A project by

3rd FOUNDATIONS AND NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP
Lisbon 2nd – 4th October 2008

REPORT

INDEX

SUMMARY

THE WORKSHOP

The Foundations and Networks International Workshop took place in Lisbon on 2nd, 3rd and 4th October at the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation headquarters.
It involved 20 cultural operators, 3 experts, 2 representatives of institutional networks and 9 foundations and private funding bodies from all over the world: Egypt, Portugal, The Netherlands, Japan, Argentina, Senegal, Jordan, Czech Republic, Indonesia, Zambia (see Annex I List of participants).

The three days developed in a vivid and fruitful atmosphere.
The first day was dedicated to the acquaintance of the participants: a needed step since the 2008 edition counted a larger number and variety of participants.
The day ended with the speech by the director of the Maecenata Institute for Philanthropy and Civil Society, Rupert Graf Strachwitz on the history, forms and roles of the foundations in the world (see Annex II).

The second day was opened by the welcome speech by the President of the Gulbenkian Foundation Mr. Emilio Rui Vilar. The working session then got to the heart of the matter with the addresses by the artists Ong Keng Sen, renowned actor and director from Singapore, and Angela Ferreira from Portugal.
The Workshop continued with a session focused on the presentation of three case studies of collaboration involving foundations and cultural networks. The cases were also the object of a research, "Exchange Rates" carried out specifically for this Workshop by Judith Staines.
The following discussion gave room to new issues and to meaningful synergies among the representatives of foundations and the cultural operators and produced some interesting suggestions (see Outcomes) on the third day.

THE OUTCOMES

The **Arts Bank**, a proposal of a self help initiative by the artists. This idea was elaborated an interesting group and aims at creating a worldwide provision of resources *(advise, spaces, knowledge but also revenues coming from sale of artworks and transfer of copyrights)* to support the professional development of artists and operators in a truly international dimension. Such initiative is aimed at making trans-national cooperation more sustainable given the restrictions and the difficulties that it is likely to face in the future.
This idea seems to have a huge potential: it is a concrete option, based on an alliance among artists, business sector and third sector, it gives an opportunity for foundations to prove their effectiveness as catalysts of social and economic resources and leaders of innovative practices. It might also provide interesting chances in terms of visibility.

The second suggestion from a group of operators concerned one year exploratory **South to South mobility fund** for artists and cultural operators in the space within Africa, Asia and Latin America. According to the promoters, the fund should be managed and co-funded by some networks and cultural organizations, with the support of public and private sources.

It was also suggested to promote a **more substantial sharing and development of knowledge and intellectual resources on the cultural cooperation environment** (concerning the policies of the main stakeholders, the information on mobility etc) through a stronger cooperation between the various existing agencies and platforms, such as Culturelink and IFACCA.

The abovementioned suggestions were the outcomes of a frank discussion on equal terms, which is the added value of this Workshop as well as a the main feature which distinguishes such initiative from more traditional meetings and formal training initiatives.

It is now a shared opinion that the Workshop provides at the same time a practical, an advocacy and a learning opportunity, and includes a rich inspirational side which fosters the evaluation of each one's work under the lights of the others' experience.

THE FUTURE OF THE WORKSHOP

It was suggested to take a further step of the Foundations and Networks Workshop might be the **Fourth World Summit on Arts & Culture** in **Johannesburg on 21st – 25th September 2009**, organised by IFACCA – the International Federation of Arts Councils and Cultural Agencies, whose membership includes national member organisations from 61 countries all over the world. The summit will be attended by 250 - 300 delegates and could provide a window of visibility in an international arena of governments, arts councils and supranational institutions.

Business Arts South Africa has already ensured its operational support to the initiatives that the Workshop will organize in South Africa.

The steering group of the Workshop[1] is now taking into consideration different options.

The process could definitely take benefit in the near future from concentrating on some **contents and tools development**, in order to feed the collaborative environment set by the Workshop.

It is necessary to focus on some issues like the **sustainability and the evaluation of transnational cultural cooperation**, to concentrate on active collaboration, by strengthening the "laboratorial" side of the Workshop.

It was mentioned by many that is necessary to take stock of the current **state of the art concerning the foundations and cultural cooperation** within and beyond Europe, also in the light of the changes of scenario and priorities.

Fitzcarraldo is therefore carrying out an update the research *Cultural Cooperation in Europe: What role for Foundations?* which should be completed within June 2009 through interviews and questionnaires: an overview of foundations' policies and trends in Europe and beyond.

In parallel, IFACCA is working on a research on the same issue, investigating the policies and resources that Arts Councils worldwide earmark for cultural cooperation and networking practice.

An application was also presented to the EFC Committee in order to present the results of the Foundations and Networks International Workshop on the occasion of the **EFC GA**, on **May 14th-16th 2009 in Rome**. The proposal was however not accepted, since it was judged not fully in line with the issue of the conference.

Other occasions are being identified to provide more visibility to the work developed by the foundations representatives and the cultural operators within the Foundations and Networks International Workshop.

---

[1] The steering group of the F&N International Workshop was agreed by the participants of the second Workshop in 2007 and was confirmed in Lisbon on occasion of the III edition in 2008. It includes: Ugo Bacchella (Fondazione Fitzcarraldo), Maria Fernanda Matias (GulbenkianFoundation), Sarah Gardner, (IFACCA,) Dietar Jaenicke (Forum Cultural Mundial), Mary Ann De Vlieg, (IETM), Magdalena Moreno (The South Project), Oumar Sall (Groupe 30 Afrique), Paul Van Paaschen (HIVOS), Basma El Husseiny (Al Mawred Al Thaqafy).

"WHY DO WE SUPPORT NETWORKS?"
FOUNDATIONS MEETING. Oct. 2nd October 2008, Lisbon **report by Janet Livingstone and Laura Cherchi**

The first session of the meeting was attended by

Basma El Husseiny – (Al Mawred Al Thaqafy /Culture Resource); Antonio Pinto Ribeiro (Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation); Maria Fernanda Matias (Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation); Patricia Kistenmacher (Avina Foundation); Janet Livingstone (Central European Foundation); Rupert Graf Strachwitz (Maecenata Institute for Philanthropy and Civil Society); Fairooz Tamimi (Arab Fund for Arts and Culture); Ugo Bacchella (Fondazione Fitzcarraldo); Atsuko Hisano (Saison Foundation); Moukhtar Kocache (Ford Foundation Africa and Middle East); Ana Feder (European Foundation Centre); Laura Cherchi (Fondazione Fitzcarraldo).

Session 1. "why do we support networks?"

The meeting began with an introduction by Mr. Bacchella explaining the meeting's purpose – a chance and forum for informal discussion on funding of transnational cooperation among foundations and beneficiaries. The idea was born three years ago at the World Cultural Forum in Rio and this is now the third separate meeting of its kind, the second one being in Turin (in 2007).

The main question of the meeting was posed: WHY NETWORKS? WHY WORK WITH THEM/SUPPORT THEM?

Each representative at the table provided some background on their organization and a reaction to this question. Points of interest included:

o   Networks have proved to be useful in the North African and Middle East region (and in others as well), because of the sheer lack of any tradition of like-minded organizations coming together. Thus they serve to **break traditional barriers**.
o   Networks **help members to develop and think differently about themselves**.
o   Starting up networks can sometimes **redefine geographical regions** as well, e.g. Arab Fund and Euro-Mediterranean region.
o   A lesson learned from working with foundations over the years is that foundations have no institutional memory. **Program directions and emphases are almost wholly dependent on individual program staff** who manage them. Therefore, when program officers leave, often programs disappear and grantees are left with a void.
o   Point of emphasis: foundations are very interested in and strongly recognize the value of **monitoring and evaluation**, but are still weak at doing it, especially when faced with the often **difficult-to-quantify world of culture**.
o   Foundations are understaffed and tend **to seek other organizations/grantees to whom they can outsource their work with networks**. Therefore, they choose one grantee who will manage a network process.
o   Foundations and beneficiaries who are involved with networks are often motivated by a **desire to overcome some kind of isolation**, whether it is based on historical, economic, political, financial or cultural grounds.
o   Isolation in the cultural sphere has been caused by a number of factors, including structural/legal restraints (e.g. the case of Italian banking foundations not being allowed to fund outside Italy, lack of clarity on this point in Central Europe – Slovakia, etc. – as well), political isolation (e.g. a long period of fascism in Portugal meant that Portuguese organizations and donors were turned inward and not interested in working trans-nationally), historical isolation (post-communist world), economic (extreme poverty and lack of cash flow in environments such as Latin America and Africa), etc., cultural isolation (the case of Japan).
o   It was noted, that unfortunately, there may be a growing trend in the opposite direction because of conservatism among governments and the U.S./global financial crisis. That is, there is a **trend toward re-nationalization of cultural policy**.

o   Also, many donors, especially governmental donors, often take a **post-colonial approach of funding activities** only in those countries that are former colonies (the European scenario).

o   There is, in fact, **very little active cooperation among European foundations and this group**, especially the F&N Workshop is seeking to change this by inviting foundations to come together and listen to beneficiaries, to meet, etc. Attempts to do this have shown that the process is powerful for convincing foundations that cooperation is positive.

o   Related to the previous point, it was suggested that at this meeting in Lisbon, the participants come up with an **idea for a pilot, collaborative project between donors to try to encourage active cooperation across borders, especially on a culture project with a social component.**

o   There is hope for change as several of the participants related how their organizations have evolved and changed…how they have opened up over the years. The strongest examples include Gulbenkian and the Saison Foundation.

o   It was noted that **networking is, in fact, not only beneficial for grantees doing cultural work on the ground, but also for the foundations that support them**.

o   Peer learning is essential for development and growth in all sectors.

How to defend trans-national cooperation? (especially in an environment of shrinking resources)

o   Need to be able to express the concept of networks, either with new terminology or old one in a convincing way to donors. **Networks should better stress their added values**. (Some foundations leaders are unsympathetic to the concept of networks. In this case and other similar cases, it is helpful to be able to clearly and **succinctly articulate the concept of networks and their value, including the concrete benefits resulting from their operation**. we need to be able to justify work in culture.

Session 2. Meeting of foundations and networks.
The second part of the discussion was also joined by
Natacha Melo (Red Sudamericana de danza) Ong Keng Sen (Arts Network Asia), Magdalena Moreno (The South Project), Mary Ann De Vlieg (IETM – International Network for performing arts), Judith Staines (researcher).

A vivid discussion on what networks are and achieve led to the necessity of specifying and sharing a terminology concerning networking and its aims.

It was stressed that
- **International cultural cooperation is worth if it can serve a local community**, providing it with continuous creativity: the synergy between international and local is crucial. It is also important to develop local networks, **to share locally the international knowledge**.
- The networks should not be considered as bodies (most of them call themselves networking organisations or communities): the **networks are place and moments where and when artists and managers meet and exchange in a peer to peer relationship**. The main high level aims of a network are: to f**oster knowledge sharing and learning competences, information, tools and training**; to **open up the minds**, to learn to think differently.
- The networks actually do works which grantmakers cannot do, since they **know the specificity of the local situation**. They can in some cases also do some microfinancing. The networks work on the "negative spaces", i.e. on what misses (e.g. professional training programmes), on what has not come out to evidence yet, concerning exigencies, cultural phenomena…
- The networks are **democratic organisations** where everyone is asked to take real responsibility: they imply a **long term engagement** where the more one participates, the more one gets/learns/grows... In South America, for example, the networks changed the rules and opened up a sector which used to be very hierarchich. The networks also **allow the operators to better advocate and lobby** towards the decision makers.

- Networks are not static: they **introduce dynamic processes and elements of innovation in the cultural policies**.
- **Network(ing) is a process** itself.
- **Their legacy is relationship building**.

In summary, according to the **list of common values of cultural networks**, which was agreed in 2006, during the Networks meeting on occasion of the World Cultural Forum in Rio, networks should be recognized as those that:

- Are grassroots-based groups who share interests, practices and principles. They represent a need of a group to come together
- Are cross borders : political, geographical, symbolic
- Are based on trust between their members
- Are flexible in the way they work
- Provide and share information
- Create a voice to speak for their constituencies
- Create dialogue and awareness
- Create opportunities and are creative
- Are transparent
- Embrace diversity and plurality: of individuals and of perspectives. They stimulate the inclusion of different age, gender and ethnic viewpoints.
- Identify good practice and therefore are knowledge centres
- Place democratic values at the centre
- Have responsibilities
- Privilege the collective process
- Are oriented to cultural and social sustainability

- The word "network" raises a **problem of terminology** and does not give its due to what the networks actually do. "Network" can also be perceived, particularly in the U.S., with a very negative meaning (e.g. "criminal association"). It would be better to talk of **sustainable cultural collaboration.**
- It is important that networks **find a clear identity and learn to better express their potential and their multifaceted activities**. This would allow them also to accede to diverse sources of funding (e.g. lines for conferences, for training processes, for community development).
- despite the word "**network**" identify **more a mode than an organisation**, they are perceived by foundations as organisations, and as organisations they have to apply for grants. In the previous editions of this Workshop, Paul Van Paaschen (Hivos) already outlined the need to identify networks in a formal structure, the difficulty to have a recognition and to understand which networks are really effective.
- **networks help organisations to survive and offer a precious chance of learning** from other organisations. Networks give the chance to **take part in a bigger community, which can help the local community to develop**. It was mentioned that Avina Foundation works with networks by implementing a leadership programme: leaders are key contact people of a community and of an organisation.
- The networks are also an **opportunity for foundations to go beyond the mere funding of projects**.
- There is a **problem of interface** within the networks: how do their representatives share with the rest of the community, how far they represent it and what would it happen if they leave?
- It is essential that networks **work to build relationships** and that they nurture the dialogue with the foundations by **continuously reporting** about the process and the projects.
- A dialogue between foundations and networks is useful, but it should be remembered that the **interests of foundations and those of networks can be in contrast**.

Furthermore, it was suggested to **bring the debate of the Foundations and Networks to a wider audience**, particularly of foundations and to present the outcomes on occasion of the general assembly of the European Foundation Centre in May 2009.

The main challenge for the future is to **involve in this dialogue also the governments and the business sector, as well as all the social networks**.

A good occasion could be the IFACCA World Forum scheduled in September 2009 in Johannesburg.

THE EVALUATION STEERING GROUP

FOUNDATIONS MEETING OF Oct. 3rd October 2008, **Lisbon**.

Meeting of foundations to develop a discussion on evaluation and to understand the feasibility of a research project. Report by Laura Cherchi

The steering group was the result of a proposal by Paul Van Paaschen (Hivos) during the meeting in Turin in 2007.

During the days in Lisbon **a working group on the evaluation of transnational cultural cooperation** was informally established and involved Janet Livingstone (Central European Foundation), Fairooz Tamimi (Arab Fund for the Arts and Culture), Moukhtar Kokache (Ford Foundation), Patricia Kistenmacher (Avina Foundation), Gertrude Flengte (Doen Fund), Antonio Pinto Ribeiro and Maria Teresa Matias (Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation), Basma El Husseini (Al Mawred Al Thaqafy - Cultural Resources), Atsuko Hisano (Saison Foundation).

It was agreed that evaluating trans-national cultural cooperation is a difficult task, which should be discussed at higher level, since **evaluation** usually is an issue which **concerns the boards of foundations and not the officers**. The variety of networks is furthermore very large in forms and activities. Sometimes it is also difficult to understand their specificity. Since evaluation is however a matter on everyone's agenda, it was agreed to work together to **identify a common framework and some general guidelines to measure the transnational work and the impact of networks**, starting from some clear and shared objectives along which the evaluation can be structured.

It was therefore suggested to organize a **working day in the first months of 2009** on this issue, involving foundations representatives and some carefully selected people/"experts" with experience in evaluation, also in field other than arts and culture. The meeting could take place in **Amsterdam**. A group of foundations (Central European Foundation, Gulbenkian Foundation, Ford Foundation, Arab Fund) expressed their concrete interest in attending the meeting; the period and the location have been agreed among these colleagues accordingly.

EXCHANGE RATES

Notes from discussion of case studies

The researcher Judith Staines introduced the session, explaining the reasons and the methodology of the research: she pointed out that the case studies were snap shots of the state-of-art: different actions in different part of the world where the foundations are taking part in, and not models for funding.

1. THE YOUTH ORCHESTRA
Presented by Hugo Seabra, the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.
The Gulbenkian Foundation felt it had the 'power to risk' with this project. Worked with youngsters from a community on the outskirts of Lisbon with many social and economic problems.
The work with this community dates back to 2005 and in 2007 the Gulbenkian started to replicate the successful youth orchestra model that was established in Venezuela, and which now encompasses 90 orchestras. The Venezuelans came to Lisbon to help initiate the project.

The main objective was to achieve the children working together with instructors and engaging the family in the process by providing instruments the children take home. The children learn to play the instruments although they don't know how to read music.
The strong liaison with this community insured the success of the project, actually being a social project with a deep cultural character.

The Gulbenkian aims at bringing the orchestra to be a top ranked orchestra in the city.
An ongoing evaluation of the project over a three year period has been being conducted.
The Gulbenkian intends to replicate the project over other municipalities and then 'export' the idea in Europe.

It was commented that a similar project was developed in Palestine, an original orchestra has won a prestigious prize and become well known in Europe.

2. THE ARTERIAL NETWORK
Presented by Mulenga Kapwepwe, the Arterial Network

Arterial started as the result of a meeting between 65 representatives of 14 African countries in Senegal, including 5 days of discussion on the artists' expectations for Africa. The results were distilled into points concerning the future, such as:
- Policy
- Economics of the arts
- Government action for development of the arts
- Profile for artists in the media
- Information sharing,
and a desire for action.
To build on the energy, an action team of 7 members was established, who met with 12 members of funding bodies as observers. At this time there was no intention to establish a network. The group met in Capetown and summarized more formally the actions artists wanted followed up, as:
1. To be able to source useful information
2. To become more engaged in policy issues
3. To improve their lack of profile in the media
4. To create a platform collecting resources artists could access.

Various foundations (DOEN, Stromme, etc) joined the network and funded some lines of intervention such as mobility, training and promotion. This has produced for example a training initiative for journalists in Mozambique and the establishment of a resource group addressing the question of how an African art fund could be established.

Comments:
- For foundations is sometimes frustrating to fund projects for short time spans (1, 3 or even 10 years) which provides only some assistance.
- Arterial requires a very coordinated plan.
- It was noted that donors usually decide to allocate funds on the basis of the first meeting, which is a hint of trust in the individuals leading the network.
- It was stressed that in the case of Arterial a high level of trust was necessary since the decision making process remained at local level. Furthermore, HIVOS facilitated a federated task force of foundations with similar interests, collected grants from the European commission and acted as matchmakers to introduce partners to each other.

3. THEERTHA
Presented by Anoli Perera.
Theertha is a visual arts organization interested in:
- Working with local and international art organisations
- Supporting art education
- Supporting innovation
- Disseminating art knowledge
- Building audiences
- Supporting group dynamics (to foster peer communities)

Theertha focuses on local art and sustainable practice with studios, exhibitions, training of art teachers and skill development for artists, it is also a lab where annual workshops and residencies take place (facilities include a guest house and studios). Theertha also supports art made by women. Its publications are conceived as forums for writing and researches on art in South Asia, and are published in 3 languages. Theertha operates as an exhibition space, Red Dot, in order to contrast the predominance of commercial spaces in Sri Lanka.

Theertha is partner of the South Asian Network of Artists, with which it shares similar goals and practises exchange. The main funder of Theertha is HIVOS.

HIVOS and DOEN also support RAIN and Triangle networks and worked to set a collaboration between the two networks (previously the two networks didn't know about each other). This new initiative between two existing networks now funds artists' activities and provides tools for culture. HIVOS and DOEN also established a partnership with the Mondrian Foundation, offering flexible programming for Dutch artists to join in initiating activities.

4. RED LATINOAMERCINA DE ARTE PARA LA TRANSFORMACION SOCIAL
Presented by Ines Sanguineti, Rede Arte Y Transformaciòn Social
The context for this network is 'the most unequal and violent region in the world', and the decision to become a network with the synergies it offered was made on the occasion of a meeting of 24 leaders.

Interested in art as a right for all people, the RED focuses on art for youth, for education and artistic production (access and training) and aims at creating a platform for networks. Its goals are:
- Strengthening the Latin American platform
- Exchange of knowledge
- Build academic knowledge
- Build visibility

The scope is broad, events are organised beyond Latin America. Statistics suggest 27,700 direct participants per month in network events.

AVINA foundation has being supporting the RED within a programme aimed at enhancing leadership: Avina found in the RED a good platform promoting knowledge exchange amongst

leaders, teams and youth, through high visibility events, and now taking on the networking strategy. Once the network was established AVINA supported the functioning of the network by investing in the leaders with the aim of empowering individuals to achieve more collaboratively then singly.

Both the RED and AVINA foundation aim at building bridges beyond borders and regions. For RED, AVINA is an equal partner. AVINA is perceived as flexible and offering knowledge and social capital.

It was outlined that that projects like the Youth Orchestra have outreach in the society, the assist community building and social change through artistic production. In these projects people identify with their own community emphasizing that the outreach effect is the most crucial one. In such cases foundations may play the role of the State.

Such projects have direct impact on the working with the community but they are dangerous since they tackle the issue of individual dignity, which can be affected with some sort of hardship, that being war or poverty or natural disaster.

It was agreed by many that the **social and artistic aspects of the projects should be intertwined**, especially when artists work in the social context, as art should be a core issue in the society, it is important since it moves people, challenges transformations.
Artists however cannot be transformed in social workers.

Concerning the future of the Worshop it is necessary to tap the fact that all the participants are committed to the same fields (arts and culture) and have shared values and experiences. This should lead to **a more precise agenda**, to **a better definition of the sense and of the purpose of this forum**. Such forum eases the communication between cultural networks and foundations: it is an occasion to listen to each other and to exchange experiences, to know more and to go deeper to the core purposes of the concrete projects.

OUTCOMES AND IDEAS

On the last day the participants split up into 3 groups discussing specific topics:

[1] **Sustainability during financial crisis** (topic suggested by Ong Keng Sen)
During financial crisis, how to build arguments to sustain transnational pure art projects (the most at risk reg. funding)?
Participants: Gertrude Flengte (DOEN), Janet Livingstone (Central European Foundation), Fairooz Tamimi (Arab Fund for Arts and Culture), Antonio Pinto Ribeiro (C. Gulbenkian Foundation), Hama Goro (Centre Soleil d'Afrique -RAIN), Nevenka Koprivsek (Bunker Production), Mulenga Kapwepwe (the Arterial network), Oumar Sall (Groupe 30 - Réseau Interafricain d'échanges culturels), Magdalena Moreno (The South Project).

With the financial crunch, there is a need to go back to basics. **Transnational will cease to be the focus** as financial resources will be restricted to country level. We have to argue that transnational processes **are BASIC because they keep borders porous**. Foundations can contribute not just money but also skills and expertise.

It was suggested to **build an arts bank**; turning to artists for self-sustainable strategies. Successful international artists can contribute to the bank to benefit other artists who suffer from a lack of resources eg. ACC conducts art auctions where they ask grantees to donate a work or an artist with a studio/apartment can share it with another artist who may be travelling in that region. In the current situation of siege, how can artists develop **self-help programme** to preserve their art? Instead of giving money to projects, can artists and foundations contribute to develop such a bank?

[2] **Sharing intellectual resources** (topic suggested by Ana Zuvela)
How to provide space for knowledge sharing (academic and professional experiences) for the benefit of foundations, intellectuals, operators etc. How to put them together? (eg. basic knowledge on cultural networks).
Participants: Patricia Kistenmacher (AVINA), Atsuko Hisano (Saison Foundation), Maria Fernanda Matias (C.Gulbenkian Foundation), Kadhija El Bennaoui (Young Arab Theatre Fund), Zara Stanhope (curator), Ines Sanguinetti (Red Latinoamericana de Arte para la Transformaciòn Social), Natacha Melo (Red Sudamericana de Danza), Alvin Tan (The Necessary Stage).

Are there common platforms for information and research, not just between networks but individuals and national bodies? There are already two existing pivotal platforms:

> (a) IFFACA (Diane Dodd)
> (b) Culturlink Network (Ana Zuvela Busnja)

The primary aim of these platforms is the importance of the arts in transnational cultural collaboration. There are essentially two approaches: the academic stream and the practitioners stream. They contribute to build social capital.

Conclusion:

[A] Can we test a model that builds on these issues?
IFFACA and Culturlink: post and look for information on cultural operations
How to reach groups that do not have the technological means to access information?
How do we involve networks to use this platform? Can we have a key person to disseminate information (and helping those who do not have sufficient means to accede the web)? In this way, communication channels and the distribution of knowledge can be increased.

[B] Another challenge is language. As this affects access to information, networks can offer to translate summaries of research essays and resources.

[C] How to communicate to others about ourselves? Can we create a dynamic presentation of who we are for people who want to know about us?

[4] **Structure of the F&N Workshop** (topic suggested by Mary Ann De Vlieg)
The Workshop include people from different experiences: a clearer structure is needed. How do we structure or create a form for this forum?
Participants: Mouhtar Kokache (Ford Foundation Africa and Middle East), Ugo Bacchella (Fondazione Fitzcarraldo), Basma El Husseiny (Al Mawred Al Thaqafy), Tony Chamberlain (International Performing Arts Centres Network), Petar Todorov (Trans Europe Halles), Karen Jeynes (Performing Arts Network of South Africa).

In order to choose what form, **the vision** of this group comprising foundations and networks should be defined. The stakeholders are not interested in an international meeting point but in a **cross-national and collaborative** environment. How can we work more effectively to learn, to analyze and to build capacity for better mutual understanding?

The following discussion did not take place, because of lack of participants.
[4] **Cross agenda** (suggested by Ines Sanguinetti)
Both networks and foundations have separate agendas. Are there more efficient ways to achieve common goals? Can we look at existing ones, then at new areas to fill the gaps?

A group of participants finally suggested a one year exploratory project: a **South/South mobility fund for artists and cultural operators**. This fund should fill a gap, since no supporting mobility scheme exists for professionals and artists from the southern regions who want to move and to set international relationships with other colleagues in other South areas. The programme could cover the space within Africa, Asia and Latin America.
According to the promoters, the fund should be managed and co-funded by some networks and cultural organizations, with the support of public and private sources.
The project could be launched in 2009 and the first selection could take place within the same year. A two year evaluation would be conducted.

FINAL REMARKS ON THE WORKSHOP

About the Workshop, it was agreed about its usefulness, since
1. it provides a free space for discussion on these topics in a learning environment without expectations of concrete results.

2. it creates a set of working arguments for supporting networks;

3. it develops an idea for a pilot collaborative project among foundations as a sign of will to demonstrate the need for trans-national work.

How can this group engage in programmes all year round? It was advice to appoint a group to meet within the next 3 months. This group identifies an organization to be the secretariat for a year tasked to organize an annual meeting. A possibility would be South Africa in 2009, although there are some problems involved. Another possible event/venue would be Jogjakarta as the South Project is having a meeting there in 2009.

ANNEX I- LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

1. Ines Sanguinetti   Crear Vale La Pena – Red Latinoamericana de Arte para la Transformaciòn social   Argentina
2. Ana Zuvela Busnja   Culturlink Network   Croatia
3. Hama Goro   Centre Soleil d'Afrique –RAIN   Mali
4. Natacha Melo   RED SUDAMERICANA de DANZA   Uruguay
5. Nevenka Koprivsek   Bunker productions, Balkan Express, Junge Hunde   Slovenia
6. Ong Keng Sen   Arts Network Asia   Singapore
7. Khadija EL Bennaoui   YATF - Young Arab Theatre Fund   Brussels/Arab region
8. Alvin Tan   The Necessary Stage   Singapore
9. Oumar Sall   Groupe 30 - Réseau Interafricain d'échanges culturels -   Senegal
10. Magdalena Moreno   The South Project   Australia
11. Petar Todorov   Trans Europe Halles and Pro Rodopi Art Centre   Bulgaria/Europe
12. Karen Jeynes   PANSA – Performing Arts Network of South Africa   South Africa
13. Basma El Husseiny   Al Mawred Al Thaqafy – Culture Resource   Egypt/Arab region
14. Mark Deputter   Danse Bassin Mediterranée   Mediterranean region
15. Mary Ann De Vlieg   IETM – International Network for performing arts   Brussels/Worldwide
16. Diane Dodd   International Federation of Arts Council and Culture Agencies   Worldwide
17. Antonio Pinto Ribeiro   Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation   Portugal
18. Maria Fernanda Matias   Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation   Portugal
19. Patricia Kistenmacher   Avina Foundation   Argentina/Latin America
20. Janet Livingstone   Central European Foundation   Slovak Republic/Central Europe
21. Rupert Graf Strachwitz   Maecenata Institute for Philanthropy and Civil Society   Germany
22. Judith Staines   researcher   Great Britain
23. Fairooz Tamimi   Arab Fund for Arts and Culture   Jordan/Arab region
24. Tony Chamberlain   IPACNET - International Performing Arts Centres Network. The Arts Centre, Melbourne   Australia
25. Ugo Bacchella   Fondazione Fitzcarraldo   Italy
26. Anoli Perera   Theertha   Sri Lanka
27. Atsuko Hisano   Saison Foundation   Japan
28. Dietar Jaenicke   INCD (International Network for Cultural Diversity) / Forum Cultural Mundial   Germany/Brazil
29. Mulenga Kapwepwe   The Arterial Network   Zambia/Africa
30. Moukhtar Kocache   Ford Foundation Africa and Middle East   Africa -Middle East
31. Antariksa   The Indonesian Contemporary Art Network   Indonesia
32. Titarubi   The Indonesian Contemporary Art Network   Indonesia
33. Gertrude Flengte   Doen Foundation   The Netherlands
34. Zara Stanhope   curator   Australia
35. Ana Feder   European Foundation Centre   Brussels/Europe

ANNEX II - -THE RESEARCH "EXCHANGE RATES"

On occasion of the third Foundations and Networks International Workshop, a research was commissioned to the independent researcher Judith Staines*.

The research focused on 4 cases of collaboration involving foundations and networks in promoting local and transnational cultural cooperation and networking. The research - entitled **"Exchange rates: a pilot investigation into the relationship between foundations and international cultural networks"** - analyzed the following cases:
- Avina Foundation and la Red latinomaericana de Arte para la Transformaciòn Social
- Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation and the Generation Youth Orchestra
- Hivos and Arterial network
- Arts Collaboratory (Doen, Hivos and Mondrian Foundation) and Theertha.

6 representatives of foundations and 5 of networks were interviewed and a substantial report were produced and delivered to the participants before the Workshop.

The interviews succeeded in reconstructing the history and in presenting the experience and the future legacy of the collaboration. It explored the kind and the quality of the collaboration between funding bodies and operators, the legacy of the project, future developments and it paid a particular attention to the evaluation processes.

The report, which uses a very readable and engaging format, highlights the strengths and weaknesses of the relationship between foundation and network, the degree such relationship influences the running of the project and any future outcomes. The report is meaningful also thanks to the informal and outspoken approach of the research.

The report was recognised to be an useful learning tool and an occasion of reflection on the ways foundations and networks can operate to promote cultural cooperation.

By common consent of the interviewees, the report is now being re-edited and will be spread out among other foundations and cultural operators who did not attend the Foundations and Networks Workshop and could be interested in the process.

Judith Staines is a freelance expert, consultant, researcher and writer with over twenty years experience in the cultural sector in Europe. She is General Editor of www.on-the-move.org, a web portal dedicated to international mobility in the performing arts. In 2007, she co-researched and wrote Moving Art, a guide to the import/export of cultural goods between Russia and the EU for the European Commission Delegation to Russia, published in English and Russian. In 2006/07, Judith was on the Editorial Team for LabforCulture.
Many of her articles and reports on international cultural cooperation and mobility issues have been widely disseminated - on artists' international mobility programmes (IFACCA), tax and social security issues (On-the-Move), legal status of independent performing arts workers (IETM). In 1996 she wrote Working Groups, the influential advocacy report which explained the work of European cultural networks, published by EFAH. This study is still an important reference document for cultural management training courses across Europe. She has worked with various European cultural networks: IETM, EFAH, RESEO, ELIA and European Artists' Pépinières. She is based in South West England.

ANNEX III – FOUNDATIONS: DEFINITIONS AND HISTORY IN A GLOBAL PERSPECTIVE
Rupert Graf Strachwitz for the 3rd Foundations and Networks International Workshop
Lisbon, 2nd October, 2008

UNPUBLISHED DRAFT – DO NOT QUOTE WITHOUT PERMISSION

In modern organizational theory, foundations are classified as one of essentially two basic forms within civil society. While the majority of civil society organizations are associational in that members constitute the core structure, a minority is commonly defined by the assets the organization is entrusted with. At different times in history, this has made foundations somewhat unpopular both in theory and in practice. While societal theory has on occasion had severe doubts as to whether the rule of the dead over the living as implied by the binding will of the founder is compatible with democracy and the rule of law, governments at times have feared the alternative source of power vested in an institution equipped with considerable assets. An early example of a forceful theoretical attack is the French author Turgot, later to become Minister of Finance under King Louis XVI, who, in the famous Encyclopédie of 1755 summed up his analysis of foundations in the words "Il faut les détruire" – "They must be destroyed".

19th and 20th century legislation in many countries has aimed at curbing the power of foundations and limiting their scope of action, more often than not because modern government did not and does not trust non-governmental institutions when they become too influential. Yet, in many parts of the world, rulers and governments are themselves responsible for the creation of many foundations. Foundations are thus not necessarily the result of an act of private philanthropy; they represent an organizational form equipped with specific characteristics that have enabled them to survive societal upheavals, have laid proof of a sometimes extraordinary longevity, and are currently inordinately popular with citizens and governments alike. It is therefore no more than reasonable to suppose that foundations have an inherent cultural legitimacy.

In saying this, as foundation experts and executives are prone to do, we presuppose that we know and agree upon what a foundation actually is. But is there in fact such a thing as 'a foundation'? Is there a global definition applicable to entities styled foundations anywhere in the world? And if so, has not this definition been so distorted by differing legal systems that it is no longer meaningful? This is what I would like to discuss with you tonight, even if many people outside the foundation world might find it a very odd idea to devote much thought to the issue of defining a foundation. This may be because foundations can be seen at work so habitually all round the globe that everybody has developed his own notion which he or she believes to be universal. In a cultural and historical sense, we need to look at the concept of foundations in a much broader perspective. For foundations are among the oldest cultural phenomena of humanity, and so it is little wonder that they have developed quite diversely under different cultural conditions. I will argue however that there remains a basic commonality, that there are common characteristics and what I will try and show in my remarks is where these lie. You may well be surprised what I will come up with. I will attempt to do so in five steps.

My first step is to remind you of the functional diversity of foundations. Some may think of the American legal term that defines a (private) foundation as assets locked in a legal entity the revenue of which will serve to fulfill the intentions of the original donor. Others may know of a foundation, a Stiftung, a stiftelsen, a waq'f or whatever name it may come under in their own culture or region and however it may be defined with some reason suppose this to be the general model. Unfortunately, both assumptions are far from the truth. An analysis of existing foundations and legal frameworks shows us some very diverse functional models. Many institutions termed foundations in one culture would not be called that in another. US private universities are one example. By their nature, they would and in some cases do rank as foundations in most European systems. In fact, historically, with the notable exception of the University of Bologna, the oldest which has an associative founding history, all European universities were instituted by the will of a ruler, who defined the purpose of his foundation in perpetuity. So, while the United States of

America follows a comparatively narrow definition, a broader definition is commonplace in Europe, with significant differences between countries. Islamic foundations (awaq'f), highly important to Islamic culture and very numerous in all predominantly Islamic countries, have to this day a strong religious connotation and are usually operating, while both European and American foundations today are usually secular, with American foundations being predominantly grant-making. European foundations retain a much larger operational and an even larger ownership sub-sector. Looking at the issue from a cultural point of view, ownership is a highly important function, both in numbers and in impact. In Germany, approx. 50,000 church foundations ensure by their ownership that church buildings are used for worship in the way intended by the original donor. Given that the total of other foundations does not exceed 20,000, it is easy to see how important they are. Foundations in Latin America tend to follow the broader European model, those in Canada, India, Japan, and Australia the American model, anyway as far as they are modern creations. In some cultures, for instance traditional Islamic culture, foundations by their very nature are operational. In Europe, many are moving back to that role model as they no longer believe in the effectiveness of grant making. So already, one popular assumption, namely that foundations are grant making intermediaries within civil society, needs to be discarded.

To sum up my first step, generally speaking, foundations pursue their goals by performing four distinct, albeit frequently overlapping functions:
a)   ownership (e.g. preserving a church building as a church in perpetuity);
b)   operational (managing an institution or operating projects);
c)   grant-making (to a prescribed beneficiary or by a selective mechanism attributed to a board);
d)   individual aid (e.g. to individuals in need or distress, necessarily to be chosen by some selective process).

My second step is a more theoretical one in that I will describe briefly three basic reasonings connected to the concept of a foundation. But before, two important caveats:
1.   The matter is complicated by the fact that in most languages, both the act of giving, if intended as a long-term investment, on one hand, and the institution as such, on the other hand, are termed a foundation (fondation / fondazione / Stiftung etc.) thus blurring the issue whether the term applies to a process or an institution. This is clearer when applying the word Trust, traditionally used in English law in describing the legal status. I will be talking about institutions.
2.   The concept of foundations shares some commonalities with the concept of philanthropy. But they are not synonyms, foundations, as I will explain, being a wider organizational form, while philanthropy includes a wider view of giving, most especially giving of time, which foundations do not. Needless to say, I will not be talking about philanthropy.

Yet, the first reasoning, unsurprisingly, does have to do with giving. Biologists, anthropologists, historians, and sociologists agree that giving is an anthropological constant that may be observed in any society, and even with primates. All empirical evidence will tell us that neither does the act of giving always lead to a foundation nor does a foundation necessarily include such reasoning. Still this basic urge exists, and it is essential to remember this in order to understand the essence of a foundation. In setting up a foundation, a proprietor of assets (not necessarily, as I will argue, material assets) changes, without the new proprietor giving the former one any material value in return.

The second reasoning has to do with another anthropological constant: the wish to be remembered. Again, not every foundation is driven by this reasoning, and if it is, this may be to a very varying degree. Yet, if we look at foundations across the globe, more often than not the original act will have something to do with someone – private or public – wishing to be remembered in posterity, hopefully in perpetuity. To neglect, or, as some authors have done, to refute the aspect of memory – memoria in Latin – not only means not recognizing one of the strongest impulses to create a foundation, but also distorting the inbuilt historicism of every foundation.

Thirdly, foundations have to do with another very basic human instinct: the wish to have one's will followed for as long a period and with as few changes as possible. This will may be chrystal clear or vague, broad or narrow, allow for interpretation or demand strict adherence, but it will always be there, whether it originated in the head of one person, of a committee or indeed of government. So, in defining a foundation, three concepts of human planning need to be taken into account:

a)   the concept of giving;
b)   the concept of memory;
c)   the concept binding an institution to the will of its founder.

In an ideal world, a foundation might stand on all three of these three pillars. In our real world, these have served to develop a form that may well serve other purposes. Let me look at these aspects in a bit more detail:

The frequently made assumption that loving one's fellow man in general as prescribed by Christian doctrine (Matthew 22, 39) is the origin of giving in an organized fashion is false. Not only can this doctrine be traced in Jewish scripture (see i.a. Leviticus 19,18). It emerges that this concept entered human thought world-wide much earlier, between the 8th and 5th century B.C. Giving was transferred from an action restricted to one's immediate kin to a universal and potentially anonymous sector of society. In this sense, there is no doubt that Buddhism encompasses the notion of a general brotherhood in the context of which giving is a valued form of action. It is interesting to note that this extends to China, as well, whereas it had long been thought that Confucian philosophy precluded this. Mozi, in the 5th cent. B.C., clearly opposed Confucius who he believed had distorted the ethic of compassion by limiting it to the family. Plato presents us with a paradox of sorts, as he was no advocate of kindness to others, but did himself perform an act of philanthropy by leaving his private fortune to the Academy he had founded. In general, Greek and Roman philosophy certainly encompassed giving. In Islam, sharing one's wealth with the less fortunate is considered one of the five principles of religious observance.

The idea that man is inherently concerned with preserving the memory of himself, is even older, as is the notion that giving to the Gods is an important feature of life. In ancient Egypt, that the living should remember the dead was deemed essential for the latter's eternal peace. The Assyrian King Sanherib made a gift of 41 servants to the God Zababa. More concisely, Indo-European tradition which exercised a determining influence on the entire Mediterranean and northern world as well as the Asian from approx. the 4th millennium B.C. lays a strong emphasis on an enduring memory in this world as prime goal of human life. From about the 4th century BC, the Greek world and later most particularly the Roman Empire saw a plethora of memorial foundations, set up as stone memorials to the founder with the added purpose of reverence to a god or goddess. Citizens donating theatres and other public buildings in a form bearing all characteristics of a foundation were careful to include the memory of themselves among its purposes. We can still se some examples of these foundations in nearly every country that once belonged to the Roman Empire. I saw one in Leptis Magna in today's Libya, complete with a charter in Phoenician and Latin, dated A. D. 8. As we all know, modern day philanthropists more often than not name their foundation after themselves thus indicating their wish to be remembered through their foundation.

Finally, the concept of binding the institution to the will of the founder is, while not their invention, exemplified most clearly by the principles laid down by the founders both of Christianity and Islam, and incidentally not in Judaism and other religions. Christians believe that their Church is the foundation instituted by Jesus Christ which entails following what he laid down in religion, ethics, and procedures. While he left some room for interpretation and commentary, the Quran is seen by Muslims as the final and uninterpretable command of God. Both Jesus Christ and the Prophet of Islam may in this context be interpreted as giving the revelation they received to the world as a charter, thus incidentally falsifying the notion that the gift has in every instance to be material. If in this sense the major contribution to philanthropy is attributed to religion, this has much truth in it, but it must be borne in mind that until 2 centuries ago, virtually any human endeavor and action was seen in the context of man's relationship with God.

This analysis provides us with an important result: The foundation as an idea is under all circumstances more important than the transferral of assets. As a defining principle of a foundation, adherence to the founder`s idea, albeit including the space he or she left for interpretation, has certainly evolved as the strongest, while the existence of material assets, let alone assets of a nature that bear a revenue, is not definitory. This goes most specifically in determining the fundamental difference between a foundation and a membership-based association, the other classical organizational form of civil society. The difference is not that foundations have assets and associations do not; many associations have assets far exceeding those of foundations. The difference is that foundations are bound to their founder's will, and associations are not.

My third step is to take a closer look at the history of foundations. The main reason for doing so, is that foundations by their very nature, as sketched out very briefly, have an inbuilt historicism. A membership organization may start and fold as their members please. A foundation is a shot into the future that will not easily be stopped. Therefore, to grasp the essence of a foundation, an historical approach is particularly appropriate.

The ancient foundations clearly share all characteristics of a foundation in a broad cultural sense. Yet, the history of modern foundations can be said to begin with what we know as the Emperor Constantine's Edict of Milan of AD 313. The establishment of the Christian Church as a public legal body was decisive for the evolution of present-day foundation theory, both in Christian and in Muslim society, while both Buddhist and Chinese and Japanese theory lack this institutional development, thus giving space for foundations in spirit, but, as far as can be seen, not in law until European legal systems were adopted.

The incorporation of the Church included the right to act as a trustee, thus enabling Christians to entrust their Church with material assets and a provision for their usage. From this moment on, the Church could occupy the same position previously held by urban communities and temples which had adopted a practice of trusteeship some centuries before, complementing the autonomous foundations of the type described above. Given the foundation-type nature the Church ascribed to itself in a theological sense, donors endorsed the immaterial goal prescribed by Christ himself, thus complementing the immaterial with increasing material assets. The Emperors Theodosius in the 4th and Justinian in the 6th cent. AD further developed this legal framework. Most particularly, the Codex Justinianus, issued around 530, made ample provision for piae causae, good works that were to enjoy the government's special protection if performed by non-governmental entities, most especially the Church. These pious undertakings were by no means exclusively religious in a narrow sense, but included hospitals and alms houses, orphanages and xenodochia, where travelers could lodge. Interestingly, the memorial foundations popular in the Roman Empire found their way into Christian society as well. Early memorial chapels (cellae memoriae) can be traced back as far as the 2nd century and were to develop into the overwhelmingly important donations towards the building and upkeep of churches in the form of a foundation throughout the Middle Ages. The stability of the Church as an institution in times of political instability complimented the intended longevity of foundations.

Three elements are most noteworthy in this development:
a)   From this early age, trusts administered by a sole or by several pre-existing trustees and autonomous incorporated bodies governed by statutory bodies confined to this function exist side by side, bound together by the same notion of adherence to the founder's will, and both prompted to various degrees by an act of giving as well as the urge to be remembered.
b)   Foundations with assets destined to serve the purpose prescribed by the founders in themselves (e.g. a memorial stone or chapel) stand beside those equipped with assets yielding a revenue through which the purpose was to be fulfilled.
c)   The Islamic and Christian traditions of foundations can both be traced back to the Codex Justinianus, thus rendering this document the first legal base for foundations that is still relevant to a modern-day concept, and one to which all cultures must revert in tracing the origins of their own foundation model.

As in Roman times, foundations in Europe in the Middle Ages were initiated by rulers, the nobility and commoners alike. They fitted the model of any structural initiation in that somebody with the charisma and/or material resources to do so would create an institution in perpetuity destined to last longer than his, in exceptional cases her, lifetime. Given this pattern, it may seem a paradox that from the 12th century onwards, foundations developed predominantly as an urban phenomenon. However, in a local community where all strata of society contained a number of equals rather than one ruler, there existed, and I would assume still exists a competitive urge to transgress this equality by creating a lasting memorial. That is why, besides the Church, townships, and later universities, became the most important trustees, and may help explainwhy today, in an increasingly urbanized society of equals, creating a foundation has become universally popular with 'high net worth individuals'.

In 15th century Italy, the importance of charitable foundations was enhanced by the notion that newly rich bankers, notably the Medici in Florence, were pressured into donating huge sums of money to religious orders, towards the embellishment of their home town but also to establish educational institutions. The pressure was political as well as religious, counterbalancing usury being the key argument. What is exemplified here is that the act of giving while instrumental to the purpose it was to serve, is not necessarily based exclusively on a voluntary altruistic inclination. A similar rationale prompted the Augsburg banker Jakob Fugger to initiate the foundations in 1530 that exist to this day. In his case, defending the old Catholic faith against the new Protestant movement, was an added motive. So, looking at definitive elements, to act against rather than to support the mainstream of thought, policy, or action, while not universally accepted, to act as one believes is right no matter what other people believe, can be termed a driving force behind many new creations.

The 16th century reformation was a starting point for increasing opposition against the concept of foundations. Theologically, protestant teaching believed eternal life to depend entirely on God's favour, whereas Catholic dogma has always upheld the necessity of good works. The first wave of state intervention that followed the reformation was not, however due to theological arguments but to the ensuing breakdown of the medieval social order. Whereas in urban communities prone to adopt the new religion, the memorial urge proved stronger and ensured a continuing foundation activity, the rise of the national state was a more dangerous threat. Both in England and France, autonomous wealthy institutions were eyed with increasing suspicion. The more independent rulers became of pope and emperor on one hand, and nobles and other vassals on the other hand, the more they attempted to suppress any entity not subjected to their will. King Henry VIII of England was a typical example. The sovereignty of the state emerged as the prime framework of society. The polyarchy in which foundations as well as geographically and membership defined entities played a decisive role began to be judged a dated societal model. Thomas Hobbes in England, Jean Bodin in France, and Samuel Pufendorf in Germany provided political theory in support of this notion, Bodin in particular being strongly influenced by the religious wars in France that led him to adopt a more decisive approach. Peace and stability could only be maintained if the state was strong and had a monopoly on exercising power.

The nation state in general that evolved as from the 18th century did not appreciate foundations. But while England, in maintaining this principle, did allow for independent charities to exist - see Queen Elizabeth I. Statute on Charitable Uses, 1601 - France attempted to prohibit any form of non-governmental organization. Foundations were first severely curbed in 1749 and finally wiped out of the framework of law in the wake of the first post revolutionary constitution of 1791. The English example is particularly interesting in that the American colonies thus had a legal base under which their opposing belief in self-organized structures could flourish. American philanthropy, while more often than not religious in a more general sense was able to develop independently from an established Church. The French model was upheld in France during the 19th, and as far as foundations were concerned to the end of the 20th century, the first legal framework for foundations since 1791 being introduced in 1983. Kathleen McCarthy has recently provided ample evidence that the non-existence was rather more theoretical than practical, so that

Alexis de Tocqueville's famous characterization of his own country needs to be amended. In a global perspective, however, it remained an episode both in its rigidity, copied to some degree but without much success in Austria and Italy, and superseded by the concept of social economy in France and, towards the end of the 20th century, by the concept of an autonomous civil society world wide.

Both in Europe and in the Americas a model of foundations evolved, independent from the State and the Church, with varying degrees of state supervision being introduced in different countries. Contrary to this, the Islamic model of awaq'f as predominantly religious bodies persists to this day, albeit highly regulated by government. In the Osmanic Empire and later in Turkey, successful attempts were made to bring these religious institutions under state control, but it was only in the later 20th century that secular foundations began to exist there. In continental Europe, the modern secular state as envisaged since the early 18th and developed in practice since the early 19th century has permitted foundations to exist but insisted on government regulation and control.

In as much as governments acquired a secular constitutional base and the monopoly of law enforcement, foundations were obliged to concur with a regulative framework that could be more or less stringent but could no longer be absent. This was the paradigm under which the present-day form of foundation developed. Both in Europe and in North America, the new bourgeoisie acting in a vein of thought not unsimiliar to that of medieval town burghers became active philanthropists. Social housing, educational and arts institutions became the focus of their activity added to the traditional care for the relief of the poor. It is however important to note that even now, personal wealth was no prerequisite. A number of important foundations were started by public subscription or by the fundraising success of a spirited individual. In many cases, the dividing line between a substantial gift and the founding of a separate institution was not clear, as some gifts were put in trust with an existing legal body. The term foundation retained a non-legal definition encompassing an act of investive philanthropy as well as a legal and/or fiscal entity in itself. Throughout the 19th century, as the foundation historian Thomas Adam has shown, one modern foundation model developed in a close interchange between Great Britain, Germany, and the United States. The wealth of American industrialists and financial tycoons eventually raised the level of assets involved to heights few Europeans could match. John Jacob Astor's will of 1849 was the first endeavor on this scale, to be followed by university founders like Vassar, Cornell and Stanford, and later Johns Hopkins, and eventually by the hitherto unknown dimensions of philanthropy shown by Andrew Carnegie and John D. Rockefeller.

Carnegie is particularly interesting in that he reflected on his philanthropy theoretically and published numerous essays on the subject. Rather than providing relief to the destitute, his ambition was to "place within its (the community's) reach the ladders upon which the aspiring can rise", thus paving the way for a paradigm shift in foundation goals. While educational institutions had existed in foundation form before, and relief institutions continue to exist in that form, contributions to societal change became the thrust of foundation activity. This was matched by Carnegie's conviction that foundations should not originate through bequests but through living and engaged donors. There can be little doubt that these outlines have helped shape the modern notion of a foundation's basic mission, but it needs to be remembered that other role models retain their legitimacy.

European industrialists, notably Wellcome and Abbe, had similar thoughts, while on both sides of the Atlantic, other foundations models both continued to exist and were newly developed, most notably the community foundation model, first started in Cleveland, Ohio in 1910, and foundations started and funded by government in the tradition of ancient rulers. France, Italy, and Spain under the influence of French political theory, during this period did not contribute in any notable way to this development. These being predominantly Catholic countries, this may have prompted a common belief that foundations had something to do with typically protestant, more precisely, Calvinist ethics. But while Andrew Carnegie may well have considered himself as a chosen one, per Calvin, it would be difficult to argue that a Catholic entrepreneur might not have acted similarly, if private resources and a concurring legal framework had enabled him to do so. In any case,

formal equality of citizens inspired the more fortunate to construct memorials of themselves, social climbers being the most active.

Despite the known existence of other models, the model of the foundation created by the will of a wealthy, philanthropically minded individual became the dominating definition in the public arena. With it came a discussion that echoed French 17th and 18th century thinking: considering their formidable size and possibilities, were foundations, the rule of the dead over the living, the rule of individuals over the fate of many, compatible with a society governed by democratic principles? With the dichotomy of ever higher taxes on one hand and tax breaks for philanthropic giving on the other, in fact rendering the community co-donors, this discussion has become ever more relevant. Answers throughout the 20th century have oscillated between governments' fear of losing overall power, theoretical considerations as to the desirability of pluralist think tanks and centres of activity, fiscal greed for post-tax individual wealth, the urge of the citizens to contribute to society in assets as well as in time, and personal ambition and possibly vanity to set a memorial of oneself. It is worth noting that while Communist dictatorships had no use for institutions of this kind, Fascist regimes remained ambiguous in that high-ranking supporters actually set up foundations themselves, with assets quite regularly expropriated from victims.

So, my fourth step is to come back to the point that to see foundations as representing private philanthropic initiatives is too narrow a perspective. At all times, foundations have been created by kings and queens, noblemen and –women, burghers, and institutions. As the importance of the latter surged, so did their urge to create sustainable entities on which they might impose their will in binding form and in perpetuity. Political parties, governments, corporations, and associations have been and are continually acting in this fashion. One of the most remarkable examples is the case of Italy, where, in the 1990s, 89 private foundations were created by law to hold and subsequently divest themselves of the hitherto public banks and savings banks. These foundations – styled of banking origin – have been instrumental in transforming Italy's financial services market, philanthropy, and civil society in general, as well as providing serious funding to countless projects and institutions.

My fifth and final step in discussing the issue of defining a foundation is to raise the legitimacy issue. Are foundations in any form compatible with 21st century notions of democracy and civil society? After all, they are, by their very nature not in themselves democratic. They are governed as the founder wished. The governors are no more than administrators of his or her or their will – incidentally a point administrators occasionally tend to forget by themselves assuming the air of a philanthropist. In fact, they have a very difficult task. They are obliged by the very essence of what a foundation is, to be accountable to, and remain loyal to the founder's will as layed down in the original charter, while at the same time keeping up a spirit of innovation in close communication with their own time. Foundations do not necessarily benefit society in the way modern governments would wish this to happen – and are not they democratically elected to pursue this goal? They might, by providing elaborately researched policy papers, exert undue influence on government, and by their grant policy, on civil society.

The Council of Europe once defined four pillars on which modern society legitimately rests: human and civil rights, democracy, the rule of law, and cultural tradition. It is obvious that foundations by definition are not part of the democratic pillar. One may certainly argue that to set an organization in motion that will outlive the founder is not contrary to human or civil rights and is protected by the rule of law for as long as it is, in a very general way, tolerated by society. Most importantly however, this organizational form in its many varieties is indeed part of our common cultural tradition – common, I am happy to add, to mean world-wide. In modern civil society, given the notion developed over the past 20 years, foundations have acquired a position as one expression of self determined engagement for public benefit, although the fact remains that not all foundations are by this definition part of civil society, belonging instead to the government or private sphere.

At the beginning of the 21st century, foundations are more popular with the citizenry and their political leaders world wide than they have been for a long while. They have become important

funders of civil society including cultural activities. Moreover, they have become important ingredients of our culture of pluralism and individualism, and are no longer seen as threats to government supremacy. Even China has created a legal framework for foundations in the context of its excrutiating process of defining a relationship of its political system with civil society. They continue to operate important institutions, and have become considerably more pro-active in their grant making, thus incidentally becoming competitors to other agents in society who more often than not have fewer resources to draw on. This has been and will increasingly become a subject of controversy.

Foundations have also become an instrument of devolution and privatization, as is best exemplified by the Italian banking foundations. This movement in a sense bridges the divide between the necessities of realizing not-for-profit ideals in for-profit form, as in France in particular, and the strict borderline between for-profit and not-for-profit as exercised in Northern Europe, the US, and most other countries. This division in most countries, has precluded or outlawed foundations with purely private goals, e.g. providing an income to relatives or offspring. With few exceptions, like Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Austria, all of them nations with impeccable democratic credentials, law makers have deemed the questionable aspects connected to foundation activity to be tolerated only in connection with benefits to society at large. More generally, foundation activities on the scale of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and Warren Buffett's donation, have added a new dimension to the legitimacy issue. While acknowledging both the undoubted real benefit to the beneficiaries and the advantages of a pluralist approach to social change and battling the challenges facing society, the undercurrent of questioning the legitimacy of foundations remains. And while their inbuilt sustainability remains a strong argument for the desirability of this type of organization, their individualism and their accountability to history rather than to society will continue to be held against them – and there is no way a foundation may shed these characteristics.

To my mind, foundations today are in danger because they are so popular. We all know from history that popularity does not last. We may well see times when the rule of the dead over the living, the existence of independent resourceful power centres, and the chances offered to wealthy citizens to impose their will on the general public are again resented and possibly no longer tolerated, when parliaments reassert their right to vote on any expenditure towards the public good, or when the market looks askance at comparatively inactive assets. As our world goes, legality offers little protection when such circumstances arise. And a discussion that centres exclusively on wealth rather than purpose, and legality rather than legitimacy, will easily develop envy and greed as driving forces in changing the law. It therefore seems good policy to add the organizational, the multi-functional, the global, the sustainable, and, last but by no means least, the cultural arguments to the list offered in defense of the legitimacy of this strange animal. Foundations, as I have tried to show are an element of human societal culture that lawmakers may legally abolish but that will rise up again, possibly in different form, within a short period of time. They are also societal performers in a variety of fields with a rich cultural tradition that merits to be demonstrated and needs constantly to be improved on.

Rupert Graf Strachwitz, born in 1947, has been involved with not-for-profit organizations for well over 30 years – as a volunteer, staff member, board member, consultant, and researcher, and lecturer. Since 1989, he has been managing director of Maecenata Management, a consultancy that specializes in foundations and associations, corporate citizenship and philanthropy, and since 1997, he has also been the director of the Maecenata Institute for Philanthropy and Civil Society, now affiliated to Humboldt University, Berlin.

Born in 1947, he studied Political Science, History, and History of Art at Colgate University, Hamilton, NY, USA, and Ludwig-Maximilians-Universitaet, Munich, Germany. He graduated as an M.A. in 1974 with a thesis on The Levellers, a 17th century English citizens' action group. After serving at World Headquarters of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta (an international catholic disaster relief and medical aid organization) in Rome for 2 years, he became regional director for the Order of Malta Relief Service in Bavaria. Subsequently, he held a position in public life while serving on the board of a number of foundations as well as other NGOs, including German Caritas, where he was Vice-President in 1984/85. After becoming an

independent consultant in 1989, he became increasingly involved with Third Sector research and chaired the German advisory committee of the Johns Hopkins Comparative Nonprofit Sector Project from 1995 to 2000. Today, while still acting as a consultant, his main focus is on research and public policy to do with civil society and philanthropy. From 1999 to 2002, he served as member of the German Federal Parliament Commission on Civic Action. He chairs the European Policy Working Group of Europa Nostra, and sat on the board of the Fondazione Cariplo, Milan/Italy (from 2000 ro 2007), and a number of other nongovernmental organizations at home and abroad.

His approx. 300 publications, in German as well as in English, Italian, French, Chinese, Japanese, and Polish, include books and articles on foundation issues as well as cultural policy, the third sector, and civil society.

ANNEX IV – THE PROGRAMME

3rd FOUNDATIONS AND NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP
PROGRAMME

Thursday 2nd October 2008
Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Av. De Berna 45A, Lisbon, Portugal

13.00	Get together	
13.15 -15.15	**Foundations meeting** Why do we support networks? Exchange of reasons and experience on supporting networks and networking	**Networks meeting** Who is who. Who is doing what and in which context. An occasion to (better) know each other.
15.15 – 15.30	*Coffee break*	
15.30 - 18.00	**Steering group on evaluation** Meeting of foundations to develop a discussion on evaluation and to understand the feasibility of a research project. Open to foundations and invited networks.	**Networks meeting** Who is who. Who is doing what and in which context. An occasion to (better) know each other.
18.30 – 19.15	**Foundations: Definitions and History in a Global Perspective** Speech by **Rupert Graf Strachwitz**, Director, Maecenata Institute for Philanthropy and Civil Society, Humboldt University, Berlin, Germany	
20.00	Dinner offered by the Gulbenkian Foundation at the Modern Art Centre restaurant, (Rua Dr. Nicolau de Bettencourt).	
21.30	Film screening "*So Far, So Close*" (10 short films commisioned by the Gulbenkian Programme Distance and Proximity to several film directors from all over the world). Duration: 50 min. Modern Art Centre Auditorium.	

Friday 3rd October 2008
Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Av. De Berna 45A, Lisbon, Portugal

9.45 – 10.15	**Welcome by Emílio Rui Vilar**, President of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation
10.15 – 11.00	1. **Ong Keng Sen**, Artists' Network Asia 2. **Ângela Ferreira**, artist Why should we work together? What does it bring? Is there a use to bringing together different actors, (arts organisations/artists/foundations..)? Two inspirational speeches about the relevance of transnational and transectoral cultural and artistic collaboration and networking within the context of our complex and problematic world.
11.00 -11.30	Coffee break *(meditation after inspiration…)*

11.30 – 12.00	*The reality check…*
	Feed back to the whole group from the previous day sessions:
	   a) Evaluation
	   b) Networks
	Questions and answers.

12.00 -13.00	**Cases of cooperation between foundations and networks**.
	Key issues: success factors and critical points along the foundation's point of view and the networks'.
	Cases:
	   ▪ *The Avina Foundation and The Red Arte y Transformación Social*
	   ▪ *The Gulbenkian Foundation and the Young Generation Orchestra*

13.00-14.30	Lunch break offered by **Mr. Rui Vilar**, President of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.
14.30 – 15.00	**Cases of cooperation between foundations and networks.** Key issues: success factors and critical points along the foundations' point of view and the networks'.

	Cases: ▪ *Hivos Fund and the Doen Foundation + the Arterial Network and ArtsCollaboratory*
15.00 – 18.00	**Discussion about the cases** on the basis of others' participants experience.
20.00	Dinner offered by the Gulbenkian Foundation at the Modern Art Centre restaurant (Rua Dr. Nicolau de Bettencourt).
21.30	Opera "*The diary of one who vanished*". Direction: Marie Mignot. Duration: 40 min. Modern Art Centre Auditorium.

Saturday 4th October 2008
Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, Av. De Berna 45A, Lisbon, Portugal

10.00-11.30	**What are we doing next?:** Working session on the future steps of the workshop, on the basis of the participants' needs and aspirations.
11.30 – 13.00	Free and unstructered discussion among the participants about present and future projects.
13.00	Snack in the gardens offered by the Gulbenkian Foundation
14.00 -15.00	**Evaluation steering group**: follow up and agenda
15.00 – 17.00	**Networks meeting**
15.00 - 16.00	**Foundations meeting**
19.00 – 20.00	Guided tour to the exhibition "*Waltercio Caldas*". Modern Art Centre
20.00	Dinner offered by the Gulbenkian Foundation at the Modern Art Centre restaurant (Rua Dr. Nicolau de Bettencourt).

Report closed on 6th March 2009.