of gifting invites a ‘transformative’ debate about:

Instead of the relentless race to the top – measuring the success of schools \textit{inter alia} by the increased earnings of its graduates - African schools might want to ask how business schools
can facilitate access to their impressive fountain of knowledge by those previously or currently excluded on both social and financial grounds.\textsuperscript{163}

But perhaps the biggest contribution African – and other “adjective” schools in India, China and Latin-America – can make is to engage with our colleagues in the West in moving us as a global business school community beyond the adjectival stereotypes of the past.\textsuperscript{164}

Vision 2022 of the Wits Business School signals a strategic move towards enhancing regional relevance and African identity, which means recognising, better understanding and professionally embracing the continent’s many facets in their own right, not as contextualised interpretations of a Western universalism.

The continent’s rich diversity of peoples and cultures, referred to above in itself provides unique opportunities for studying and understanding the cultural and social dynamics of people and communities, their expression through literature and performance, their ability to anticipate and adapt to changes brought about by globalisation, and many more aspects of their lives.\textsuperscript{165} (Emphasis in original)

In keeping with the WBS Phoenix Strategy, the establishment of a Chair in African Philanthropy, with an explicit pan-African remit, signals a bold step and innovation this direction. As the cradle of human kind, the preceding sections speak to abilities of the continent’s peoples to adapt to adversity by, inter alia, applying a pro-social behaviour of gifting: a place where identity, culture, survival and economics meet. But widespread poverty and increasing inequality also make clear the stresses that this relational system has faced and must still must cope with. It should be clear that the knowledge relied on so far to understand this critical ethical interface on the continent – who gifts to whom, when, why, why not, how much and with what effects - is far from systematic, robust or unbiased. Remediating this situation must be a collaborative endeavour with outreach into leadership development, teaching, policy and practice. Guiding students, their employers, investors and the many organisations concerned about the continent’s welfare calls for well thought through, high quality, teaching informed by carefully crafted (comparative) research. The inaugural seminar was a critical step in filling in what this effort means with a vision as a guide.

This section draws on the previous pages to do two things. First, to describe and make the case for a preliminary analytic frame work which reflects the institutional theory explained in section two. Putting meat on this skeleton pulls together some of the more fine grained factors that will have to be taken into account. It concludes with ideas and propositions that could guide teaching, research, outreach and measurement as well as a guiding vision for the path ahead.

**An Ecological Analytic Framework**

An argument has been made to expand the economy of affection from its endogenous roots to include gifting driven by other sources and forces – such as the wealthy, the middle class, corporations, foundations, small and medium enterprises and others – that are attracted to, that is motivated by, a particular social issue or group or set of circumstances where they believe gifting can make a difference.\textsuperscript{166} Put another way, with any number of motivations and reasons, CSR/I professionals, social investors and High Net Worth Individuals are attracted to, i.e., adopt an affinity with, an issue – social, ecological, economic whatever. In doing so, their ways of working can bring about organisational evolutions, that is they alter the institutional ecology and the way that society works.\textsuperscript{167} This process can create blended or hybrid organisational forms that try to hold together the logics of accumulation and commoditization associated with capitalist market economies and
the collaborative processes which assert rights and values, such as social justice which permeate much of social development.168 The figure below sets out the categories which comprise African gifting, conceived as an economy of affinity. Understanding the figure involves considering the way philanthropy meets organisations.

**Business organising for African philanthropy**

Putting together section two on philanthropy as an institution with section three on Africa’s history means being aware of various ways in which they result in designs and functions of organising. This process drives how the ecology of gifting entities and their practices has evolved through selection rather than by the cumulative decisions of (corporate) leaders.169 There are various ways of distinguishing organisational types, for example by how they are designed and governed, that is the allocation of authority to make decisions. From a WBS point of view, the way corporations are structured is important in terms of ownership, leadership, management, employees, financing using market principles, the regulatory environment, human resource development the good and services they provide, the (brand) reputation so on. Incorporating philanthropy in for‐profits, for gifting rather than accumulating, typically requires adjustment to design and possible revisions to culture. In thinking about ‘integrating’ African philanthropy to business models, it is important to take hard issues of organisational (re)design and viability and soft issues of culture, values, social image and ethics into account.

From a horizontal gifting point of view, organisational design is more about collective ownership and rule‐making with divisions of labour and accountability agreed on in organic, negotiate ways.170 This can translate into organisational designs, such as community foundations, which take on ‘horizontal’ characteristics.171

While there is much good literature available on organising and managing, there is little in the way of hard and fast rules about design in either case. The point is to be aware of the different principles involved and not to assume one is a priori better than the other.

**African philanthropy in practice**

Africa’s peoples operate in the gifting space through an economy of affection informed by customary affinities and ties networks that are relatively proximate as well as through Diaspora resource channels that involve residence in other settings, cultures, life experiences, and sources of information and so on. Private donors – like the emerging middle classes - have surplus funds, time and other resources that they can choose to allocate to gifting alongside, or instead of, strong reciprocity. High Net Worth Individuals can choose to alter whole gifting landscapes with the volume of resources that they can bring to bear, benefiting countless people.

An important reminder is that these categories can be expressed in three different institutional types (section 2, Table 1), making analysis and research often quite messy.
Business can choose to or might have to allocate their resources for social purposes. Common modalities for doing so are corporate social investing, discounting products, gifts in kind, placements and volunteering the time of staff, including for their own personal and career development. As noted in the section on debates, the trade-offs involved can be very complex, difficult to untangle and to unambiguously qualify as ‘gifts’ in a bigger picture of organisational behaviour as a corporate citizen. Often through professional intermediaries, such as audit firms with specialist arms, richer investors commit finance to ‘philanthropic’ causes which may or may not include ‘affinity’ preferences, such as children, the ecology, youth employment, and so on.

The in-between category is constantly taking shape as ideas and practices – such as the new age philanthropies and home grown variants - gain ground, while tried and tested models, such as community foundations, scale outwards. Membership based self-financing schemes - such as rotating saving and credit clubs, South Africa’s stockvels and their continental equivalents- are maturing into more formalised set ups that can leverage other sources of capital and make their own investments. The two columns illustrate the multiple combinations of possibilities for motivations and practices. Preceding texts point to some more common combinations that also reflect having to or wanting to gift, for example where public policy places obligations on private actors, such as businesses to show a social responsibility. Common combinations can also arise from tax and policy incentives towards desirable public goods, such a child welfare or environmental protection with little prospect of financial returns requiring grants rather the (soft) loans. Identifying combinational patterns across could help understand what forces shape an economy of affinity. Investigating what types of pluralisation of gifting entities are emerging where and why across the continent’s diversity will help identify what it is about context that works for and against gifting. This sort of information can be of value to those needing to understand the risks and opportunities that patterns of gifting can imply – an untapped knowledge resource.
Underpinning the figure are the different ‘qualities’ of resources that gifting relies on. By qualities are meant, for each source type, (1) substance – material, non-material, financial and so on – that makes up the gift transaction; (2) implicit or explicit expectations about what the gift means for the transacting parties – what do they each value; (3) the rules of the game associated with the transaction such that it is asymmetric, i.e., a gift and not an instance of strong, ‘I scratch your back’ reciprocity; and (4) the power dimensions between gifter and receiver are acknowledged in terms, for example, of obligation or free will.

The two columns illustrate the multiple combinations of possibilities for motivations and practices. Preceding texts point to some more common combinations that also reflect having to or wanting to gift, for example where public policy places obligations on private actors, such as businesses to show a social responsibility. Common combinations can also arise from tax and policy incentives towards desirable public goods, such as child welfare or environmental protection with little prospect of financial returns requiring grants rather the (soft) loans. Identifying combinational patterns across could help understand what forces shape an economy of affinity.
Fig. 5 Populating the Analytic Framework

What is not set out in these figure are the outcomes which gifting should generate for whom. A simple reason is that they are too varied and numerous to mention, but that are a critical starting point for prioritizing enquiry. The outcome must, however, be somewhat narrowed in terms of what is expected of the Wits Business School – what value can a Chair in African Philanthropy offer?

**Adding value**

When taken together, the Business Case for the Chair, Vision 2022 and the Phoenix Strategy triangulate a complicated and demanding set of expectations. This sub-section cannot spell out in detail how each is to be addressed and accomplished with what priority. What it can do is to speak to a number of characteristics that the Chair should aim to cultivate, allied to a number of propositions that would feed into teaching, research, outreach and performance metrics.

**The WBS Ethos**

One could summarise the Chair’s role within the WBS ethos is pursuit of ethical transformation, promoting responsible profitability on the continent while advancing Africa-centred narratives into the discourse of business management and its development. The notion of ‘responsible’ applies across the board to students, leaders, the business community, etc. Gifting, as an essentially pro-social concept, can practically and empirically add to the ethics of business and to a global pluralisation of business thinking and debate. The sub-Saharan focus and mandate of the Chair in African Philanthropy will, of necessity and by design, add to ongoing initiatives bringing the continent in and reaching out with WBS agendas and services.
**Research intensity**

There is common ground that the strength of the Chair in African Philanthropy will depend on the breadth, depth and robust empiricism of the multi-country knowledge it relies on. All three conditions are generally lacking. This means, for example, that it is not possible to provide satisfactory answers to questions such as: why is African Philanthropy important, what different does it make and why? How does African philanthropy contribute to corporate citizenship and to what standards should they be held? The Chair must, by design and priority, fill in important knowledge gaps in ways that benefit African countries not just WBS. Doing so will, in and of itself, be a significant investment that increases the legitimacy of the initiative and its initiators.

**Pragmatic, inter-disciplinary academy**

This discussion paper relies on many disciplines and attempts to make them inclusive of each other. Without doing so, the nature of gifting on the continent cannot be fully described or understood in its own terms. But inter-disciplinarity on its own is not enough, it has to serve useful purposes. In this sense the Chair will aspire to be what Posner saw for the field of public administration.

While theory can be self-contained, the impact of our research and teaching arguably finds its most compelling and highest audience when it addresses the agenda items and concerns of practitioners.

... the failure of professional schools to teach or write for their natural markets is far more threatening to their social and economic function of preparing students to excel in the worlds of business and public organizations.\(^{173}\)

The Chair in African Philanthropy should become known as a ‘pracademic’ touchstone for inclusive, incisive thinking and relevance to multiple constituencies. It will, where sensible, follow Posner’s ‘reconnection’ approach which recognises the value of judiciously combining explicit and tacit knowledge.\(^{174}\)

**Reading Africa**

The substance of a Chair in African Philanthropy is related to the deeper ‘invisible’ fabric of economy and society showing connections to the more visible features of socio-economic processes to see if and how they can be mutually reinforcing. A Chair in Philanthropy can contribute by opening up windows that advance what the Phoenix Strategy calls for “an understanding of the complexities of doing business in Africa within a global context.” This necessity is highlighted by South Africa’s business community’s reflections on its behaviour on the continent.

“And sometimes we are too arrogant. We just want to go in there guns blazing and ‘let’s do this deal’. So I think that is probably one of the biggest problems.”

**South Africans need to test their perceptions of Africa**

Layo Seriki, managing director of management consultancy firm Cielarko, noted that the question of how other Africans perceive South Africans comes up a lot in her line of work.

“And what we try and remind people is that it’s just as important to know how we perceive the people from the countries that we are going into... Because very often we have our minds made up about how people in Angola are, and how it’s going to be to do business in Angola. And we don’t question these assumptions,” said Seriki, adding that South Africans should test these assumptions by spending time in the countries they want to operate.”\(^{175}\)

Put another way, because of its roots in values and obligations, a gifting lens can add to what any entrepreneur or business leader has to do well: read the context, understand what it means and see
how you are seen. For example, is leadership seen in different ways; do incentives play out the same way across the continent or is adaptation required; how is reputation judged; what networks reach where when gifting and consumption decisions are made; and so on. While context analysis is far from new, a gifting dimension could open up new insights.

An additional angle is, though a gifting lens, to connect with those stranded at the ‘bottom of the pyramid’ in ways that are not just commercial but resonate with and advance the informal economies that vast numbers of the population rely on to survive and to develop. Creative and collaborative social entrepreneurialism awaits.

**Contribution to transformation**
Transformation is a complicated, multi-layered narrative which plays out a bit differently in South Africa than most other countries on the continent. One layer, noted in sections two and three, is re-inscription of African identities. Another is one of WBS’s signature and identity reinforced as a pan-African centre of excellence in a nascent academic field of continental significance with attraction for faculty and students. A Chair in African Philanthropy can be one avenue to add to ongoing transformation discourses – access, inequality, accountability and ethical public policies - in positive practical and innovative ways.

**Propositions**
Propositions are a challenging way of illustrating what a Chair in African Philanthropy could bring to the development of WBS in the years to come. Below are triggers to thinking and debate – some repeated in the seminar’s outcomes, where understanding (differences) in the economy of affinity across countries of the continent might:

- Better align and optimise the diversity of resource allocations and investments across the gifting space
- Contribute data for public budgeting and policies, such as gifting incentives
- Assist in gifting decision making, for example by HNWIs and social investors
- Provide insights into the evolution of expenditures of emerging middle classes and their consumption decisions
- Tease out the role of faiths in approaches to corporate philanthropy
- Provide additional interpretations for marketing successes and failures
- Expand insights on African peoples’ risk appreciation and strategies
- Improve CSR/CSI decision making and performance
- Judge how public policies would be responded to by which social groups
- Inform exogenous organisational/practice reforms towards African conditions for social investment and enterprise
- Offer additional conceptual pathways to engage with informal economic incentives and behaviours
- Contribute to the design of multi-stakeholder initiatives which are intended to be a major mechanism to implement the Sustainable Development Goals, i.e., bridge the philanthropy-development gap.

These are clearly potential and possibilities. In the months to come discussions and consultations will help prioritise efforts in establishing a full time Chair. These ideas will gain meaning and momentum when located in a compelling vision, which the seminar proposed below.
A Ten Year Vision for the Chair in African Philanthropy

Participants at the inaugural seminar were invited to craft a compelling vision for the Chair in African Philanthropy. Its content could act as a guide to setting priorities; communicating a clear message about goals and outcomes; and helping to set milestones for assessing progress.

A Working Vision

By 2026, the Chair will have partnerships and collaborations with key players across Africa and in global philanthropy. The Chair to be embedded and appreciated at WBS so that the future is sustainable, specifically to help WBS gain EQUIS accreditation which focuses on business ethics, corporate connections and internationalisation.

Specific goals for teaching/curriculum development by 2026:

- 100% of WBS students to have been exposed to (African) philanthropy in some form.
- 50% of students have attended a short course/event/debate on (African) philanthropy.
- 10% of students have completed a new elective on philanthropy.
- 5 new PhDs whose thesis is on some aspect of African philanthropy.

Pan-Africa - at least 3 other universities will be offering courses on African philanthropy, some likely taught by new WBS PhDs.

Globally – other courses in universities around the world to have increased content related to African philanthropy, e.g. new books on reading lists, additions to course content.

A strong academic research output, to include:

- Publication of an Africa-type empirical report: Africa Gives/Giving/Gifting
- An increase (unspecified %!) in articles by African-based academics in Journals covering civil society, philanthropy and business.
- African presence in global academic literature, e.g. greater presence in next edition of the Palgrave handbook on Global Philanthropy
- An online Knowledge Hub to make new data and research available to people beyond the academia (i.e. who can’t freely access the Journals)

Outreach – a vibrant social media presence (to include widely-read blogs, links to case studies, new data etc) so that the Chair is known by a majority of relevant stakeholders, and generally viewed as a ‘critical friend’.

Implementation

Few details were provided on a long term game plan to reach the vision. What was put forward for priority activity in the short term 2016/2017/2018 is as follows:

2016

- Determine the (initial) business model
- Recruit a permanent chair
- Accelerate (social) media presence with regular/periodic communications
- Prioritise research on the knowledge required for teaching, publications and outreach
- Commence Executive Education offerings
- Establish an advisory committee of academics, business, government, treasury, etc.
• Put in place plans for a (bi)annual signature publication and Working Paper Series
• Commence MBA electives
• Ensure outreach and access for all students all WITS
• Formulate a five year strategy.
• Establish at least two relational ‘hubs’ across the continent
• Have a Working Paper Series running

2018
• Start a MM programme
• Independent review of progress to date
• Joint research Conference (in Cairo)

These are helpful suggestions which will inform a formal Chair in African Philanthropy Value Proposition for Wits and WBS senior management and the Southern Africa Trust. Progress will, however, depend on the business model and timely recruitment of a full time Chair.
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Hofstede, 1991: 15.

Harris, Moore and Schmitz, 2009. These authors then list 178 indices that can be applied to country categorizations.

See, for example, Lilley School foundational research https://philanthropy.iupui.edu/research/prior-research/index.html

Kurzban and Houser, 2005. The ratios do not add up to 100 percent due to a number of non-determinant cases.


The volume edited by Tade Aina and Bheki Moyo (2013) is an inspiration source for this section and others which follow.

Rossi, 1980: 333.

Sahlins, 1974b.


Mauss, 1969: 3.

Mauss, 1969: 37, relies on the concept of ‘potlach’ or a tradition of feasting which distributes wealth and resources while demanding allegiance and recognition.

Mauss, 1969: 38.

Mauss 1969: 45. See also Eisenstein (2011) on the evolution of money from primal forms of exchange, barter and so on.

http://www.centerforinquiry.net/blogs/entry/cfi_kenya_african_humanism_and_its_agenda/ For the influence of Ubuntu today, see Khoza (2011) and Malunga (2009).


Whitaker, 1974. He notes that the mission one of the first charities registered was to by firewood to burn witches.

CAF 199; Dekker and Halman, 2003.

Semboja and Therkildsen, 1995; Fowler, 1995.

http://www.ehow.com/about_5579857_history-501_c__3_-non_profit.html

Inkeles and Smith, 1974: 21-24. These researches codified a modern person in the following way: Open to new experiences; readiness for social change; a disposition to hold opinions about issue; use of information; time with a future orientation; efficacy in controlling the environment; reliance on long term planning; trust as a calculable appreciation; valuing technical skills, occupational and educational aspirations; awareness of dignity as a relational necessity; and understanding production, or how the world works.

Inkeles and Smith, 1974: 25-32. Impact was anticipated on: kinship ties and family life; women’s rights; reproduction and family size; religious resistance; the place of the aged; politics and civic engagement; expansion of communication; consumerism; social stratification; and commitment to work.

Hyden, 1983.

Hyden, 1983: 8-10.

For more detailed examples see Aina, 2013: 17. Africa’s liberation movements after the Second World War were resourced by gifting from the population as are many still today.

Aina, 2013: 15 points to the voluntary gifting as a form of community levy or tax whose use was collectively agreed. This could be money raised to send a members’ child to school, or saving and mutual aid groups as the means of local, or horizontal, resource mobilization with collective accountability, oversight and control.

Aina 2013: 17-19.

Mbiti, 1975.


“Mbeki has touched upon an important point of principle: the making of Africa requires a prior making of the African.”


Miller, 2011: 86.


"Giving is obviously more blissful than receiving, but in addition, institutional mechanisms have been developed on both sides that strengthen the asymmetry of the transaction." SIDA, 1996: 11. See also Nauk and Land, 2000.

There are instances of international NGOs walking the talk of partnership and of foundations treating grantees with respect, but they are far from the norm.

He warned of the identification of the new rulers Africa as elites with the bourgeoisie of the West to exploit their own people.

In fact there are two public realms in postcolonial Africa, with different types of moral linkages to the private realm. At one level is the public realm in which primordial groupings, ties, and sentiments influence and determine the individual's public behavior. I shall call this the primordial public because it is closely identified with primordial groupings, sentiments, and activities, which nevertheless impinge on the public interest. The primordial public is moral and operates on the same moral imperatives as the private realm. On the other hand, there is a public realm which is historically associated with the colonial administration and which has become identified with popular politics in post-colonial Africa. It is based on civil structures: the military, the civil service, the police, etc. Its chief characteristic is that it has no moral linkages with the private realm. I shall call this the civic public. The civic public in Africa is amoral and lacks the generalized moral imperatives operative in the private realm and in the primordial public.

Though the literature on predatory leadership, rule and states emphasises different elements of the phenomenon, the following appear to be the common characteristics identified in most accounts: (a) a high degree of political power concentrated in personal rule, mediated through, and sustained by, what is in effect a narrow 'predatory coalition', without traditional, 'customary' or coherent ideological justification or legitimacy; (b) the use of this power to control economic resources, accompanied by wide discretion in their use or distribution; (c) the failure to use such resources for any observable developmental purpose; (d) the absence of any plausible or practical evidence of a vision or commitment to promote long-term and sustainable growth, development or the systematic provision of public goods; e) a ruthless application of coercion and repression to gain and especially maintain power; (f) the use of a mixture of fear and reward as a means of retaining the loyalty of immediate followers and supporters; (f) the use of often considerable brutality and exclusion as the means for punishing opponents or competitors; (g) the systematic erosion
of both public institutions and the rule of law, and the transgression of customary institutions; and (h) a consequent degradation of the economy.

Aina, 2013: 22.


https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gift_economy

Carr, McAuliffe. and MacLachlan, 1998.

SIDA, 1996; Elbers, 2012

OECD, 2005.

From 1988 to 1991, I served as a Ford Foundation in East Africa responsible for the portfolio of Governance and Public policy.


OECD, 2009.


This, of course, is determined by how the economic and political elites inter-relate. The Giving Back study (AGN, 2014; 26) alludes to HNWIs who choose to avoid visibility in case questions are asked about their source of wealth or their allegiance, or otherwise, to those in power.

A start in this direction can be found in AGN, 2015.


Lönnqvist, 2008; Rowlands, 2008.

I have long believed that far from being a catalyst, foreign aid has been the biggest single inhibitor of Africa’s growth. Among its shortcomings, aid is correlated with corruption, fosters dependency, and invariably instils bureaucracy that hinders the emergence of an essential entrepreneurial class. For Africa to grow in a sustained way, foreign aid will have to be dramatically reduced over time, forcing countries to adopt more transparent strategies to finance development.


A study on horizontal philanthropy developed a method to impute the value of the endogenous gift economy: Philanthropy of Community Measuring and Valuing Assets (PMVA) (Wilkinson-Maposa, 2009: 23-28). “The total of the combined number of volunteer hours and cash contributions received by the ten CBOs and the JDF were added up and a financial value assigned. The results were impressive and our calculations revealed that a total of R371 150 was mobilised, comprised of R341 938 (41 555 volunteer labour hours) plus R29 212 (direct cash contributions). This does not include the many forms of in-kind contributions made within the community, such as:

• bringing food to work to share with volunteer colleagues;
• loans of personal vehicles;
• using private telephones for organisational work;
• donation of prizes for fundraising events;
• sharing knowledge and passing on skills;
• donating materials and equipment in the start-up phases of income-generating projects; and
• providing access to municipal land and buildings at nominal rates.

The 41 555 volunteer hours translate into a total community contribution of 19 years and eight months of ‘volunteer’ labour in the year under review.”

Some 42.7% of the 947 million making up population of the sub-Saharan live on less than $U$1.9 per day. http://povertydata.worldbank.org/poverty/region/SSA

AGN: 2013; 20. It is probably fair to assume both that financial contributions to Community based philanthropy would draw on a wider range of income levels, and that they would be augmented by in-kind contributions of time, goods and services.
An alternative measure of gifting is to take average GDP per capita (US$1,638), multiplied by the population of 947 million, amounts to US$1.5 trn. Assuming a 2% proportion spent on Gifting (AGN, 2013: 17, fn 13) equates to US$30 bn circulating as Gifting. An economy of affection thesis and ratio of 20:63:15 would estimate the proportion as much higher.

Habib and Maharaj, 2008. The research was undertaken across categories of gifting, each with a distinct method: by the public at large; in relation to religion; within poor communities; corporations and small scale enterprises (SMEs); in relation to racial groups and corporate social investment; foreign donors; and the state itself – though this would hardly qualify as ‘gifting’ from the tax base as a statutory obligation. Sound comparative enumeration proved elusive. For example, poorer people are more inclined and able to give time than money; faith-based giving – cultivated by leaders for redemption and salvation is by far the largest source and function of gifting. SMEs, focus on local issues and sensitivities in cash and kind. The overall findings confirm the ‘economy of affection’ thesis.

... the philanthropy literature tends to portray giving as a voluntary act inspired by generosity, religious conviction or more altruistic motives. Implicit in this assumption is that the nuclear family is the basis of all societies. Yet we know that in large parts of the world, and in the developing world in particular, nuclear families are a component of extended families. Patterns of obligation therefore occur in ways fundamentally different from those of the industrialised world. Family and informal networks are highly personalised and giving is influence by specific identity categories individualised such as relatives, friends and neighbours. While there may well be selfish or altruistic motives, such giving is not motivated by profit, is not enforced by law, and is not entirely voluntary. And, more often and not, this informal system of caring and sharing is taken for granted. (page 29)

The practice of impact investing is further defined by the following four core characteristics:

**INTENTIONALITY**
An investor’s intention to have a positive social or environmental impact through investments is essential to impact investing.

**INVESTMENT WITH RETURN EXPECTATIONS**
Impact investments are expected to generate a financial return on capital or, at minimum, a return of capital.

**RANGE OF RETURN EXPECTATIONS AND ASSET CLASSES**
Impact investments target financial returns that range from below market (sometimes called concessionary) to risk-adjusted market rate, and can be made across asset classes, including but not limited to cash equivalents, fixed income, venture capital, and private equity.

**IMPACT MEASUREMENT**
A hallmark of impact investing is the commitment of the investor to measure and report the social and environmental performance and progress of underlying investments, ensuring transparency and accountability while informing the practice of impact investing and building the field.

For comparisons of CSR and CSV see Moore, 2014.

He advances three arguments against reconciliation between making money and making change. The deep changes required of climate change racism and violence require 100 percent of people’s energy. Blending social and economic goals dilutes both with the former winning out over time as inflation bites and, reason two, money wins. A third reason is that social change and market mechanisms aren’t easily interchangeable. They are fundamentally different—more like ‘oil and water’ than the ‘perfect Margarita’ that’s presented by advocates of ‘blended value.’

Buffett, 2013.

Hayman, 2015.

WEF, 2014.

In my view there is a sort of horses for courses, ‘mixed methods truce’ between advocates of random control trials, social constructionist and complex systems perfectives.

Carlsson, Kohlin and Ekborn, 1994; Eyben, Giijt, Roche and Shutt, (eds), 2015.

Davis, 2013.

Naudé, 2015.

Naudé, 2015: 22.

Naudé, 2015: 23.


Complexity theory applied to adaptive human behavior involves the notion of ‘attractors’ as points which gain the attention of sufficient people to alter the behavior of others in the same direction. A high profile contemporary attractor is ‘youth unemployment’, which is mobilizing all sorts of actors to tackle the issue. See McKenzie, 2005.

Hannam and Freeman, 1989.

Jäger and Schröer, 2014.

Baum and Ambergey, 2000.


http://www.howwemadeitinafrica.com/are-south-africans-seen-as-too-arrogant-when-doing-business-on-the-continent/
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