



Diaspora and Transnational Philanthropy in Greece

REPORT OF THE DIASPORA PHILANTHROPY COMMISSION

LEAD AUTHOR:

Antonis Kamaras, Country Coordinator of the Greek Diaspora Project,
South East European Studies at Oxford (SEESOX)

November 2019

The Greek Diaspora Project

South East European Studies at Oxford (SEESOX)
University of Oxford

seesox

South East European Studies at Oxford



UNIVERSITY OF
OXFORD

Diaspora and Transnational Philanthropy in Greece

REPORT OF THE DIASPORA PHILANTHROPY COMMISSION

By Antonis Kamaras

The author is grateful to Dorian Singh for her meticulous editing and Julie Adams for her impeccable formatting and presentational style of the Report. Othon Anastasakis and Manolis Pratsinakis provided invaluable advice on the Report's structure and contents. As usual ultimate responsibility for the Report, and in particular for any errors of omission and commission, lies with the author.

Table of Contents

Foreword	2
Executive summary and recommendations	5
Introduction	11
1. Diaspora and Transnational Philanthropy in Greece pre-crisis	15
2. The crisis and its effects on Diaspora and Transnational Philanthropy	22
3. Diaspora and Transnational Philanthropy and government entities as grantees	26
4. The interviews with Transnational Foundations: Key findings	31
5. The interviews with non-profits, NGOs and state organisations: Key findings	39
6. Concluding synthesis	46
7. Resources	52
References	56

Foreword

In the 1970s Konstantinos Tsoukalas, in his path-breaking doctoral dissertation on the formation of Greek society in the 19th century, studied thoroughly a subject matter that up to that time had not seriously engaged either historians or sociologists: the role of educational institutions and of their funders in the evolution of Greece¹. Other than municipalities which the Constitution prescribed that they should fund primary schools, what were the allocations by the state and private individuals for secondary education and the University of Athens, the one and only university in Greece at the time? Taking note of a disproportionately large contribution of philanthropic donations to Greek education, Tsoukalas sought to find out who were the philanthropists.

Thus, he compiled a list of benefactors to the nation in which he included not only the names of the great and well-known philanthropists, such as Varvakis, Dombolis, the Valliano brothers, Syggros, Maraslis, Arsakis, Tositsas, Rizaris, Averoff and others, but also dozens of less prominent individuals who funded more modest projects, usually primary schools in their birthplaces. Most of the stone-clad schools which we still see today in our villages, both in the islands and in the mainland, were built during that period. Almost all of the great benefactors belonged to diaspora Hellenism, from Alexandria to Vienna, while the smaller ones were in their majority dispersed throughout the Greek Kingdom.

Throughout the second half of the 19th century, and in the first two decades of the 20th, the funds thus committed by philanthropists were enormous. Tsoukalas compared the grant total of philanthropic benefactions to education with the budgetary allocations of the Ministry of Education for the period, and established the astonishing fact that up until 1870 the funds committed by the ten largest benefactors were well in excess of state expenditure on education. This disparity of private benefactions over state allocations in education continued, albeit not as pronounced, up until 1922, as in the aftermath of the Asia Minor Catastrophe philanthropic giving lost its prominence.

To the above mentioned benefactions directed to school buildings Tsoukalas added scholarships for indigent students in Greece and abroad, granted by the same cohort of philanthropists. My own research has established that over half of the bequests which were established for the University of Athens until 1944 originated from professors who died childless and who bequeathed their assets to the financial support of students who mostly originated from these professors' birthplaces.

¹ See Tsoukalas, K., *Dependence and Reproduction: the social role of educational mechanisms in Greece (1830-1922)*, introduction by Svoronos, N.G., Athens, Themelio, 1977

The conclusion by Konstantinos Tsoukalas is highly significant from the point of view of the contribution of Diaspora philanthropists to modern Greece:

‘The national consciousness which was reproduced in Eastern Mediterranean [during that period] was closely connected with the ‘cultural patriotism’ which was embodied by all school mechanisms and principally of the University of Athens’.²

This cultural patriotism, in combination with what the author calls “the adoration of learning” (‘μορφωσιολατρεία’), placed Greece at the onset of World War I in a leadership position among countries in the Balkan and Eastern Mediterranean regions, from the point of view of education, skilled expertise and integration in the European trade, capitalist and, by extension, civilisational order.

Regrettably, the author’s investigation does not advance further in the 20th century so we are not aware of the specific reasons for which philanthropic benefactions and bequests discontinued. Was it due to the Asia Minor Catastrophe and the disorientation caused by the enormous state task of catering to the welfare and integration of a vertiginous large number of refugees? Or was it due to the National Schism (Εθνικός Διχασμός) and the Civil War which marked our national trajectory until the fall of the military dictatorship in 1974? What is for certain is that the enthusiasm and optimism engendered in the first one hundred years of independence by the ‘Megali idea’, namely of a greater Greece that would encompass its most significant co-ethnic population groupings living under Ottoman rule, were now missing. We had to reach the post-1974 democratic transition and the entry of our country to the then European Community to regain the self-confidence and faith in the strengths of the nation. What about the current crisis, ‘the memoranda era’, someone could plausibly ask? I want to believe that the current crisis did not stymie a broadly positive trajectory but that, on the contrary, this coming down to earth, no matter how painful, will prove to be a solid foundation for a new beginning for Greece.

What is for certain is that, in recent years, the philanthropic tradition seems to have revived in Greece. I am not only referring to the brilliant projects on Piraeus and Syggrou Avenues - although in this present period I believe that there is no other country, at a similar stage in development, where the National Library, the National Opera and a leading hospital have all been built and funded, in total, by private, philanthropic foundations. I will focus to a greater degree on smaller donations which continue to be granted steadily, and in particular to educational institutions. In the University of Athens, during a period when state funding, excluding salaries, has been dramatically curtailed – from 77 million euros in 2009 it fell to less than 10 million euros in 2016 – such support became even more important. To highlight a single case, in my capacity as a professor of

² Ibid, p. 492

the Athens School of Law, I can verify that in 2017, amidst the crisis, the most ambitious plan for the upgrade of the School's facilities was implemented since I was first hired in 1980. This plan incorporated the construction of our library in the historic building of the Old Chemistry, at Solonos Street, and the renovation of the neoclassical building at the intersection of Academias and Sina Streets which houses administrative functions, professors' offices and many seminar rooms. These projects would not be completed without private, philanthropic funding. Additionally, there have been dozens of donations to the two university hospitals, Aretaion and Aiginitio, while there are many university clinics and laboratories that owe much to philanthropic and corporate donors. Finally, with regard to domestic and international scholarships, the amount given in 2016 from the returns of bequests granted to the university exceed the very meaningful amount, in such times of crisis, of 3 million euros annually, supporting a total of 307 students.

To my knowledge the Greek Diaspora Philanthropy Commission Report is the first one that aims to study the issue of philanthropic funding for the public benefit at the present juncture, both in its domestic and international dimension. The authors of the Report, being aware that in Modern Greek history the contribution of the diaspora has been highly significant, did not limit themselves to the collection of the relevant material. Rather, they have articulated specific recommendations to the state, to local authorities, but also to philanthropists themselves for the renaissance of philanthropic patriotism under these novel circumstances. These recommendations are pertinent due to the fact that the existing regulatory framework for philanthropic donations and assets does not meet the needs of the present. There is no policy regarding philanthropic giving from abroad. As for philanthropic giving for resident Greeks, the asphyxiating regime of state supervision and control of Law 2039 / 1939 – although it was improved in many areas with Law 4182 / 2013 – denies philanthropic foundations the flexibility they need to achieve their goals. It would not be an exaggeration to say that philanthropists are treated by the relevant state authorities primarily as potential tax evaders, only rarely as disinterested volunteers, and even less frequently as benefactors.

Having observed philanthropic giving in recent years, out of scholarly and professional interest, I am in position to assure that the present Report is the most thorough and ambitious study of this subject matter. The use of the Report's conclusions by the relevant stakeholders will, I believe, contribute to the improvement of the conditions pertaining to philanthropic giving in Greece, to the benefit of the country in this difficult juncture.

Athens, May 2019

Nicos C. Alivizatos

Professor Emeritus, University of Athens

Executive summary and recommendations

The Greek Diaspora Philanthropy Commission and its Methodology

South East European Studies at Oxford/Greek Diaspora Project (SEESOX/Greek Diaspora Project) established a Commission on Greek Diaspora Philanthropy. The objective of this Commission is to investigate the patterns of diaspora philanthropy during the crisis years and the implications of these patterns for post-crisis Greece. The end product of the SEESOX Greek Diaspora Philanthropy Commission is this report which highlights the successes and constraints of diaspora philanthropy in Greece and puts forward a set of actionable recommendations.

The Commission Report's evidence gathering and analysis rests on two foundations. First, on the identification of significant patterns in the domains of philanthropy, both in the non-profit sector and the state, through a careful reading of the reporting, analysis and commentary by the Greek press in the period 2013-2018. The second foundation of the Commission's report rests on material from 22 interviews lasting approximately one hour each that took place in 2018. The interviews were conducted with (1) eight Greek diaspora, transnational philanthropic foundations and one ex-minister of diaspora affairs (2) four US non-profits and one UK non-profit with a long-standing presence in Greece and with a strong grantee relationship with Greek diaspora philanthropy, Greek-American and transnational (3) eight Greek state and local government organisations, NGOs and non-profits which have developed or could develop a diaspora-centric fundraising strategy.

Diaspora and Transnational philanthropy, what it is and who practices it in Greece?

The widely used definition of diaspora philanthropy adopted by the Commission is the private, voluntary transfer of resources for the benefit of the public which involves (a) charitable giving from individuals who reside outside their homeland, who (b) maintain a sense of identity with their home country (c) give to causes or organizations in that country and (d) give for the public benefit. Furthermore, diaspora philanthropy does not only entail the transfer of monetary resources but also goods, volunteer labour, knowledge and skills and other assets.

The Commission also focused on transnational philanthropy which is the form of diaspora philanthropy that is most prominent in Greece. Transnational philanthropy is practised by actors who operate concurrently or sequentially in their host and home countries. Such

transnational philanthropists tend to be embedded in their home country where they have deep connections and networks as much as operational experience accumulated over an extensive period of time.

Greek transnational philanthropy originates mostly from Greek shipping, which has been its main funder. Greek shipping is a global activity, managed in Greece but also in several other jurisdictions, which generates above average surpluses.

Another feature of Greek diaspora and transnational philanthropy which long predates the crisis is the role of US non-profits operating in Greece which, due to the increasing prominence and wealth of the Greek-American community in the US, have become increasingly reliant on diaspora fund raising.

The crisis in Greece and diaspora and transnational philanthropy

The crisis has expanded the portfolio of activities of diaspora and transnational philanthropy in Greece while redefining pre-crisis funding priorities. Particularly transnational foundations responded to the widespread, as well as acute, social needs that arose out of the dramatic loss of employment and overall fall of income of the population. They did so by incorporating in their agenda social welfare and economic recovery issues.

Still, transnational foundations, even after internal debate, confidently stuck with pre-crisis priorities in culture and education, convinced that these priorities actually became uniquely resonant due to the crisis.

Altogether the ranks of non-profit organisations that were primarily funded by diaspora and transnational philanthropy expanded during the crisis, a fact which has a qualitative and not only quantitative dimension, as these non-profits could not but respond to the expectations of their private, philanthropic donors for transparency and efficiency.

The crisis not only increased the impact of diaspora and transnational philanthropy on the operational strategies and governance of Greece's non-profit sector, it also affected Greek Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). CSR piggybacked on projects of increasing ambition funded by diaspora and transnational philanthropy which, due to the crisis, had acquired an appetite for bankrolling transformative change in Greece.

By contrast to such fluidity in grantee and grantor relationships in the non-profit sector and CSR, Greek governments during the crisis have doubled down on the pre-crisis tradition of selecting unqualified boards for state organisations, of engaging in high turnover of boards, and of not creating boards in important state organisations, such as archaeological museums. These sets of practices have undermined the ability of state

organisations to appeal systematically to the diaspora and transnational philanthropic community in order to augment and diversify their revenue streams in a period when state funding barely covers their operational expenses.

Notwithstanding the above, both the record and our interviewees have confirmed and specified the differentiated aptitude for attracting diaspora and transnational funding within and at different levels of the Greek state. Leading Municipalities, such as that of Athens and Thessaloniki, have struck strategic relationships with diaspora and transnational philanthropy which have involved novelty both in policy delivery and policy content. Our interviewees have also highlighted that within the central government there are many dedicated functionaries that act as advocates of diaspora and transnational foundation funding and ensure that such funding fulfills its intended purpose.

No systematic effort to catalyse diaspora and transnational philanthropy, at home or abroad

Our interviewees communicated to us the lack of a systematic effort by Greece's diplomatic machinery to catalyse diaspora philanthropy for Greece. Our interviewees have also noted the jealous attitude of the Greek Orthodox Church in the US towards competing claimants, be they non-profit initiatives from Greece or from the Greek-American community, to Greek-American philanthropy.

That being said, responsibility for successive Greek governments not having instituted changes on governance in important categories of state grantees or in actively soliciting diaspora philanthropic inflows must be at least, in part, shared with the most important diaspora and transnational foundations. Diaspora and transnational foundations have registered in the interviews, in their majority, their unwillingness to engage in public advocacy. Illuminatingly, they have chosen not to form an association, which would be the necessary institutional corollary of their public advocacy. Thus, issues such as the governance of state grantees and of catalysing diaspora philanthropy are bound to lack 'ownership' in the foreseeable future and Greece's political class will, commensurably, not be challenged to address them.

Diaspora philanthropy and the Greek state: what can we recommend?

The question that arises, both from the factual record and the interviews conducted, is the extent to which Greece, with its statist, Southern European tradition, under conditions of dramatic and long-term fiscal retrenchment, aligns itself with diaspora and transnational philanthropic actors – wealthy diaspora Greeks mostly from North America

and foundations endowed mostly by Greek shipping families - who are integrated in and share the assumptions of a highly liberal and pluralistic order.

The Commission, in an attempt to answer this question, proposes a three-pronged response. First, the Commission argues that transnational foundations engage in structured advocacy of their position so that democratic deliberation can have the opportunity to reach an informed decision on the nature of the relationship between philanthropy, society and the state. Second, the Commission advocates that considering Greece's severe medium to long term fiscal constraints the Greek state should, through governance reforms and active solicitation, expand both the quantity of diaspora and transnational philanthropy and of state grantees of such philanthropy. Thirdly, the Commission suggests that government and diaspora and transnational philanthropy work together, via the mechanisms of improved supervision of non-profit and state grantees, to enhance the positive impact of philanthropic inflows be they from the diaspora or from resident philanthropic actors.

The Commission's Recommendations

To the diaspora and transnational foundations active in Greece:'

- 1. Diaspora and transnational foundations and other significant philanthropic foundations should form an association in Greece to pursue goals such as i) codify key findings and proposals to the Greek state based on their very significant interaction with state authorities and grantees without fear of being singled out for retribution ii) collate and disseminate data and knowledge on philanthropic activity in Greece and thus help create an informed stakeholder community, around philanthropic giving, in Greece and in the Greek diaspora. In particular, such an association should seek as a priority to maximally catalyse the shipping community's philanthropic engagement with Greece, as well as the philanthropic engagement of the diaspora's most wealthy members.*
- 2. Prioritise funding support in Greece's universities for the creation of fund-raising offices. With a relatively small outlay, the foundations can help state universities cultivate their huge alumni bases in order to generate donor inflows. Developing this fund-raising infrastructure will also bring closer the diaspora to Greece, as thousands of state university alumni live and work abroad. At the same time, such a fund-raising infrastructure will help encourage the notion of philanthropic giving among Greece's university educated population.*
- 3. Advance the public and scientific dialogue in Greece on best practices in the management of national patrimonies, and in particular antiquities, particularly museum governance. The reform of the governance regime of Greece's classical*

legacy is an absolutely critical factor in expanding the philanthropic engagement of the diaspora with Greece.

To the Greek State:

4. Form a Charities Commission – the England and Wales Charities Commission can be a model - which will supervise all foundations and non-profits so that there is a single regulator in a position to articulate the regulatory regime for philanthropy and the non-profit sector in Greece, and endow it with the resources necessary to police the sector and protect it from abuses. Relatedly, remove the charitable bequests from the control of the Ministry of Finance where there is an inherent conflict of interest (the Ministry of Finance being traditionally hostile to measures that affect taxable income) and move them under the control of such a Charities Commission.

5. Introduce boards of directors in all organisations under state control and supervision and reintroduce them in state universities. Create a Public Appointments Commission – the UK example could be adopted - which will screen the suitability of all appointments by the government and by the boards themselves, to board membership, executive and non-executive, of state controlled and supervised organisations. Credible, stable boards in important state organisations are simply a sine qua non for the execution of an effective fund-raising policy in Greece and abroad.

6. Facilitate the philanthropic activity of resident, non-diaspora, non-transnational legal entities and individuals through generous tax exemptions on charitable giving. This fiscal cost is justified for a series of compelling reasons, such as a) the resulting increase in local philanthropy will align with diaspora and transnational philanthropy, thus increasing not only the totality of philanthropic resources but also the quality of its impact due to the local know-how that it will carry with it b) greater local philanthropy will also expand the organizational capacity of Greek non-profits as much as their connectivity with the diaspora and transnational philanthropic community, thus having a multiplier effect on philanthropic inflows.

7. Strengthen and extend an audit and review process in state education and public health respectively so that the philanthropic community, diaspora and non-diaspora, can both reward excellence in the state sector as well as, in the case of underperformance in critical areas of state provision, support remedial measures.

8. Instruct ambassadorial and consular staff to promote fund-raising by all highly reputable non-profits operating in Greece, be they of Greek or non-Greek origin, as in the case of the US non-profits, within the diaspora communities of their catchment areas. In coordination with the President of the Hellenic

Republic, prioritise and systematise the bestowing of state honours to distinguished diaspora and local philanthropists

9. Consider adopting policy instruments designed to enhance the impact and volume of diaspora giving such as that of the Mexican state, whereby charitable giving by diaspora associations to their locales of origin is matched by state funding.

10. Consider that by facilitating the exercise of the right to vote to Greek citizens living abroad, numerous diaspora loci will be created, via political mobilisation, other than those of the Greek Orthodox Church. Thus, the capacity of the Greek Diaspora communities to engage with Greece not only politically but civically and philanthropically might well increase exponentially – as much as the capacity of societal and non-profit actors in Greece to connect productively with the diaspora.

To Greek local government:

11. Embrace a pro-philanthropy agenda in terms of improving board governance, instituting boards where none exist in state organisations, be they under central, regional or municipal control, and supporting tax exemptions for philanthropic giving. Given that diaspora and transnational philanthropy is strongly attracted to giving to places of origin, it is to the interest of local government to adopt such an agenda.

To Greek non-profit organisations:

12. Work with a future association of foundations to form voluntary guidelines in terms of board structure and other governance principles, as well as in embedding transparency. Form an association or associations of their own, around such thematic axes such as social welfare, education, culture and so on, that will protect the designation of non-profit from disreputable players, generate data on their collective achievements and participate in the policy dialogue that affects the domain of their activities as well as their interaction with the local and the diaspora and transnational philanthropic communities.

Introduction

South East Europe Studies at Oxford (SEESOX) has launched a multiyear research programme entitled the Greek Diaspora Project. SEESOX's Greek Diaspora Project studies the economic, political and philanthropic interactions of Greek diaspora communities and actors with Greece – and in particular the way these interactions can influence Greece's evolution and developmental trajectory as an economy, society and polity, during the crisis years and beyond.

SEESOX established a Commission on Greek Diaspora Philanthropy. The workings of the Commission have been greatly helped by the Bodossaki Foundation which has identified many of the interviewee institutions, contributed to the determination of the questionnaire approach, assisted in setting up interviews and participated with its staff in the interviews themselves. The Commission Report's team members were Marilena Anastasopoulou and Antonis Kamaras from SEESOX and Panos Alexopoulos and Xenia Papastavrou from Bodossaki Foundation. Bodossaki Foundation's support is gratefully acknowledged by SEESOX notwithstanding the fact that the lead author of the report, Antonis Kamaras, is solely responsible for the report's analysis and recommendations.

The objective of this Commission is to investigate the patterns of diaspora philanthropy during the crisis years and the implications of these patterns for post-crisis Greece. In this context, we need to underline the lack of associational forms among philanthropic foundations as well as non-profit organisations that have attracted diaspora and transnational philanthropy. Such associational inaction in Greece has meant that the experiences of the relevant stakeholders, as it relates to the diaspora and transnational philanthropy, have mostly been informally shared as opposed to being systematically registered and articulated by the stakeholders themselves. Relatedly, although there has been substantial scholarly interest in Greece during the crisis years of developments in the non-profit sector, and more generally in civil society, diaspora philanthropy and its impact have been, comparatively speaking, underexplored.

Consequently, the Greek Diaspora Philanthropy Commission seeks to provide an empirically substantiated analysis of the phenomenon of diaspora philanthropy in Greece that could contribute to the thinking of both practitioners in the field and scholars. The end product of the Greek Diaspora Philanthropy Commission is this report which will highlight the successes of diaspora philanthropy in Greece, without overlooking the barriers limiting its activities. The report will also put forward practical recommendations and their supporting rationale. The Commission's ultimate goal is,

first, to encourage the creation of a community of stakeholders, more aware of their respective activities and strategies and capable of advancing a coherent agenda of action. Second, to facilitate a greater understanding of the collective experience of diaspora philanthropy in Greece, of benefit to public discourse and scholarly inquiry, and thus facilitate evidence-based democratic deliberation and decision-making in the domain of philanthropy in Greece.

Methodology

The Commission Report's evidence gathering and analysis rests on two foundations. First, on the identification of significant patterns in the domains of philanthropy, the non-profit sector and the state, through a careful reading of the reporting, analysis and commentary by the Greek press in the period 2013-2018. The identification of patterns to emerge out of this press review has been complemented by policy and scholarly analysis where possible. The main themes reviewed in the relevant press articles relate to Greek diaspora and transnational, as well as non-diaspora philanthropy, the non-profit sector and the Greek state, in its capacity as a major grantee of diaspora and transnational philanthropy.

This press review was based primarily on the relevant coverage of the daily editions of KATHIMERINI and TA NEA and the Sunday editions of KATHIMERINI and TO VIMA which cover the center-right, center-left gamut. The criterion of choice in the selection of these newspapers was comprehensiveness and credibility of reporting rather than comprehensiveness of ideological preference in the coverage of diaspora and transnational philanthropy across the political spectrum.

The second foundation of the Commission's report is 22 interviews lasting approximately one hour each that took place in 2018 and where both SEESOX/Greek Diaspora Project and Bodossaki Foundation staff were involved. The aim pursued through these selected interviews was to confirm, qualify or enrich the identification of the patterns established through the examination of the literature and of the factual record of diaspora and transnational philanthropy in Greece.

The interviews were conducted with (1) eight Greek transnational and diaspora philanthropic foundations and an ex-minister of diaspora affairs (2) four US non-profits and one UK non-profit with a long-standing presence in Greece and with a strong relationship with Greek diaspora and/or transnational philanthropy (3) eight Greek state and local government organisations, NGOs and non-profits which have developed, or could develop, a diaspora-centric fundraising strategy. The interviewee choices were informed, first, by the observation that most significant diaspora philanthropy involves

donors' transnational foundations rather than 'pure' diaspora foundations, i.e. foundations, the founders, boards and staff of which tend to be located both in Greece and outside Greece. Second, by the observation that US non-profits in Greece, precisely because of their American origins, have tended to develop, within the ranks of the Greek non-profit sector, the strongest links with diaspora philanthropy originating from the Greek-American community and subsequently with the transnational foundations. Third, by particular features of non-profits, NGOs and state and local government organisations that allowed them to develop promising fund-raising strategies vis-a-vis diaspora and transnational philanthropy, or could yet enable them to develop such strategies in the future. While scheduling conflicts and time limitations meant that we were not able to interview important grantor and grantee organisations, we hope that the interview findings will establish that the aim of the interviews has substantially been achieved.

The Commission Report's Outline

The first section of the Commission's Report will briefly identify key concepts, the scholarly treatment of civil society development in Greece during the crisis, and the leading players and features of diaspora philanthropy prior to the crisis. In particular, in the pre-crisis period, we will identify a) the hybrid, transnational philanthropy conducted by foundations almost exclusively established by the Greek shipping community, hence referred to as transnational foundations b) the mainly US non-profits operating in Greece, often for more than a century, which have progressively become more reliant on funding from the Greek-American community and transnational foundations.

The second section will seek to identify the key elements of diaspora philanthropy during Greece's nearly decade-long economic crisis. First, we will focus on the expansion in diaspora philanthropic giving due to the acute, nearly existential economic crisis that Greece has undergone. Second, we will examine the evolution under crisis of the partnership between diaspora and transnational philanthropy, local NGOs, and the charters of international NGOs in Greece and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR).

The third section will examine how critical choices of the central government expand and constrain the possibilities of diaspora and transnational philanthropy. First, we will assess the impact on the capacity of government-controlled entities to seek funding from diaspora, transnational philanthropy, of Greece's governments' preference for partisan control in the appointments of board members of such entities. Second, we will address the political and bureaucratic entrepreneurship demonstrated, respectively, by proactive mayors and state functionaries who have engaged in co-production of public

goods and services in alignment with diaspora and transnational philanthropy and key partners in the Greek non-profit sector and CSR.

The fourth section will present the key findings of the interviews conducted by the Diaspora Philanthropy Commission with important diaspora and transnational foundations and one of Greece's most experienced policy makers in state policy towards the diaspora.

The fifth section will present the key findings of the interviews conducted by the Diaspora Philanthropy Commission with US non-profits with a tradition of sourcing diaspora philanthropic giving and Greek and international non-profits and state organisations which have accessed, or could potentially access in the future, significant diaspora philanthropic support.

The sixth section will synthesize the analysis of the patterns relevant to philanthropic giving in Greece, established by the review of the print media and relevant literature, with the interviews' main findings.

A Resources section will briefly review the publications and press coverage utilised by the Report for its analysis and recommendations.

This Report represents a first stage in the investigation of diaspora and transnational philanthropy by SEESOX's Greek Diaspora Project. A subsequent stage will involve the investigation of diaspora philanthropy – specifically, the patterns it exhibits and its actual or potential interaction with Greece - in important diaspora communities, such as that of the UK, the US, Canada, Switzerland and Australia. This next stage will be undertaken in partnership with local academic institutions and researchers in these countries.

1. Diaspora and Transnational Philanthropy in Greece pre-crisis

Key concepts and scholarly debate

Neither the migration of people nor the tradition of giving back to homelands are new phenomena, either for Greece or for numerous other countries which have substantial diaspora communities. However, over the past two decades there has been an increasing interest worldwide by scholars, government leaders, policy makers, and international agencies in diaspora philanthropy. This growing interest can be seen in light of the changing patterns of migration including the increased rates of well-educated and highly skilled migrants, the growth of remittances, the contribution of diaspora communities in national development, and the emerging importance of global philanthropy and civil society. But what do we mean exactly by the term of philanthropy, diaspora and transnational philanthropy, in present-day terms?

The widely used definition we will adopt of philanthropy is the private, voluntary transfer of resources for the benefit of the public. When we discuss diaspora philanthropy we adopt definitions that include the following features (a) charitable giving from individuals who reside outside their homeland, who (b) maintain a sense of identity with their home country (c) give to causes or organisations in that country and (d) give for the public benefit. Furthermore, diaspora philanthropy does not only entail the transfer of monetary resources but also goods, volunteer labour, knowledge and skills and other assets.

We also focus on that aspect of transnational philanthropy which is the form of diaspora philanthropy that is most prominent in Greece. Thus, the effectiveness of diaspora philanthropy can also be determined by the nature of contemporary transnationalism involving donations in both money and time of diaspora actors, persons and organisations, which operate concurrently or sequentially in their host and home countries. Such transnational philanthropists tend to be embedded in their home country where they have deep connections and networks as much as operational experience accumulated over an extensive period of time. Greek shipping, which is the main funder of transnational philanthropy in Greece, is par excellence an economic activity which is conducted transnationally, over time, in Greece as well as in other jurisdictions where Greek ship-owners and their staff operate from. As we will see

below, the foundations that Greek ship-owners and other transnational Greek businessmen have set up tend to resemble, in important respects from the perspective of this inquiry, the transnationalism of their founders.

It is worth explaining in full the above mentioned distinction between transnational and diaspora philanthropy. Greek, transnational philanthropic actors, either as individuals, through their business activities and the foundations they have endowed, are those actors who operate and/or are physically present both in Greece and elsewhere. Whereas, Greek diaspora philanthropic actors are those diaspora Greeks who have donated money and other assets to institutions and causes in Greece without themselves spending considerable time in Greece, maintaining business interests in the country or having established philanthropic foundations or their outposts in Greece. For example, Stavros Niarchos Foundation with substantial staff and operations in both the US and Greece, in New York and Athens respectively, is a Greek transnational philanthropic foundation for the purposes of this Report. Whereas, a Greek-American Trustee of Thessaloniki-based Anatolia College who donates time and money to Anatolia, but only visits periodically Greece for recreation or to attend annual Anatolia board meetings, is a diaspora philanthropist active in Greece. Finally, as we will see subsequently in the Report, it is important to note the trilateral dynamic between transnational foundations, diaspora donors and grantees in Greece. Anatolia College enjoyed diaspora funding support long before it became a Stavros Niarchos Foundation grantee. On the other hand, the Stavros Niarchos Foundation helped the Municipality of Athens set up an entity, the Athens Partnership, in such a way as to attract tax exempt donations from diaspora donors in the US.

Whether we talk of diaspora or transnational philanthropy, the questions of when, why, and how homeland states and societies engage their diasporas with regards to philanthropic giving are paramount. Specifically, a homeland states' and societal position vis-a-vis diaspora philanthropy is highly varied depending on such parameters as: the unique characteristics of the members of its diaspora communities; the nature of the homeland polity, economy and society; international norms and features, internalised by philanthropic diaspora actors. More specifically, some scholars focus on diaspora philanthropy as a tool for development aid and/or in response to homeland crises, while yet another category of scholars explores the influence of strategic diaspora philanthropy in relation to homeland social transformation. The war-like dimensions of the economic crisis, in terms of the contraction of state support for essential services, and the widespread crisis of legitimacy of Greece's political establishment, are both factors that put Greek diaspora philanthropy at the very centre of these debates.

Scholars of the Greek non-profit sector have been understandably preoccupied by how Greece's tradition of statism and clientelism has resulted in an undernourished Greek civil society dominated, more often than not, by party political priorities. The interdependent factors underpinning this phenomenon include a) a religious establishment funded by the state b) the legacy of a post WWII authoritarian political tradition which was hostile to civic initiative c) a low trust society in which members connect via kinship networks rather than social causes d) a rent-seeking business class which is dependent on access to the state e) a fiscal regime which does not support, via substantial tax exemptions, charitable giving f) even EU funding which, although it has boosted growth in the non-profit sector in Greece, by being distributed by the Greek state, has actually reproduced in another format civil society's subordination to the political system.

Considering this legacy, in the crisis years scholarship has primarily focused on the evolving relationships between the state and the non-profit sector, and civil society at large, in the context of a dramatic fall in state expenditure and the massive loss of prestige of the Greek party system and political establishment. In particular, this scholarship has focused on such issues as: informal and anti-establishment solidarity networks to emerge out of the crisis; the impact of the sharp curtailment of state funding of NGOs on the latter's performance; the prominence of international NGOs on the refugee issue negotiating their influence from a position of relative strength with the Greek state; whether social trust has risen, via the growth of social solidarity during the crisis, as institutional trust has fallen; the growth of operational effectiveness of civil society due to the response to the crisis. The main question, in others words, that scholars have addressed is whether the crisis has strengthened civil society vis-a-vis the pre-crisis, dominant state and the party-political establishment, known also as the partitocracy, and in what ways.

Greek scholarship has secondarily examined corporate philanthropic giving in the context of CSR as well as giving by diaspora and non-diaspora foundations and individual Greek citizens, mainly in the process of examining how the crisis affected the composition and volume of the funding streams of Greece's non-profit sector, and civil society at large. The issue of the impact of philanthropic giving on the governance of NGOs has also been examined, which is one of the domains of inquiry of this report. Key conclusions that have emerged are that CSR and foundation giving has been reprioritised towards addressing social needs due to the crisis, that foundation giving has strengthened transparency and efficiency in grantee NGOs, and that donations from Greek citizens have decreased due to the generalised fall in personal incomes in Greece.

We need to stress that the Commission's main focus is at the opposite end, as it substantially analyses developments in Greece from the point of view of grantor and then of the grantee. Thus, even when we evaluate non-profits we do so in the context of their actual or potential capacity to seek funding and other forms of support from diaspora and transnational philanthropists. By doing so, the Commission seeks to illuminate the implications for the Greek society and polity of the majority of philanthropic giving originating from diaspora, transnational actors who share important features.

By thus focusing first on the grantor and then the grantee we see our work as complementing and qualifying the scholarly investigation that we identified above on Greek civil society and the Greek non-profit sector.

We complement this scholarly investigation because: a) we focus on how diaspora and transnational philanthropy, as it commits to interventions of increasing scale and ambition in partnership with its non-profit grantees, engages in normative diffusion and policy innovation in Greece, thus boosting pluralism b) we look at the interaction between Greek diaspora, transnational foundation and Greek CSR giving, taking into account that they increasingly cluster around the same causes and grantees c) we examine the cohort of US non-profits and international NGOs as template organisations, for both the Greek non-profit sector and state entities, due to their commitment, long predating the crisis, to seek diaspora and transnational foundation funding and d) we analyse the impact, in the ability of state organisations to attract diaspora philanthropic funding, of successive Greek government's reluctance to improve or introduce board governance in these entities.

We also qualify the scholarly investigation because our focus allows us to: a) examine how local government, which has during the crisis partly been emancipated by Greece's partitocracy, has opted to become a key grantee and strategic partner to the diaspora and transnational foundations b) how civil servants with the engagement (or not) of their political higher-ups have actively sought to enlist the support of diaspora, transnational philanthropy c) we treat non-profit and state grantees as comparable entities – e.g., a private non-profit museum and a state museum, a private, non-profit college and a state university - in terms of our investigation and our policy recommendations, as both have become increasingly reliant on diaspora, transnational philanthropic giving.

One of the main purposes of this Commission's Report is to be able to arrive at a set of actionable policy recommendations. The purpose of these recommendations is to help our thinking on how diaspora, and even non-diaspora philanthropic giving in Greece, to both state and non-profit entities, can be strengthened in volume and effectiveness. These recommendations will focus on themes such as: the raising of the collective

effectiveness of diaspora, transnational foundations through associational action; the ability of state grantees to adopt best practice as it is implemented in the non-profit sector in Greece; the type of state reforms that would improve transparency and governance at both the non-profit sector and the state itself so that greater philanthropic engagement could be rendered feasible; fiscal changes that could facilitate local giving to the non-profit sector and state organisations so that diaspora and transnational foundation giving could be filtered and rendered sustainable by local commitment; policies that the Greek state could undertake so that diaspora and transnational philanthropy could be further expanded beyond the circle of the diaspora, transnational foundations currently operating in Greece.

Transnational Foundations

We examine philanthropic giving from Greece's shipping community, and / or the foundations set up by distinguished ship-owners, which we would describe as a hybrid, both resident and diasporic at the same time, hence the term transnational that we adopt to describe them. Ship-owners combine personal and professional lives in Greece and abroad. They have genuine stakes in Greece due to their constitutionally protected tax amnesty, their sourcing of officer crews and management teams, the ancillary services to shipping, as in finance and law, and their investment in non-shipping sectors of the Greek economy, primarily in finance, real estate and tourism. At the same time, they have attained a level of wealth that includes them into the global moneyed elite. Often these individuals live for long periods of time in places such as London, Geneva, Monaco or New York. They might have been born and raised abroad and they are consumers of advisory services of a global standard, in tax, finance, law, estate planning and so on.

While appreciated for their wealth and success abroad, they are lionized as much as envied in Greece where they are employers of choice, symbols of business success achieved outside Greece's rent-seeking business environment (which is not to say that they are not beneficiaries of the Greek state's fiscal treatment) and, for the less discrete among their cohort, emblems of a high consumption, glamorous life style.

Critically, their level of wealth accumulation enables them to engage with Greece philanthropically on a scale that is simply unobtainable by Greek business peers who are mostly dependent on the small Greek economy, a middling, and introvert performer within its OECD peer group which has dramatically shrunk in size during the crisis years.

Ship-owners thus have the capacity and the motive to be important and capable philanthropists in Greece. They have the money, they and their lieutenants have the knowhow of conducting business in Greece and they have the incentive of legitimation,

of validation, of enlightened self-interest and of patriotism to distinguish themselves philanthropically in their homeland. They can also bring to bear to their philanthropic enterprise the kind of operational excellence and best practice – simply put, the best that money can buy - to which they are accustomed in a business and a personal capacity. The Commission has interviewed some of the most prominent of these foundations, namely, the Captain Vasillis and Carmen Constantakopoulos, Laskaridis, Latsis, Leventis, Maria Tsakos, Onassis and Stavros Niarchos Foundations. We note that foundations set up by ship owning families which are incorporated in Greece, for example, Captain Vasillis and Carmen Constantakopoulos Foundation, or are established by a non-ship owning family, such as the Leventis Foundation, demonstrate the same characteristics of their peers due to the internationality and sophistication of their founding business families. Thus, we include all these seven interviewees under the ‘transnational’ heading.

The US non-profits in Greece

Moving to those institutions which have systematically sourced support from the Diaspora, in addition to the transnational foundations examined above, the dominant category is comprised of US non-profits long resident in Greece and not established by Greek natives. What we see in the US non-profits operating in Greece, mostly from the 1960s onwards, is the increasing involvement of Greek-American trustees. This group is usually a typical mix of wealthy donors and accomplished professionals with the suitable, to the institutions that attract them, skill-set. These individuals are first, second and third generation Greek Americans who have been actively recruited by the boards of trustees of these institutions in an attempt to renew board ranks, infuse the boards with the necessary expertise and expand access to fund-raising in the Greek-American community. The institutions themselves offer high quality US governance standards, a long track record of navigating the intricacies of operating in Greece, as well as of making a tangible contribution to Greek society. To Greek-Americans with the ability and inclination to involve themselves with their country of origin they combine a convivial atmosphere and the prospect of results, offsetting the obstacles and frustrations that are attendant to conducting any type of business in Greece. This type of cross-border philanthropic engagement of Greek-Americans with US non-profits in Greece is inextricably connected to general trends in the US not unique to Greece or to Greek-Americans: the tendency of ethnic minorities in the US to absorb dominant norms of noblesse oblige to build their social profile and advance their business connections through charitable giving; the rise to affluence and prominence of second and third generation hyphenated Americans; the US’s generous fiscal regime towards charitable contributions, and; the ability to run the

affairs of a non-profit entity from a huge distance due to the fall of transport costs and the elimination of communication costs.

The Commission has interviewed the most prominent of those non-profits namely, American College of Greece, Anatolia College, American Farm School and the American School of Classical Studies. In addition, the Commission has interviewed the British School of Archaeological Studies which exhibits organisational features and a diaspora-donor orientation of a very similar nature to the US non-profits.

2. The crisis and its effects on Diaspora and Transnational Philanthropy

The expansion of the remit of diaspora and transnational philanthropy under crisis conditions

There is no doubt that Greece's severe economic crisis – the contraction in GDP terms in peacetime is unique in the annals of economic history and comparable to the impact of war - has expanded the remit of diaspora philanthropy in Greece. For the transnational foundations it has meant that acute social needs that harked back to their founders' childhood memories of post WW II Greece had to be met. At the same time in the traditional domains of their activity, namely Greek education, culture and the arts, they were confronted with renewed calls for support as the state instituted cutbacks ranging in most cases from 30% to 60%. Concurrently, the crisis raised issues well beyond the mitigation of its effects and in particular the question of what kind of changes could be supported by the diaspora and transnational philanthropic community so that Greece could acquire the institutions and outlook that would secure it from a relapse in bankruptcy.

Moving beyond this general observation we can note that, first, it would neither be feasible for the transnational foundations to abandon their existing commitments nor, at the same time, ignore newly arising needs. We can assume that donor-grantee relationships years or even decades in the making, often encapsulated in very significant building commitments as in the cases of the Onassis Cultural Center, the Stavros Niarchos Cultural Center and the Goulandris Museum of Modern Art, could not simply be abandoned or starved of resources. Having said that, the rationale of the transnational foundations' pre-crisis focus on culture and education was repurposed by the crisis in terms of 1) giving a boost to the economy 2) serving as statements of optimism for the arrival of a post-crisis Greece 3) maintaining the outward orientation of the Greek culture and arts scene, as well as satisfying the needs of a hard-hit population for something beyond mere survival.

Additionally, the commitment through scholarships and other grants to Greek students and academics acquired a crisis-relevant context. Beneficiaries of such donor support were seen, through the demonstration of scientific and creative excellence, both as ambassadors of Greece and as exemplars of the type of qualities that the country will need in order to renew its institutions and rebuild its economy. In short, whereas funding

excellence pre-crisis was a natural alignment between elite foundation and elite grantees, during the crisis it acquired a collective significance that it previously lacked. Likewise, support of cultural activities and of archaeological excavations that were particularly noteworthy have projected a positive image of Greece during the crisis period which became much more important than in the pre-crisis years when Greece's EU vocation had not been challenged, nor was the country characterised as a 'failed state'.

Having said that, neither could the foundations stick to their existing portfolio amidst widespread social distress without endangering their societal reputations and legitimacy. So, foundations have either added priorities to already existing ones to alleviate the socioeconomic challenges, or have somewhat rebalanced their portfolios by altering their funding prioritisation. Donations in income support, food kitchens, medical equipment, primary medical care and so on, have multiplied as a result.

By entering the crisis domain, foundations also evolved their intent, combining alleviation with transformation, both at the level of the individual and that of the nation. Training and back to work schemes were funded for those who lost their jobs and/or wanted to change employment, e.g. moving from urban to rural-related employment. Policy relevant research on the causes and the solutions to the crisis were funded. Proposals for the transformation of the governance of key policy domains, such as that of Greece's cultural patrimony, were also supported, bearing as they did the promise of an increase in state revenue and the strengthening of tourist receipts. This evolution of intent by transnational foundations, and the resulting expansions of causes to be supported, also expanded the ranks of their non-profit grantees, as discussed below.

The non-profit sector and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as partners of diaspora and transnational philanthropy

The crisis has severely limited state transfers to the non-profit sector, ranging from support to leading private museums, historic social welfare organisations as much as relatively recently minted NGOs - particularly those founded in the 2000s to implement Greece's rising Official Development Assistance (ODA) program. At the same time, the expansion of the diaspora's philanthropic remit has meant that foundations have increasingly utilised NGOs to implement their social mitigation strategies. The rise in the volume and the range of the diaspora and transnational foundation giving is thus having an effect both on non-profit sector composition, norms and skills. As resource seeking from the foundations replaces resource seeking from the state, a different set of non-profits and NGOs demonstrate or acquire the necessary skills, norms and organisational principles to address the foundations' demands. Transparency, professionalism and

ability to secure funding from private sources are bound to gain the upper hand, as opposed to access to ruling political parties.

Recommendation to the Greek State:

Form a Charities Commission – the England and Wales Charities Commission can be a model - which will supervise all foundations and non-profits so that there is a single regulator in a position to articulate the regulatory regime for philanthropy and the non-profit sector in Greece. It should possess the resources necessary to police the sector and protect it from abuses. Relatedly, remove the charitable bequests from the control of the Ministry of Finance where there is an inherent conflict of interest (the Ministry of Finance being traditionally hostile to measures that affect taxable income) and move them under the control of such a Charities Commission.

The crisis has also had a negative impact on levels of Greek CSR. However, those corporations who could still afford to fund a CSR policy entered the same domain of social harm mitigation with the diaspora and transnational foundations. We thus experience a rising occurrence of co-funding of a number of initiatives in the field of social welfare policy – but also in education, research and culture – by the diaspora and transnational foundations and Greece’s leading corporations. This is to be expected as foundation and corporations’ staff would tend to share the same outlook and expectations in terms of transparency and efficiency of grantee organisations.

The effect however is not simply greater funding being allocated to the same causes and grantees. It is also qualitative, in terms of the range of causes supported and the range of means through which causes are supported.

First, there are a number of initiatives that would not have come into being without the comparatively greater resources at the command of the foundations. For example, the Centre for Talented Youth (CTY) programme, implemented by John Hopkins University and the Thessaloniki-based Anatolia College and funded by the Stavros Niarchos Foundation, for the teaching of gifted children from Greece and Cyprus, has attracted additional support by leading Greek corporations. It is doubtful that any corporation’s CSR department would have had the human resources, networks and budget to bring this partnership into being.

Second, corporations contribute not only financial resources but also corporate-specific expertise that is not available to the foundations, at least in-house. For example, the Athens Partnership, the vehicle set up by the Municipality of Athens, at the

encouragement and advice, again, of the Stavros Niarchos Foundation, has received the support in know-how by the Greek subsidiary of Microsoft for the establishment of a municipality-run IT training center.

Importantly corporations, either intentionally or unintentionally, not only support their reputation through philanthropic giving, but also become ancillary supporters of the foundations' more ambitious change agendas. To illuminate this point, in the two examples we mentioned above, corporations, by jumping on the bandwagon of foundation giving, have (a) advanced the cause of a specialised regime for the teaching of gifted children in Greece, (b) boosted policy experimentation in local government, the Athens Partnership vehicle, a non-public entity, having become the main instrument in the delivery of novel programmes and services by the Municipality of Athens. Both the notion of a dedicated programme for the education of gifted children and of local government services provided by an organisation not staffed by local government employees are inherently political and thus potentially contestable.

3. Diaspora and Transnational Philanthropy and government entities as grantees

Governance in state organisations and diaspora and transnational philanthropy

While the crisis has expanded the realm of action for diaspora and transnational philanthropic foundations it has not appreciably affected the formal governance of most state organisations that are or could become grantees of such philanthropy. On the contrary, the feature that has been accentuated by Greek governments during the crisis has been the tradition of appointing partisan choices at the boards of government-controlled entities.

This has meant that at Greece's hospitals, museums, theaters, and so on, all organisations which are dependent on philanthropic support, there has been high turnover of mostly unqualified executive and non-executive members of the relevant boards. By the same token, no consideration has been given to the need to create board compositions that could advance the cause of financial stability of these organisations, not least by a methodical appeal to the philanthropic community.

Lack of awareness in public discourse of the deficiencies in the composition of boards and their quality has also allowed this state of affairs to reproduce itself during the crisis. Indicatively, the abrupt termination of directors of state organisations, particularly in the media-savvy domain of culture, as in the cases of the National Theater, the National Museum of Modern Art and the Athens Festival, has generated considerable reporting and debate in the Greek print media. Yet, very little consideration has been given by opinion makers to the impact of the combined shortness of tenure or unsuitability of the board members chosen, executive as well as non-executive – especially in regard to either disrupting or not cultivating a productive relationship with the resident and diaspora philanthropic community.

Specifically, there is no understanding evident, even in quality Greek print media, of the need for a balanced board structure. This would ideally include: clear demarcations between executive and non-executive roles; the understanding that a director of a modern cultural (and other public interest organisations) should be able to contribute to the diversification of the revenue streams of their organisation, not least through their own interaction with the philanthropic community; and that board members should combine, as a body, capacity to financially support their institution, knowledge

of operational or mission-critical matters and a sophisticated understanding of the legal and institutional environment in which the organisation operates.

Governance has also suffered in Greek state organisations when governments, in alliance with local stakeholders, resisted the sharing of control with outsiders, either from Greece or from the diaspora and transnational elite, by rescinding or isolating earlier reform efforts.

In higher education governance, the ranks of the boards legislated by an educational reform of 2011 were filled by many renowned diaspora academics; although, inclusion to the boards of resident, transnational and diaspora businessmen was resisted. The authority of these boards was curtailed by the tripartite government of ND-PASOK-DIMAR, including two of the parties that first voted for the institution of the boards, namely PASOK and ND, and ultimately the boards were abolished by the next government of SYRIZA-ANEL. Elsewhere in higher education the decision was taken to merge a template English-speaking university, International University, with several technical institutes, leading to the resignation of the President of the university, Costas Grammenos, a high-profile diaspora academic who had secured the long-term financial backing of the Onassis Foundation. In cultural organisations, despite one of the Ministers of Culture of the SYRIZA-ANEL government entertaining the thought publicly of emulating the (widely perceived as successful) example of the Board of the financially autonomous Museum of Acropolis in other state museums, this did not lead anywhere. Strikingly, in other prominent institutions, such as the National Theater (the establishment of which was funded by a diaspora donor), its board compositions under the SYRIZA-ANEL government was completely composed by theater insiders.

We also note that resistance to autonomy and/or outside control varies not only between state sectors but within such sectors depending on the historical trajectory of different institutions or their different legal status. Indicatively, the opposition to the institution of the boards was tenacious in Greece's older universities, the University of Athens and the University of Thessaloniki, and less so in newer institutions like the University of Crete. The recently established Museum of Acropolis acquired a board at its founding, while the National Archaeological Museum, Greece's most important museum and its oldest, is just an administrative unit of the Ministry of Culture.

Concurrently, a diverse range of Greek organisations and institutions that could have acquired a board structure that would have catalysed diaspora and transnational donor support have remained under the tight control of the Greek state. Most of the older Greek archaeological museums which lack boards have not been revamped since the 1960s and are in urgent need of renovation. Seventy five percent of Greece's NATURA (the European Union network of nature protection) areas, lack a management authority

and there is constant reporting in the Greek print media of the creation of various museums and other sites of significance which lack the operational cash flow that is needed for them to be properly run.

Recommendation to the Greek State:

Introduce boards of directors in all organisations under state control and supervision and reintroduce them in state universities. Create a Public Appointments Commission – the UK example could be adopted - which will screen the suitability of all appointments by the government and by the boards themselves, to board membership, executive and non-executive, of state controlled and supervised organisations. Credible, stable boards in important state organisations are simply a sine qua non for the execution of an effective fund raising policy in Greece and abroad.

Diaspora and transnational philanthropy and political and bureaucratic entrepreneurship

By contrast to the picture painted above, there has been considerable innovation in the partnership between diaspora and transnational philanthropy and local and regional government. Additionally, in the central government state officials in various policy domains have demonstrated entrepreneurship and flexibility in working with the diaspora and transnational philanthropy within existing governance constraints.

In essence, as the needs have proliferated during the crisis years what we have seen is a commensurate rise in various forms of partnerships between diaspora philanthropy, the non-profit sector and political and bureaucratic entrepreneurs. Additional factors, such as the constraints on public sector hirings imposed by Greece's creditors, as well as the onerous approval, disbursement and audit regime governing the expenditure of public funding, and the administration of charitable bequests and foundations incorporated in Greece, have cumulatively pushed these actors to contemplate organisational experimentation.

The previously mentioned 'Athens Partnership' is a prominent example of this process, whereby a local government executes a variety of high-profile policy initiatives, funded by philanthropic contributions, which are implemented by a non-state legal entity and by its non-civil servant employees. Likewise, the Municipality of Thessaloniki has engaged in co-production in its social welfare policies. Under the auspices of the Municipality's Social Solidarity Deputy Mayorship, a homeless shelter funded by Stavros Niarchos Foundation and Filoptohos Adelfotis Andron Thessalonikis, a local social welfare non-profit, has been run by personnel from a NGO specialising in this domain,

ARSI. Another key initiative of the Municipality of Thessaloniki, the Holocaust Museum commemorating the loss to the Holocaust of the city's Jewish population, was funded by a combination of foundation money, namely by a Stavros Niarchos Foundation grant and a contribution from the Federal Government of Germany. Importantly, the entity itself has been incorporated in Luxemburg so as not to suffer the rigidities of the foundations and bequests regime in Greece, an innovation which adopted donor understandings of the rigidities attendant to incorporating such a foundation in Greece. It is worth noting that particularly in the municipalities of Athens and Thessaloniki, the municipal leaderships and their staff themselves originated from civil society and have been active as donors and/or grantees. They did so as the crisis, by delegitimising the political establishment, gave an opening to this publicly prominent citizen cohort. Thus, the same crisis trends that have brought to the fore diaspora and transnational philanthropy also created the municipal leaderships that could best interact with it. The Mayor of Thessaloniki personified this development due to his status as the co-founder, and for many years main funder, of Greece's first museum of contemporary art and as the founder, funder, fund-raiser and advocate in chief of one of Greece's leading environmental NGOs.

But even when such political entrepreneurs originating from the sophisticated non-profit sector of Greece's two largest cities were not present, political incentives throughout Greece's local government coincided with diaspora and transnational foundation intent. Foundations provided monetary and intellectual resources in the fields of social welfare and economic regeneration at a time when the central government could no longer guarantee, to any of Greece's municipal and regional leaderships, neither mitigation nor recovery from the localised effects of the economic crisis. In particular, environmental protection and heritage promotion NGOs have proved attractive to donors, who have funded restoration of traditional pathways and the promotion of classical-era theaters, for example. In turn, local municipalities and regional authorities have lent their support, and even integrated in their EU funding proposals, the projects of these NGOs. A particularly prominent case of this was NGO's Diazoma activities in the regions of Epirus and Central Greece which has facilitated the integration of classical era theaters in the tourist promotion strategies of these regions. Thus, in Greece's provincial, local and regional government structures we see an openness to align with philanthropy and the non-profit sector which is also crisis-relevant. These alignments are seen to promote economic growth objectives, particularly in terms of diversifying and expanding tourism inflows, thus at least partly compensating for collapsed domestic demand.

Recommendation to the Greek State:

Consider adopting policy instruments designed to enhance the impact and volume of diaspora giving such as that of the Mexican state, whereby charitable giving by diaspora associations to their locales of origin is matched by state funding.

Recommendation to the Greek Local government:

Embrace a pro-philanthropy agenda in terms of improving board governance, instituting boards where none exist in state organisations, be they under central, regional or municipal control, and support tax exemptions for philanthropic giving. Given that diaspora and transnational philanthropy is strongly attracted to giving to places of origin, it is in the interest of local government to adopt such an agenda.

At the core of state bureaucracy – the units and legal entities under the control of central government – this process did not acquire such prominent political-institutional loci as in the cases of the municipal and regional authorities we mentioned. Rather, within distinct cohorts of state actors – the hospitals, the museums, the research institutes, the archeological excavations sites – certain individual functionaries have taken the initiative to create partnerships particularly with the diaspora and transnational foundations, but also with other diaspora associations and donors, to promote their missions. Archaeologists supervising star excavation sites, such as the underwater sites where the Antikythera mechanism was discovered and Delos, have produced alignments with the transnational foundations, with CSR joining in. Hospital directors and ambitious clinicians setting up novel treatment centers have also been visible in attracting diaspora and transnational foundation support.

Finally, these entrepreneurial alignments have often included the international, non-Greek, philanthropic element as in grantee causes that possess international resonance, be they the mitigation of the suffering of refugees, the upkeep of star archaeological sites, as in Santorini's Akrotiri, or the progressive urban response to the challenge of resilience by the municipalities of Athens and Thessaloniki. Greek public entities have aligned not only with the diaspora and transnational foundations, but also with international actors. In the three examples we mentioned these actors were George Soros' Open Society Foundation, the Russian IT-magnate Yevgeni Kasperski and the Rockefeller Institute, respectively.

4. The interviews with Transnational Foundations: Key findings

As mentioned in the introduction, this fourth section will present the key findings of the interviews conducted by the Diaspora Philanthropy Commission with important transnational foundations. In addition, in this section we include the interviews with a Greek politician with long involvement in the Greek state's diaspora policy and the leading diaspora philanthropic organisation to emerge as a response to the crisis outside Greece, namely The Hellenic Initiative.

Transnational Foundations

We start with the transnational foundations operating in Greece: We have interviewed the Captain Vasillis and Carmen Constantakopoulos, Laskaridis, Latsis, Leventis, Maria Tsakos, Onassis and Stavros Niarchos Foundations. As we mention above, we believe that despite covering a wide range of choices and origins these foundations have more things in common than not. Thus, justifying including them all in the single category of diaspora and transnational foundations.

As expected of foundations originating from diaspora and transnational families, they have been endowed mainly by fortunes made in shipping or other multinational activities. Sole focus on the Greek economy has not created the kind of capital accumulation needed to create the substantial endowments that these foundations possess.

Relatedly, many board members of these foundations, whether they originate from their founding business families or from the latter's executive ranks, lead cosmopolitan, transnational lives and are either not resident or not solely resident in Greece. Members of the foundations' boards can also be leading Greek academics and other internationally accomplished professionals who might have become acquainted with the founders through common board memberships, past collaborations or simply by reputation.

The foundations, with the one exception of the Captain Vasilis and Carmen Constantakopoulos Foundation, are incorporated in jurisdictions which provide a facilitative as well as a sophisticated regulatory environment, such as the US and Lichtenstein. In one case, a foundation reported that it emulated the choice of a more established peer, founded by a leading figure in Greek shipping, when it decided to

incorporate in Lichtenstein by asking for their advice. In other words, knowledge sharing and best practices are shared amongst these transnational foundations.

In terms of staffing and operations, some of the foundations operate not only in Greece but also in countries such as the UK, the US and Monaco and engage in charitable giving in order to support causes and grantees related to Greece, mainly in education and culture. We have found staff that are trained on foundation policy outside Greece and form overall an increasingly professionalised cohort in Greece with a similar outlook and skill set. Relatedly, we noted the pronounced propensity by both board members and staff to utilise state of the art expertise in legal matters, in outside audit and impact assessment and best practice know-how, in shaping and executing foundation policy.

In terms of the perspective of the diaspora and transnational foundations on their Greek grantees, they noted that the efficiency of state organisations as grantees is not sector-based but personality-based thus raising implementation risk not least due to discontinuities in the leadership of state institutions. In other words, in all state entities, such as museums, hospitals and social welfare organisations, quality of civil service management is highly uneven as well as unstable. By the same token, they communicated to us that there are dedicated civil servants in all state domains that will often persist and ensure that a foundation grant gets implemented and achieves its stated purpose.

Recommendation to the Greek State:

Strengthen and extend an audit and review process in state education and public health respectively so that the philanthropic community, diaspora and non-diaspora, can both reward excellence in the state sector and, in the case of underperformance in critical areas of state provision, support remedial measures.

By contrast, and with increasing interaction with the foundations, our interviewees have established that there is a recognisable improvement in grantee applications and grantee execution from Greece's non-profit sector. This general trend, according to their testimonials, has been a factor not merely of increasing foundation funding to the non-profit sector but also of deliberate action of the foundations, attendant to their crisis-driven status as the main funder of the non-profit sector in Greece. The transnational foundations have systematised their giving as multiple applications have revealed particular needs that require programmatic support in various policy domains. The relative scarcity of foundation giving means that the need is keenly felt for grants to have systemic impact, thus foundations and grantee organisations align and become jointly strategic in their approach. Foundations themselves, through their relationship

with grantees, focus on capacity building through matching pledges and funding of the development function in grantee institutions.

Recommendation to the Greek State:

Facilitate the philanthropic activity of resident, non-diaspora, non-transnational legal entities and individuals through generous tax exemptions on charitable giving. This fiscal cost is justified for a series of compelling reasons, such as a) the resulting increase in local philanthropy will align with diaspora and transnational philanthropy, thus increasing not only the totality of philanthropic resources but also the quality of its impact due to the local know-how b) greater local philanthropy will also expand the organisational capacity of Greek non-profits as much as their connectivity with the diaspora and transnational philanthropic community, thus having a multiplier effect on philanthropic inflows.

Recommendation to Greek non-profit organisations:

Work with a future association of foundations to form voluntary guidelines in terms of board structure and other governance principles, as well as in embedding transparency. Form an association or associations of their own, around such thematic axes such as social welfare, education, culture and so on, that will protect the designation of non-profit from disreputable players, generate data on their collective achievements and participate in the policy dialogue that affects the domain of their activities as well as their interaction with the local and the diaspora and transnational philanthropic communities.

In terms of the evolution of their giving, the crisis has compelled all foundations to dedicate resources to social welfare needs (a) reviving an earlier legacy of personal or foundation giving by their founders in Greece in the post WWII period, as in the case of the Latsis Foundation, and in Cyprus after the invasion of 1974, as in the case of the Leventis Foundation (b) and due to the need to include, amidst widespread social distress, crisis mitigation in a philanthropic portfolio geared towards education and culture in the pre-crisis period. Foundations thus stress the need to maintain flexibility, even within a broad strategic framework, to deal with mostly social needs in the context of widespread cuts in the state provision of essential services. That being said, foundations also report that as caseloads develop in the mitigation of social crisis they commensurably systematise their understanding on how to address these issues and thus develop their own philanthropic agendas. The implication may be that even when the crisis abates, some if not all of the foundations would continue to be active as sophisticated funders in the domain of social welfare.

One foundation official noted that the advantage that the long distance, diaspora philanthropy could bring to Greece would be the ability to focus to a greater degree on long term problems. Unlike the transnational foundations which have a local presence in Greece, such long distance philanthropists would not be confronted with the need to address situations of human urgency that are being brought to their attention and need to be dealt with immediately. So, proximity to the problem means greater responsiveness to it, for a mixture of humanitarian and reputational reasons, but greater responsiveness can come at the cost of having fewer resources available to address the long term, root causes of social distress.

In terms of the foundations' relations and leverage with the state, it has been reported to us that the crisis has both expanded the realm of foundation giving and the terms and conditions attached to it, particularly for social welfare and public health purposes to state agencies. In others words, foundations have demanded more to give more to state organisations, in these domains, and the Greek state has often responded to this development, particularly in the public health sector. Having said that, in other domains, such as culture, resistance to policy innovation funded by foundations remains strong, among Greece's bureaucracy, and allies of foundation aims remain 'in the closet'.

Recommendation to the transnational foundations active in Greece:

Advance the public and scientific dialogue in Greece on best practices in the management of national patrimonies and, in particular, antiquities and museum governance. The reform of the governance regime of Greece's classical legacy is an absolutely critical factor in expanding the philanthropic engagement of the diaspora with Greece.

Relatedly, the foundations are generally reluctant to engage in public advocacy despite the fact that they have become deeply knowledgeable of the shortcomings of the Greek state. The prevailing attitude is one of 'actions being arguments', as opposed to 'actions being turned into arguments', and of avoiding open criticism and thus conflict with the state and its political masters. In terms of actions speaking louder than words, we selected the example of a foundation engaged in the funding of merchant marine education, the Maria Tsakos Foundation. This initiative purposefully seeks to fill a gap created by the shortcomings of the state education system in one of Greece's leading and most competitive economic sectors, while being undertaken under the supervision and licensing of the Greek state. As such, the initiative recognises a long-term failure in public policy while being implemented with state approval in order to mitigate this failure. An outlier in this pattern could be the Laskaridis Foundation which reported its engagement in public advocacy, for instance, by taking its views to the Greek Parliament

on issues relating to the protection of the marine environment. And while this issue was not raised during the interviews we note that the transnational foundations lack a common voice through which to appeal to the philanthropic engagement of Greece's wealth holders, particularly from the shipping community whose philanthropic ability might well exceed, in total, its philanthropic engagement with Greece. While the shipping community in Greece has, during the crisis, through the creation of the philanthropic foundation SYN-ENOSIS, pulled some of shipping's philanthropic contributions, the collective representation of transnational and resident philanthropy could further assist this goal. The issue of shipping's contribution, indirect or direct, to the Greek commonwealth has acquired crisis-relevant resonance considering the preservation of the constitutional protection of shipping's highly favourable tax status by a state which is hard-put to meet its citizens essential needs and which, at the same time, has been compelled to tax the average Greek citizen heavily to meet its creditor-determined requirements.

Foundations are interested in the diaspora's philanthropic engagement with Greece and indeed are represented through some of their founders in The Hellenic Initiative, a key diaspora response to the crisis in Greece, but have not developed a strategy, singly or as a collective body, to facilitate this engagement.

Recommendation to the transnational foundations active in Greece:

Transnational foundations and other significant philanthropic foundations should form an association in Greece to pursue goals such as i) codify key findings and proposals to the Greek state based on their very significant interaction with state authorities and grantees without fear of being singled out for retribution ii) collate and disseminate data and knowledge on philanthropic activity in Greece and thus help create an informed stakeholder community, around philanthropic giving, in Greece and in the Greek diaspora. In particular, such an association should seek as a priority to catalyse to the maximum degree possible the shipping community's philanthropic engagement with Greece, as well as the philanthropic engagement of the diaspora's most wealthy members.

Foundations, perhaps reflecting their founders uniquely double identity of cosmopolitanism and Hellenism, identified with shipping but also other diaspora-linked business activities, are keen promoters and supporters abroad of: studies on Greek culture, history, and contemporary affairs and of Greek scientists regardless of their subject matter, as in the case of the Onassis Foundation scholarship programme. Foundations are also keen to fund the promotion of Hellenism and in general cultural exchange, but also non-Greek causes, in countries with which they maintain close

business ties like China, Korea, Uruguay and Nigeria. In one significant exception, that of Stavros Niarchos Foundation, a foundation clearly aims at making a leading mark in the US and in the world, on domains not related to Greece or Hellenism. The byproduct, in a Greek context, is the Stavros Niarchos Foundation's capacity and aptitude to match grantees in Greece with what it considers to be bearers of best practice primarily in the US. The latter are non-profit and other organisations, such as US universities, which have been matched with Greek grantees, in the execution of the foundation's grants, or which have supervised the execution of grants to Greek grantees.

Altogether, the crisis does not seem to have had an impact on the foundations' willingness to fund the promotion of causes relating to Greece but involving grantees outside Greece. Foundations, in general, are comfortable and capable of funding grantees both in Greece and abroad, reflecting policy domain interests, business trajectories and possibly fund-raising appeals, to the founder or the foundation, by Greek and non-Greek non-profits and NGOs.

Foundations can also be active in the locale of origin of their founders, where policy themes are combined with location, as with naval education in Chios by the Maria Tsakos Foundation or farming innovation and environmental management in Messenia by the Captain Vasilis and Carmen Constantakopoulos Foundation. In that respect they are very similar to the hometown associations formed by most diaspora Greek communities which tend to support philanthropically their places of origin, e.g. Greek-Australians from the Dodecanese, Greek-Americans from Crete and so on.

State policy and diaspora philanthropy

Moving now to state policy on the diaspora, from the perspective of the latter's philanthropic engagement with Greece, we just interviewed one politician, Mr. Grigoris Niotis, who had, however, the opportunity to participate in the formation and implementation of the state's diaspora policy almost in the entire post junta period. We also interviewed the one major Greek American organisation to emerge during the crisis years with the explicit mandate to support Greece in its hour of need, namely The Hellenic Initiative.

According to Mr. Niotis, proposals to create a dedicated ministry of the diaspora with a particular focus on economic issues and diaspora education never materialised due to bureaucratic reluctance to have resources and power move from existing Ministries. The diaspora vote never became a reality also due to a combination of vested political interests, most prominently the perceived risk of the ruling parties, such as the center left PASOK and the center right ND, of a creation of an electoral constituency of

unknown size and party preference; the reluctance to reserve seats for the diaspora that would be taken out of available seats for the resident political class; and the fear of the Greek Communist Party's (KKE) that the diaspora vote will bring it below the 3% threshold and thus outside parliament.

Mr. Niotis also noted that the Greek Orthodox Church in North America was hostile to the creation of Greek language instruction charter schools, generously funded by US states, as it feared that they would deny charitable funding and students from its own educational institutions. Ultimately, only 15 were established as a result, compared to more than a hundred by the Turkish cleric Fethullah Gulen's, movement. Relatedly, there are a number of conflicts between laity organisations and the Greek Orthodox Church in Greek diaspora communities worldwide on the governance and control of property assets in the main, according to Mr Niotis. In the crisis years, such constraints in the mobilisation and efficiency of collective action within Greece's diaspora communities coexisted with the deterioration of the capacity of the Greek state to relate to Greece's worldwide diaspora. The capacity of the General Secretariat of Greeks Abroad at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs declined due to an aging staff and retirements and the Council of the Worlds' Hellenes was dissolved due to the cessation of the half a million euros per annum financing of its operations.

Recommendation to the Greek State:

Consider that by extending the right to vote to Greek citizens living abroad, numerous diaspora loci will be created, via political mobilisation, other than those of the Greek Orthodox Church. Thus, the capacity of the Greek diaspora communities to engage with Greece not only politically but civically and philanthropically might well increase exponentially – as much as the capacity of societal and non-profit actors in Greece to connect productively with the diaspora.

Notwithstanding the lack of will on the part of the Greek state to provide the necessary institutional linkages for the relationship of the diaspora with Greece and the weakness of the church to partner with laity to facilitate the evolution of the diaspora, new organisational forms filling these gaps are possible, as it was pointed out to us through the course of our interview with The Hellenic Initiative. The Hellenic Initiative was formed by mostly distinguished Greek-American business people, while also attracting to its leadership leading figures from Greece's transnational business and philanthropic community. Since its establishment it has expanded into Canada, the UK and Australia while also maintaining an office in Greece. Its donations have prioritised the support of Greek entrepreneurship as well as crisis relief. While an influential representative of the

Greek Orthodox Archdiocese is a member of The Hellenic Initiative's governance, it has chosen to operate outside the Church-oriented philanthropic organisations.

According to The Hellenic Initiative's representative, new Greek-American organisations can build on a) the mobilisation of the Greek-American community in the US political process and b) the need of Greek-Americans to network on an ethnic base to facilitate their career and business interests. Once pools of wealthy and influential diaspora individuals can be identified, their philanthropic attitudes towards Greece could shift if they were to be systematically given tangible examples of the impact of charitable giving to Greek citizens and organisations. Considering The Hellenic Initiative's mission to catalyse diaspora philanthropy in Greece, by limiting transaction costs attendant to philanthropic engagement with Greece, and highlighting systematically the positive features of the country, The Hellenic Initiative's representative underlined Greek state inaction in relation to such a private undertaking. In particular, it was noted that Greek politicians have refrained from coming up with proposals of their own in engaging The Hellenic Initiative in Greece, nor have they treated the organisation as an interlocutor in the debate on the challenges facing the country.

5. The interviews with non-profits, NGOs and state organisations: Key findings

The US non-profits operating in Greece

We now move to the US non-profits long operating in Greece where we interviewed three educational institutions: Anatolia College, American Farm School, and the American College of Greece (which is better known for its high school and college divisions, Pierce and Deree College respectively) and two research institutes, the American School of Classical Studies and the British School of Archaeological Studies which, as mentioned above, we judged that it shares important similarities with the US non-profits.

These US non-profits feature the following: high reputation for transparency and effectiveness, robust governance structures, accounts audited by global accounting firms. They have pursued increasing representation both of Greeks on their boards and of Greek-Americans, certainly from the 1970s onwards. Their fund-raising operations are often led by Greek-Americans or other diaspora Greeks, involve their Presidents whether they are Greek or US citizens, and are supported by US development offices.

A substantial focus in their fund-raising is the Greek-American community. In particular, wealthy Greek-Americans that are active as donors to the Greek Orthodox Church in the United States, and thus easily identifiable and with a higher than average propensity to give to Greece.

The US non-profits also reported to us an increasingly important grantee relationship with the transnational foundations operating in Greece and an incipient relationship with THI, the main US diaspora philanthropy organisation to emerge during the crisis.

In one case, following the fall in capital markets in the US in 2008, and the subsequent decline of the endowment, a US non-profit reported a change in its fund-raising strategy from one based on board members, highly elite Greek-Americans and non-hyphenated Americans, to a more systematic courting of the Greek-American wealthy. Results have been promising, thanks also to the hiring of a Greek-American development officer with familiarity with the Greek-American community.

Greek Ambassadors and consul-generals in the US and Canada have periodically assisted the fund-raising efforts of these non-profits by holding events at embassy premises, but this has been done as a result of personal connections rather than a deliberate policy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Greece.

Moving from fund-raising operations targeting the diaspora and diasporic transnational foundations to the underlying factors shaping the directions and outcomes of these operations, a number of illuminating insights were shared with us.

The three educational US non-profits all underlined that there is widespread cynicism and scepticism about Greece among the Greek-American donor community, specifically in terms of the efficiency and integrity of the Greek state and its institutions, the legal and administrative environment affecting the capacity of either Greek state or non-profit organisations, no matter how well run the latter might be, and on societal attitudes in Greece towards these failings. This cynicism and scepticism has been built over time and it constitutes a significant hurdle in fund-raising. Within that context, the crisis has both animated philanthropic interest in Greece and discouraged it. On the one hand, the need for scholarships of worthy individuals has become more evident, and the perception of these US institutions as uniquely able to positively shape post-crisis Greece – through their training and research missions – has become much sharper. Thus, all three institutions are fund-raising in the diaspora for initiatives designed to build the capacity of Greeks and Greece to create a more competitive economy. On the other hand, the lack of a clear ‘fall and redemption’ narrative, due to political developments and well-publicised reform backtracking, has reinforced those diaspora attitudes that hold that Greece is beyond redemption.

Perhaps not surprising considering the above, there has not yet been a breakthrough in fund-raising with the Greek-American diaspora, in terms of soliciting several mega gifts donations, notwithstanding the fact that requirements and expectations among Greek-American donors in strategic philanthropy should be very similar to that of the transnational Greek philanthropic foundations that we have interviewed. Still, fund-raising anchored in a particular policy area has been particularly effective with transnational and diaspora foundations, with the foundations and the three US educational non-profits co-shaping initiatives that aim at having strategic impact. Teaching gifted and talented children at Anatolia College, training farmers at American Farm School, addressing the public health issue of tobacco smoking at American College in Greece, all three cases testify to the increasing ambition of this partnership.

In the US itself the Greek Orthodox Church provides the main channel for funding opportunities for wealthy Greek-Americans to be perceived as members in good standing of the community. Yet the Church jealously guards this role and views competitively claims to the resources of this cohort of Greek-Americans. Regrettably, the weakness of the Church’s own institutions and governance limit its ability to catalyse Greek-American giving in general, and for non-Church related causes in particular.

In terms of the Greek-American community, the older generation of Greek-Americans seems to more easily engage with Greece, while there are significant doubts on the overall propensity of the third and fourth generations to engage with Greece. That being said, the Greek state does not purposefully seek to catalyse Greek-American philanthropy to Greece. While on occasion individual Greek diplomats - ambassadors, consul generals - are willing, as reported above, to facilitate the efforts of the US non-profits to engage with the Greek-American and Greek-Canadian diaspora, the Greek state as a whole is absent and certainly not a catalyst in this endeavour.

Recommendation to the Greek State:

Instruct ambassadorial and consular staff to promote fund-raising by all highly reputable non-profits operating in Greece, be they of Greek or non-Greek origin, as in the case of the US non-profits, within the diaspora communities of their catchment areas. In coordination with the President of the Hellenic Republic, prioritise and systematise the bestowing of state honours to distinguished diaspora and local philanthropists.

The US and British archaeological institutions also feature very prominent support by the diaspora and transnational foundations. They also note the very tight supervision exercised by the Greek state authorities, a function of a 'protective' versus 'promoting' culture vis-a-vis Greek antiquity. This protective institutional culture combined with scarce human and financial resources has entrenched bureaucratic rigidity in the governance regime of Greek antiquities. One of the archaeological institutions noted in the interviews that features of EU funding in Greece, in particular lower bid rules which endangers the quality and even the execution of a contract, makes foundations leery of supporting, via their own donor-raised funds, EU funded projects or applying themselves for EU funding so as to leverage the deployment of their own donor-raised resources.

NGOs and non-profits, state institutions

In terms of international NGOs, Greek non-profits and state organisations – cause-specific NGOs, private museums, local government, universities– which have or can potentially attract diaspora funding, we interviewed: WWF Greece, ActionAid Hellas, Benaki Museum, The Museum of Cycladic Art, Hamogelo tou Paidiou (a child welfare charity), the Athens Partnership, the University of Athens and the University of Thessaloniki, Greece's two largest state universities.

There are stark divergences between how the two state universities and the NGOs/non-profits seek funding from diaspora and transnational philanthropy.

In our NGOs and private museums, we observe a balanced board structure seeking to address issues of relevant expertise to the subject matter of the institution in question, of the legal and regulatory environment, and of fund-raising. Some board members come from Greece's transnational elites, i.e. leading members of business families that operate well beyond Greece's borders. In other words, there is convergence in governance terms with the US non-profits we analysed above. Importantly this board structure, in the case of Benaki Museum, has come out as a result of the crisis where currently half of the board members seek to address fund-raising needs, whereas pre-crisis such a need was not as well represented within the non-executive ranks of the Museum's board.

In the case of the entity under the control of the Municipality of Athens, Athens Partnership, its creation was driven by the need to manage a significant donation by the Stavros Niarchos Foundation. The purpose was to secure operational flexibility in the management of donations and in the implementation of municipal policy priorities without the procedural and personnel constraints which bedevil the public sector in Greece. The entity has focused and secured additional funding by other philanthropic foundations as well as by corporations and has fund-raised for the Municipality both in the US and in Greece. The Municipality of Athens has been advised by Bloomberg Foundation in setting up the Athens Partnership. Likewise, in the cases of Anatolia College and American Farm School, which have partnered with John Hopkins and Rutgers Universities respectively, we observe an important grantee relationship with a diaspora and transnational foundation generating transfer of knowhow from sophisticated, non-Greek organisations.

We also observed, through the interviews, alignment with leading diaspora and transnational foundations pursuing a strategic purpose, as in the cases of Benaki Museum, WWF Greece, and the Athens Partnership. In effect, fund-raising is accompanied by a joint process, involving both the grantor and the grantee, of articulation and implementation of strategic intent. So leading, international NGOs, non-profits and the Greek local government, in our interviews, increasingly come to resemble the US non-profits operating in Greece, in their strategising, via fund-raising, with leading diaspora and transnational foundations.

In terms of fund-raising in the wider Greek diaspora universe, WWF Hellas communicated to us that there is interest in accessing the diaspora through coordination with national charters of the parent NGO where Greek diaspora communities are influential.

Action Aid Hellas is an NGO focused on developing countries and led by a prominent diasporic Greek. Members of diaspora Greek communities, either from developed or

developing countries, have chosen to support Action Aid Hellas, as opposed to their Action Aid chapter of their host countries, as a way of endorsing Greek society's embrace of its global responsibilities.

Both of our two Greek non-profits cases, Benaki Museum and the Museum of Cycladic Art, have made use of US legal entities so that they can receive tax exempt donations from the US. Additionally, the activities of Benaki Museum in the US, such as organising a major exhibition, are also accompanied by fund-raising efforts among the Greek-American wealthy starting, as with the case of the US non-profits, with the Church-related Greek-American elite.

Both museums have a dedicated fund-raising operation. At the Benaki Museum this operation was established during the crisis when the institution faced a threatening cash crunch, and the fund-raising office's operational expenses were actually funded by a donor. The Museum of Cycladic Art has long been actively fund-raising. Dedicated fund-raising staff are responsible for encouraging corporate donations and overseeing membership fees, while the director prioritised fund-raising from diaspora, transnational and local foundations and other leading donors, often within the circle of the founders' family.

In the case of Hamogelo tou Paidiou, diaspora donors are attracted by the highly prominent cause of this NGO, and both social events and social media having been used for fund-raising purposes. The ex-ambassador of Greece in Canada has activated diaspora support in the context of the refugee crisis while the Greek ambassador in Belgium has led fund-raising efforts. Clearly the high legitimacy of the cause supported – children's welfare – has motivated Greek diplomats to lead fund-raising efforts among the diaspora. Considering the fund-raising prowess of the NGO in Greece one would think that the NGO has the organisational capacity to undertake a major fund-raising effort within the diaspora and steps are taken in this direction.

In both our two international NGOs cases, WWF Greece and Action Aid Hellas, diaspora and transnational Greeks, as NGO officers and as board members and donors, have propagated and sought to influence public and state attitudes and policies in two policy domains: environmental protection and development assistance respectively. By doing so, they have acted, via the chosen NGO mission and institutional capacity, as transmitters of values and policies originating from abroad to Greece. In turn, this alignment has contributed to the dissemination of normative understandings, in the case of development aid and environmental conservation, which bring Greek constituencies closer to the attitudes prevailing among Greek diaspora communities. We noted in the case of Action Aid Hellas the cause of alleviating child poverty found traction in Greece, as demonstrated by their significant fund-raising prowess based on mass solicitation of relatively small donations. Another example is that of the Behrakis Foundation which we

did not manage to interview and which has generously funded a public health campaign directed against smoking in Greece. Behrakis Foundation has selected, as a partner in Greece, American College of Greece, which it has generously funded.

In the case of Action Aid Hellas, expertise developed in the developing world in microlending has been applied to crisis-hit Greece. The NGO has helped to develop the framework for microlending and, in the process, brought on board international expertise built up in France, as well as generating supportive donor funding originating in Greek-American and Greek private wealth. Action Aid Hellas' crisis alleviation initiatives in Greece have also been supported by diaspora and transnational foundations and Greek CSR.

WWF Greece by setting the parameters and helping run the Giaros sea park and Action Aid Hellas through its advocacy of microlending – like Anatolia College through its partnership with John Hopkins on the teaching of gifted children and American College in Greece's partnership with Behrakis Foundation geared towards the campaign against smoking - demonstrate the increasingly prominent role of the non-profit and diaspora and transnational foundation alliance in advancing policy change and innovation in various domains in Greece.

Both the private museums we interviewed, albeit via distinct trajectories, have become 'Noah Ark' institutions for Greece's cultural patrimony in cooperation with the state. Dolly and Nikos Goulandris received a special dispensation in 1961 to buy Greek antiquities in Greece and abroad pillaged by widespread theft and smuggling while undertaking the commitment to keep and exhibit these antiquities in the museum they founded. In the case of Benaki Museum, the collection of Antonis Benakis was gifted to the state in 1930 in exchange for the state's commitment to allow the eponymous museum self-governance and to fully fund its operating costs; the latter commitment kept only in part historically and further shrunk during the crisis. Importantly, the Benaki Museum has since then managed to convince other Greek collectors to donate their artefacts to the museum, more than doubling its collection. Consequently, the reputation and ability of these two private museums to fund-raise from the diaspora is also a function of the unique relationship they established with the Greek state.

What stands in contrast to all of the above organisations are the cases of the two state universities we interviewed, the University of Athens and the University of Thessaloniki. A combination of liquidity constraints and, perhaps more importantly, political constraints, in formally acknowledging that a state university will seek to rely on private funding for part of its needs in the medium to long term, has proven to be an insurmountable block in systematically accessing either local or diaspora and transnational donors.

Consequently, a fund-raising operation has not come into being in the two universities despite the fact that their operational budget (excluding payroll) has been reduced to one third of its pre-crisis levels. This means that neither of the two universities can systematically identify among their vast alumni bases – ranging from one hundred thousand for the University of Thessaloniki to more than half a million for the University of Athens – those alumni who have achieved significant wealth either in Greece or abroad and cultivate them as prospective donors.

Plans that the boards of these state universities had to make use of legal entities in the US that would allow for tax exempt donations never had the chance to be implemented – unlike the case of the non-profits we interviewed such as Benaki Museum and the Museum of Cycladic Art. We will recall from the analysis above that in terms of board structure (a) there was successful resistance to the possibility initially included in the educational reform legislation for members of the state university boards to also come from the business community and that (b) subsequently the university boards, including those of the University of Athens and the University of Thessaloniki, that included members of the Greek academic diaspora experienced in fund-raising, were abolished by the SYRIZA/ANEL coalition government. Or to put it in the context of our interviews, the two state universities were denied by legislative developments the opportunity to adjust to the crisis through changes in their governance similar to those undertaken by the autonomous Benaki Museum which renewed its board ranks in order to address its funding crisis.

Shortness of rector tenure, state interference in the running of the university and widespread vandalism which discourages donations in new buildings and / or improvements in existing infrastructure, have been reported by one of the two state universities as insurmountable hurdles in achieving the type of strategic alignments that have been achieved between the US non-profits in Greece, the local charters of the international NGOs, Benaki Museum and the Athens Municipality, via the vehicle of the Athens Partnership with the diaspora and transnational foundations.

Recommendation to the diaspora and transnational foundations active in Greece:

Prioritise funding support in Greece's universities for the creation of fund-raising offices. With a relatively small outlay, the foundations can help state universities cultivate their huge alumni bases in order to generate donor inflows. Developing this fund-raising infrastructure will also bring closer the diaspora to Greece, as thousands of state university alumni live and work abroad. At the same time, such a fund-raising infrastructure will help diffuse the notion of philanthropic giving among Greece's university educated population.

6. Concluding synthesis

In this section we synthesise the analysis of the patterns of diaspora and transnational philanthropy that we noted in Greek print media and which have been, at least in part, examined by the relevant scholarship with the findings of the interviews we conducted.

Our direct exposure to the transnational foundations illuminated a strongly corporate, internationalised, process-driven board structure and operations. In that respect these foundations bear increasing resemblance to Greece's large corporations, something which is of course not surprising considering that their founders run large, sophisticated businesses. This feature of the foundations adds to our understanding of the joined philanthropic giving of these foundations with Greek CSR that has been recorded by Greek print media. The professionalisation of the transnational foundations, noted by the interviews, also enriches the understanding of their impact on Greece's non-profit sector, considering the state's retreat from its funding role of Greek non-profits. Transparency, capacity and efficiency are the qualities that diaspora and transnational foundations prize and thus reward with funding.

Non-profits with a capacity to raise funds from the diaspora and transnational foundations, as well as other donors, have an increased ability for norms diffusion within Greek society. Anatolia College with gifted and talented children, WWF Greece with environmental protection, Action Aid Hellas with development assistance, American College in Greece with smoking as a major public health issue - all these non-profits manage and propagate norm-setting in Greece. We thus see the emergence of an alignment between diaspora and transnational philanthropy and highly prestigious non-profits with an increased capacity and legitimacy to operationalise and diffuse norms in various domains of public interest in Greece.

More generally, we expect that the long-term trend in the rise in importance of foundation funding channeled to non-profits and NGOs with best-of-breed characteristics will strengthen the non-profit sector reputationally and operationally. Relatedly, CSR will compound this trend by providing additional funding and expertise to non-profit entities in Greece.

The analysis of the record of diaspora and transnational philanthropy and our interviews coincide in their findings in the case of the Municipality of Athens' willingness to deliver public goods and services outside a civil service organisation. Additionally, we note the commitment substantiated in some of the interviews of diaspora philanthropy to particular localities in Greece where the foundations' founders originate from. Local

government thus emerges as the level of government where the interaction between diaspora and transnational philanthropy and state entities will tend to be the most systematic, wide-ranging and experimental. Our interviewees have also highlighted that within the central government there are many dedicated functionaries that will act as advocates of transnational foundation giving and will ensure that such funding fulfills its intended purpose. Considering Greece's medium to long-term fiscal constraints, and this positive response at the level of both local and central government, we fully expect diaspora and transnational philanthropy to have an effect not only in the non-profit sector but also in the public sector in the years to come.

Thus, we observe that diaspora and transnational philanthropy is boosting a pluralism that redefines the state-private, party-civil society binaries as they have been conceived by Greek scholarship prior and even during the crisis. This pluralism, in some ways, reverses the legacy of partitocracy and state funding dominating Greek civil society, inasmuch as non-profit actors with funding by the transnational foundations co-determine and co-produce public goods and services with state entities at various levels of government. Furthermore, transnational philanthropic funding clearly has an emancipatory effect, from partisanship, politicisation and deadening bureaucratic rigidities, for those dedicated and highly accomplished public servants which can access it so as to creatively conceptualise and implement their public service missions.

Notwithstanding the above, our interviewees have confirmed and specified the differentiated aptitude for attracting diaspora and transnational funding within the Greek state. Particularly Greece's classical legacy and higher education domains demonstrate strong internal resistance even amidst double digit cut backs in state funding, in accepting stakeholder diaspora and transnational philanthropy. By contrast, public health is recorded as being much more receptive of such philanthropy and willing to consider or even accommodate the latter's expectations and requirements.

We also note that the US non-profits operating in Greece, and with the most solid fund-raising relationship with the Greek-American diaspora, were hampered by the exceptionally restrictive legal framework in the fields of higher education and the country's classical legacy. Relatedly, resistance to the involvement of diaspora volunteerism in the governance of state higher education, which bore the promise of attracting follow-on diaspora philanthropy, led to the abolition of the governance reforms that catalysed this diaspora engagement in the first place. We thus have a Catch-22 situation whereby the most highly resonant domains of education and classical legacy for Greece's wealthiest diaspora communities, as demonstrated by their long-standing support of the US non-profits in Greece which we interviewed, are also the

very same domains that generate the greatest resistance from Greek stakeholders to diaspora and transnational philanthropic involvement.

The Greek political class, due to a mixture of its own incentives and pressure by state stakeholders, has been highly reluctant to share control with diaspora and local philanthropy. Or to reframe: the fiscal outlays needed to attract such resources, with the single exception of tax exemptions for local philanthropy, are insignificant. They mostly involve governance changes of state organisations which do not have financial implications. Yet the political costs – i.e., the costs of greater transparency and supervision in state organisations in order to limit corruption, clientelism and featherbedding - is undeniably high.

That being said, responsibility for Greek governments not having instituted changes in governance in important categories of state organisations and in Greece's non-profit sector that would maximise philanthropic engagement and its impact must be, at least in part, shared. The most important transnational foundations, perhaps due to the strategic reticence and discretion of their mostly ship-owning founders, have been unwilling to enter the public fray and share their knowledge and insights. Thus, transnational foundations have registered in the interviews, in their majority, their unwillingness to engage in public advocacy. Consequently, the issues that emerged in our preceding analysis are bound to lack 'ownership' in the foreseeable future and Greece's political class will not be challenged to address them. It is important to note in this regard that the transnational foundations are the only cohort of sophisticated organisations in Greece aimed at giving to the Greek state and society. As such, they are in possession of knowledge that can be of significant benefit for the welfare of the Greek people.

Transnational foundations, although interested in the involvement of diaspora philanthropic actors in Greece, have not dedicated resources to a strategic effort to catalyse such involvement. Indeed, the fact that they have thus far avoided coordinating their activities, through formal associational action, means that they lack the vehicle to do so. This despite the fact that transnational foundations invest considerable resources in the promotion of Hellenic causes abroad and in countries which host strong Greek diaspora communities. Thus, they are themselves, even if singly, influential actors in the evolution of Greece's diaspora communities. At the other end, that of philanthropic engagement by wholly Greek residents in Greece, individuals and legal entities, which have been encouraged by the transnational foundations via the instrument of matching funds and the funding of capacity building of Greek non-profits, via the creation of a fund-raising function, the issue of tax treatment of donations has also been left amiss. Systematic, evidence-based, associational advocacy of the transnational foundations for a generous tax treatment of

donations in Greece would make eminent sense from the perspective of the foundations. Such a policy change would powerfully leverage the funding of the diaspora and transnational foundations as well as enrich and inform their strategic aims by enhancing the financial capability of the wholly local philanthropic community.

Our interviews have substantiated the presence in the Greek non-profit sector of a cohort of organisations of diverse origin – namely US non-profits, charters of international NGOs, purely Greek non-profits – which have developed over time the governance and operational characteristics necessary to attract the support of diaspora and transnational foundations and of other donors from the Greek diaspora, primarily in the US. This means that as other non-profit and government organisations seek to attract diaspora fund-raising there is a critical mass of organisations and individuals in Greece which they can seek lessons from.

While in the course of our interviews the retrenchment due to the crisis of state capacity needed for catalysing purely diaspora, as opposed to transnational philanthropy in Greece was mentioned to us, this was not the most salient factor. A more important element that our interviewees communicated to us was the lack of a systematic effort by Greece's diplomatic machinery to catalyse diaspora philanthropy for Greece. The network of embassies and consulates of the Greek Ministry of Foreign Affairs has not been instructed by its political leadership during the crisis years to catalyse the diaspora's philanthropic engagement with Greece. In fact, the aegis of Greek ambassadors, to non-profits in Greece seeking to fund-raise among the diaspora communities, has been a hit and miss affair dependent on personal connections and not on state policy. Our interviewees have also noted the jealous attitude of the Greek Orthodox Church in the US towards competing claimants, be they non-profit initiatives from Greece or from the Greek-American community, to Greek-American philanthropy.

The desire on the part of Greek Orthodox authorities to have the lion's share of Greek-American philanthropy might also explain the reticence of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Greece. The ambivalence, or even outright hostility of important state entities, in the domains we identified such as Greece's cultural legacy and higher education, must have surely constrained Greece's diplomats in their interaction with potentially promising Greek diaspora philanthropists. In combination with the lack of associational commitment of the diaspora and transnational foundations, the effort to mobilise diaspora engagement with Greece has been left, as we noted in our analysis, to private entities such as The Hellenic Initiative, which no matter how prestigious and efficient cannot match the authority and infrastructure of the Greek state.

Our interviews have reinforced a feature of the factual record as well: namely that of the dominance, in diaspora and transnational philanthropy, of what we will call the

Anglosphere. Those foundations and individuals from a diaspora and transnational background who accumulated capital well beyond Greece's borders and already had experience in engaging philanthropically with Greece, mostly originated from shipping which enjoyed privileged relationships with the economically liberal US and the UK – not coincidentally two of the world's greatest maritime powers. Even those non-Anglo countries such as Lichtenstein, Luxemburg, Switzerland and Monaco, where many of the transnational foundations are incorporated and where some of their founders and board members live and work, have a symbiotic relationship with the Anglosphere, and thus similarities in terms of their legal and fiscal regimes relating to corporations, charitable foundations and high-income individuals.

Shipping's capital and earning capacity was diversified and thus protected by Greece's severe contraction unlike the capital and earning capacity of corporations, non-profits and individuals who were predominantly vested in Greece. Additionally, the non-profits operating in Greece with the most developed links with diaspora philanthropy are of US provenance in contrast with the mostly state-funded and controlled cultural and educational organisations of major European continental countries active in Greece, such as Germany's Goethe Institute, a country with a significant Greek diaspora community. The US features the most fiscally generous regime towards philanthropic donations, up to and including cross-border donations. It also hosts Greece's most numerous and wealthy diaspora community.

The interesting question that arises, both from the factual record and the interviews conducted, is the extent to which and how Greece, with its statist, Southern European tradition, under conditions of dramatic and long-term fiscal retrenchment, aligns itself with the diaspora and transnational philanthropic actors originating from the liberal and pluralistic order that is the most prominent characteristic of the Anglosphere.

Considering this summation, three main thoughts inform the issuance of the Commission's recommendations and of the suggested further directions of research which follow.

First, we are dealing with a de facto rise in the importance for the Greek society, polity and even economy of diaspora and transnational philanthropy. The dramatic retreat of the state due to Greece's fiscal crisis both legitimises and renders even more imperative the mobilisation of philanthropic resources. By extension, this inexorable rise in importance of diaspora and transnational philanthropy renders very important the issue of how diaspora philanthropy expands in Greece, in volume and range, to include an even greater range of diaspora and resident philanthropic actors.

Second, we need to have a proper, well-informed debate in Greece on the range of changes that need to be effected in order to increase the volume, range and impact of

diaspora philanthropy in Greece. This debate should include a conversation about the governance of state organisations, as they constitute a very important grantee category, the legal and regulatory regime surrounding those domains to which diaspora philanthropy is most attracted, such as Greece's classical legacy and higher education, and the governance and fiscal treatment of Greece's non-profit sector. The most well-resourced diaspora and transnational foundations and non-profits have a significant responsibility in enabling this debate to take place. It is up to the Greek people and their elected representatives to ultimately decide which, if any, of the changes affecting future patterns of diaspora and transnational philanthropy, are to be implemented. But for democratic deliberation to fulfil its role, those institutions most informed and vested in this issue must adequately articulate and disseminate their position.

Third, and to the extent that the political will in Greece emerges in the future to strengthen state capacity through the appropriate combination of fiscal, personnel and administrative choices, it can still synthesise this enhanced state capacity with an influential and growing diaspora and transnational philanthropic activity. Such a Greek state would be able to a) systematise experimentation and policy innovation funded by diaspora transnational philanthropy whenever it judged that to be in the public interest, and in conformity with democratically legitimated mandates and b) focus recourses not on micromanaging state organisations and non-profit organisations, but on ensuring, through robust and well-resourced regulatory action, that they operate in a more liberal environment according to their statutory and private charter mandates respectively and with the assistance of philanthropic giving.

7. Resources

In this section we record the press articles and academic publications we have made use of in sections 1, 2 and 3, as well as in the formulation of some of our recommendations. A subsequent References section gives a full record of all these resources.

1. Diaspora and Transnational Philanthropy in Greece pre-crisis

‘Austerity and the Third Sector in Greece’ (Clarke, Huliaras and Sotiropoulos, 2015) and ‘The Greek society of citizens and the economic crisis’ (Sotiropoulos, 2017) survey developments in the Greek non-profit sector and, partly, in philanthropic giving.

Diaspora Philanthropy: Influences, Initiatives, and Issues (Johnson, 2007) and ‘Mobilizing diaspora entrepreneurship for development’ (Newland, Tanaka, 2010) provide the main definitions and concepts relating to diaspora philanthropy and its contribution to homeland development.

‘Indian immigrants in the United States - The Emergence of a transnational population’ (Lessinger, 2003) illuminates the case of a particularly influential transnational population of businessmen and benefactors while ‘Diasporas and conflict: Distance, contiguity and spheres of engagement’ (Van Hear, Cohen, 2016) examine the friction which diaspora engagement with a homeland can generate.

‘Greek shipowners and Greece: from separate development to mutual interdependence’ (Harlaftis 2015) and ‘Moving Ashore? Greek Shipowners, State Corporatism and the Europeanisation of Maritime Transport’ (Romanos, 2008) chart the ebbs and flows of Greek shipowners vis-a-vis the Greek state and economy whereas ‘Inaccessible Shores’ (Kouloukoundis, 2017) gives an account of the peripatetic, cosmopolitan existence of Greek shipowners in the post WWII era.

‘Educating Across Cultures: Anatolia College in Turkey and Greece’ (McGrew, 2015), presents a typical case of a US non-profit in Greece which gradually increases the contribution of the Greek-American community in its governance and fund-raising in the post WWII era.

2. The Crisis and its effects on Diaspora and Transnational Philanthropy

The leadership of the Stavros Niarchos Foundations has vigorously defended the appropriateness of its decision to go ahead with a half a billion investment in Greek letters and the arts amidst the crisis, see typically ‘If you build it they will come’, (Financial Times, 1 December 2016). Another significant diaspora and transnational philanthropic commitment, that of the Goulandris Museum of Modern Art, was initiated back in the mid-1990s and its implementation coincided with the crisis years, see ‘Diamonds of Modern Art in Athens’, (KATHIMERINI, 17 of April 2017). Distinguished Greek scientists, whether they are supported or not from philanthropy, have received much greater attention during the crisis due to prominence of the notion of excellence in the crisis-generated debate. Certainly, there has been no question of the rationale behind such philanthropic support, see typically ‘International successes with a Greek stamp’, (KATHIMERINI, 31 May 2017), which highlights the research achievements of five Greek diaspora professors which were honoured by the Bodossaki Foundation.

The rise in the importance of the foundations as funders of Greek NGOs has been analysed in ‘The Economic Impact of Economic Crises on NGOs: The case of Greece’, (Tzifakis, Petropoulos, Huliaras, October 2017). There have been numerous academic publications on the impact of the crisis on CSR in Greece, mostly identifying a shift towards the mitigation of the social effects of the crisis, such as ‘The Impact of the economic crisis on the Corporate Social Responsibility activities of Greek companies’ (Sahinidis, Daskalaki, Mantzari, Mantzaris, 2018). Such scholarship however has not, to our knowledge, explored the implications of the fusion of CSR with diaspora and transnational philanthropic giving. This fusion has been recorded, if not analysed, in the Greek press as in ‘A new overcoat is woven for Athens’ (KATHIMERINI, 2 August 2018) and ‘A summer school for gifted children’ (KATHIMERINI, 2 July 2018), two articles that deal respectively with the Municipality of Athens’ ‘Athens Partnership’ and Anatolia College’s CTY programme.

3. Diaspora and Transnational Philanthropy and government entities as grantees

The upheavals relating to the reshuffling of boards of state organisations, particularly in the domain of culture, have been well-recorded in the Greek press; but the debate on the suitable mission and composition of boards of state organisations has been undernourished with reforms timidly broached by the political leadership but not eventually pursued, see indicatively ‘The National [Theatre] is a battle ground’ (TO

VIMA, 22 March 2015), ‘New Episode in the EMST serial’ (KATHIMERINI, 16 November 2018), ‘The two faces of Nikos Xidakis’ (TA NEA, 14-15 March 2015).

Pesmazoglou (1994), trenchantly analyses resistance to reform in Greece’s older and largest universities while ‘Diaspora Philanthropy and Volunteerism as a contestable process: Tracing the connections and disconnections between diaspora and homeland’ (Anastasopoulou, Kamaras, 2019) focuses on resistance to the introduction of boards in Greece’s state universities.

Reportage on the Municipality of Athens’ ‘Athens Partnership’ is referenced above while the analysis on the Municipality of Thessaloniki’s interaction with diaspora and transnational philanthropy and the non-profit sector is substantiated by the following press release of the Municipality https://thessaloniki.gr/erga-kai-draseis-dimou-thessalonikis-me-dorea-idrimatos-stavros-niarxos/?fbclid=IwAR0Eu254Xy5T_k1vJefaDMEhfXLiMJ01-oSBBJrU7a05xnCcBsNS4erfnVY

The synthesis in the regions between diaspora and transnational foundations, CSR, the non-profit sector, regional authorities and EU funding is illuminated by such reporting as ‘Diazoma and a social alliance’ (KATHIMERINI, 21 April 2015) and ‘The cultural path unifies Central Greece’, (TA NEA, 4 August 2017). There are numerous reports of state functionaries who have managed to align with diaspora and transnational foundations and CSR in order to fund their activities and here we mention two examples from classical archaeology, ‘A Travel in time to a model museum’ (KATHIMERINI, 2 June 2016) and ‘Laskaridis Foundation: a ‘diving’ exhibition to the ancient shipwreck of Antikythira’ (KATHIMERINI, 8 December 2017). The additional factor of the non-Greek international philanthropic community co-funding, with the diaspora and transnational foundations and CSR, Greek local and central government projects, in social welfare and Greece’s classical legacy respectively is brought home in ‘Solidarity Network in the old Guardhouse’, (KATHIMERINI, 19 November 2014) and ‘A new future for Akrotiri’, (KATHIMERINI, 17 June 2016).

Recommendations

For recommendation 2, useful background on the advisability of kickstarting, via external funding, the fund-raising function in a university sector with no prior experience of it, can be found at ‘Increasing Voluntary giving to higher education – Task Force Report to the Government’ (May, 2004) which can be accessed at: https://www.case.org/Documents/PublicPolicy/CASE_Europe/increasingvoluntarygivingreport.pdf

On recommendation 4, information on the functioning and role of the England and Wales Charity Commission can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/charity-commission>

On recommendation 5, information on the functioning and role of the UK Public Appointments Commissioner can be found at:

<https://publicappointmentscommissioner.independent.gov.uk/>

On recommendation 9, analysis on the case study of Mexico on the state's co-funding commitment of diaspora hometown associations analysis is provided at 'Hometown Associations and Development: A look at Ownership, Sustainability, Correspondence and Replicability (Orozco and Welle, 2005).

References

Athinakis. D., 2018. A new overcoat is woven for Athens. KATHIMERINI, 2 August
<http://www.kathimerini.gr/978033/gallery/politismos/polh/ena-neo-panwfori-yfainetai-gia-thn-a8hna>

Clarke, J., Huliaras, A. and Sotiropoulos, D.A. 2015. *Austerity and the Third Sector in Greece*. Ashgate

Doulgeridis, D. 2015. The two faces of Nikos Xidakis. TA NEA. 14-15 March.
<https://www.tanea.gr/2015/03/13/lifearts/ta-dyo-proswpa-toy-nikoy-ksydaki/>

Fotiadis, I. 2014. Solidarity Network in the old Guardhouse. KATHIMERINI, 19 November 2014
<http://www.kathimerini.gr/792539/article/epikairothta/ellada/diktyo-allhleggyhs-sto-palaio-froyrarxeio>

Fotiadi, I. 2017. 'International successes with a Greek stamp', KATHIMERINI, 31 May.
<http://www.kathimerini.gr/911978/article/epikairothta/ellada/die8neis-epityxies-me-ellhnikh-sfragida>

Harlaftis, G. 2015. 'Greek shipowners and Greece: from separate development to mutual interdependence' 'Moving Ashore? Greek Shipowners, State Corporatism and the Europeanisation of Maritime Transport'. Bloomsbury.

Hope, K. 1st December 2016. If you build it they will come. FT Wealth, pp. 52-53

Johnson, P. D. 2007. *Diaspora Philanthropy: Influences, Initiatives, and Issues*. Boston, MA: The Philanthropic Initiative Inc, and the Global Equity Initiative, Harvard University

Kamaras, A., Anastasopoulou, M. 2019. *Diaspora Philanthropy and Volunteerism as a contestable process: Tracing the connections and disconnections between diaspora and homeland*. SEESOX.

Kouloukoundis, I. 2017. *Inaccessible Shores*. Potamos (in Greek)

Lakasas, A. 2018. A summer school for gifted children. KATHIMERINI, 3 July

Lessinger, J. 2003. 'Indian immigrants in the United States - The Emergence of a transnational population'. In *Culture and Economy in the Indian Diaspora*, edited by Parekh, B., Singh, G., Vertovec, S.. Taylor and Francis. 165-182.

Loverdou, M. 2015. The National [Theatre] is a battle ground. TO VIMA. 22 March
<https://www.tovima.gr/2015/03/20/culture/pedio-maxis-to-ethniko/>

Mavroudi E. (2015) 'Helping the Homeland? Diasporic Greeks in Australia

and the Potential for Homeland-Oriented Development at a Time of Economic Crisis' in Anastasia Christou and Elizabeth Mavroudi (eds), *Dismantling Diasporas: Rethinking the Geographies of Diasporic Identity, Connection and Development* Ashgate: New York, pp. 175 – 187.

McGrew, W. 2015. *Educating Across Cultures: Anatolia College in Turkey and Greece*. Rowman & Littlefield

Municipality of Thessaloniki. 2019. Projects and actions of the Municipality of Thessaloniki funded by the Stavros Niarchos Foundation. Press Release.

https://thessaloniki.gr/erga-kai-draseis-dimou-thessalonikis-me-dorea-idrimatos-stavros-niarchos/?fbclid=IwAR0Eu254Xy5T_k1vJefaDMEhfXLiMJ01-oSBBJrU7a05xnCcBsNS4erfnVY

Newland, K., & Tanaka, H. 2010. 'Mobilizing diaspora entrepreneurship for development'. *Migration Policy Institute*: Washington D.C.

Orozco, M. and Welle, K. 2005. *Hometown Associations and Development: A look at Ownership, Sustainability, Correspondence and Replicability*. Inter-American Development Bank.

Pesmazoglu, S. 1994. Government, ideology and the university curriculum in Greece. *European Journal of Education* 29, no. 3: 291–304.

Pournara, M. 2016. Diamonds of Modern Art in Athens. KATHIMERINI 17 April.
<http://www.kathimerini.gr/856720/gallery/politismos/eikastika/diamantia-monternas-texnhs-sthn-a8hna>

Pournara, M. 2016. A new future for Akrotiri. KATHIMERINI, 17 June.

<http://www.kathimerini.gr/864152/article/epikairothta/ellada/ena-neo-mellon-gia-to-akrwthri>

Pournara, M., 2017. Laskaridis Foundation: a 'diving' exhibition to the ancient shipwreck of Antikythira' KATHIMERINI 8 December,
<http://www.kathimerini.gr/938336/article/epikairothta/ellada/idryma-laskaridh-mia-ek8esh-voytia-sto-arxaio-nayagio-twn-antiky8hrwn>

Romanos, M.J.2008. Moving Ashore? Greek Shipowners, State Corporatism and the Europeanisation of Maritime Transport. London School of Economics and Political Science. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis

Sahinidis, A.G., Daskalaki, D., Mantzari, E.,Mantzaris, I. 2018. The Impact of the economic crisis on the Corporate Social Responsibility activities of Greek companies. In Sustainability and Social Responsibility: Regulation and Reporting pp.241-258). Springer.

Saltou, E.2017. The cultural path unifies Central Greece. TA NEA, 4 August
.https://www.tanea.gr/2017/08/04/greece/i-politistiki-diadromi-enwnei-ti-sterea-ellada/

Sotiropoulos, D.A., 2017. The Greek society of citizens and the economic crisis. Potamos (in Greek)

Sykka, Y. 2016. A Travel in time to a model museum. KATHIMERINI 2 June.
<http://www.kathimerini.gr/862117/article/epikairothta/ellada/tazidi-ston-xrono-se-ena-moyseio-ypodeigma>

Task Force report to the Government. 2004. Increasing Voluntary giving to higher education – Task Force Report to the Government’, accessed at:
https://www.case.org/Documents/PublicPolicy/CASE_Europe/increasingvoluntarygivingreport.pdf

Tsoukalas, K., Dependence and Reproduction: the social role of educational mechanisms in Greece (1830-1922), introduction by Svoronos, N.G., Athens, Themelio, 1977

Tzifakis, N., Petropoulos, S., Huliaras, A.. 2017. The Impact of Economic Crises on NGOs: The case of Greece. VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organisations, Vol 28, Issue 5, pp 2176-2199

Van Hear, N. and Cohen, R. 2017. ‘Diasporas and conflict: distance, contiguity and spheres of engagement’, *Oxford Development Studies*, 45(2):171-184

Vatopoulos, N., 2015. Diazoma and a social alliance. KATHIMERINI, 21 April.
<http://www.kathimerini.gr/812133/article/epikairothta/ellada/to-diazwma-kai-h-koinwnikh-symmachia>

Vasileiadou, M.2018. New Episode in the EMST serial. KATHIMERINI, 16 November.
<http://www.kathimerini.gr/995467/article/politismos/eikastika/neo-epeisodio-sto-sirial-toy-emst>