

Policy Plutocrats: How America's Wealthy Influence Governance

American democracy faces serious challenges, including hyper-partisanship, declining public confidence in government, and legislative paralysis. When government cannot or will not act, civil society and its philanthropic patrons have offered an alternative mechanism of social change. This article documents how America's billionaires are using their wealth, ideas, and political leverage to advance controversial policy goals, from deficit reduction, to school reform, to gun regulation. Drawing on an original dataset of nearly 200 leading philanthropists, I find that more than half have serious policy interests and ambitions. While receiving acclaim in some circles, these "policy plutocrats" often draw criticism for disregarding democratic processes, enhancing elite power, and inflicting ill-conceived experiments on disadvantaged populations. However, these donors also are subsidizing organizations that amplify the voice of unorganized issue publics and marginalized populations. These donors and their activities have opened a vast research frontier for normative and empirical political science.

Note: The final version of this manuscript appeared as Kristin A. Goss, "Policy Plutocrats: How America's Wealthy Seek to Influence Governance," *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 49 (3), 2016, 442-448. Please cite to the published article. Check quotations and figures against the published version.

Democratic governance in the United States is under threat on several fronts: the growing concentration of wealth and political power in the hands of a relatively few individuals, the public's steadily declining faith in government's ability to respond effectively to public problems, and hyper-partisanship that makes compromise – the bread and butter of American democracy – very difficult to achieve (Bartels 2010; Gilens and Page 2014; Hacker and Pierson 2011; Mann and Ornstein 2012). Coupled with the weakening of populist institutions such as mass membership federations and unions (Skocpol 2003; Hacker and Pierson 2011), these larger economic and political developments have tended to strengthen the power of elites, who already dominated the political system (Carnes 2013).

Big money in politics, including billionaire patronage of presidential candidates, has garnered a great deal of attention (see, for example, Beinart 2014; Vogel 2014; West 2014). But the concentration of wealth and the weakening of government capacity have given rise to another, less studied trend: Public and private pledges by America's wealthiest citizens to devote most of their resources to public betterment – and to do so soon, during their lifetimes. As government has failed to act and mass publics have failed to mobilize, many of America's millionaires and billionaires are stepping into the void with ambitious plans to ameliorate public problems. These donors are directing not only their money, but also their time, ideas, and political leverage, toward influencing public policy. These men and women are important *political actors* whose activities raise important questions about democratic voice, government performance, and public accountability. And yet, scholars of politics and policy have paid scant attention to how “giving is becoming governance” (Rogers 2012, B3; see also Eikenberry 2006).

Although philanthropic plutocrats have been a feature of public life at least since the Gilded Age, “as the 21st century unfolds it has become accepted, and even expected, that wealthy

philanthropists, businesses, charities and social entrepreneurs, rather than governments alone, will take part in and even lead efforts to solve big problems” (Bishop and Green 2015, 542). Compared to their forebears, today’s philanthropic tycoons are said to be distinguished by the scale of their ambitions; by their application of business rhetoric and methods, such as venture-capital investment models and impact metrics, to their philanthropy; and by their desire personally to direct the liquidation of their fortunes during their lifetimes (Bishop and Green 2008; Jenkins 2010-11). Freeland captures the essence of these developments: “You might call it the Silicon Valley school of politics – a technocratic, data-based objective search for solutions to our problems, uncorrupted by vested interests” (Freeland 2013). This approach to giving has come to be known as “philanthrocapitalism” (Bishop and Green 2008). An analytically important sub-strain has been termed “philanthro-policymaking” (Rogers 2011).

Although some history-minded critics have questioned whether philanthrocapitalism represents a new phenomenon or simply a new label (Harvey et al. 2011, Beresford 2007), modern-day plutocrats are disrupting stable governing arrangements and reconfiguring the delicate balance of power between the state and civil society. Donors do so by leveraging their wealth through one or more strategies.

First, many choose to focus on neglected policy domains, working on issues especially prone to collective action problems or making it possible for government entities to experiment without worrying about political constraints or scarce public funds. Billionaire Michael Bloomberg, for example, views his philanthropy as “a way to embolden government” (Allen 2015). Many donors further leverage their wealth by combining with peers in secretive funding alliances, networks, and global convenings, where they can coordinate strategies and channel donations to favored organizations (Goldenberg 2013; Freeland 2012; Jenkins 2010-2011; Kroll

and Schulman 2014; Skocpol, this volume; Vogel 2014; West 2014). Some donors have joined forces around issue-specific organizations and campaigns, such as Ed in '08 (school reform) and FWD.us (immigration). A few donors also are integrating different types of financial investments – in policy ideas, legislative advocacy, election campaigns, and even for-profit start-ups – to tackle a single issue along multiple fronts.¹ Some billionaire philanthropies are actively partnering with government (Bishop and Green 2015). Because of such leveraging strategies, the marginal value of a private donor's dollar may far exceed its face value.²

Policy plutocrats deploy other sources of leverage to amplify the effects of their philanthropy. Moral authority is one such source. Many of today's most active donors are entrepreneurs and “self-made men” (and increasingly women) whose track record of successful ideas resonates with government officials and the broader public. Donors also carry the promise of campaign cash, necessary to keep up in the campaign finance arms race. These different sources of leverage – innovative philanthropic strategies, moral authority, and campaign cash – can add up to real political power. As journalist Bob Herbert (2014) acerbically argued: “When a multibillionaire gets an idea... [on] matters of important public policy and the billionaire is willing to back it up with hard cash, public officials tend to reach for the money with one hand and their marching orders with the other.” These features of donor influence – money, leverage, authority, and access – may provide even greater advantages in an era of vast income inequality and weakening modes of mass organization.

Implicit in these accounts is that today's billionaires may not be primarily interested in

¹ Laurene Powell Jobs, for example, has founded the Emerson Collective, which is an LLC, meaning it can make charitable grants, business investments, and campaign contributions toward its core concerns, which include education and immigration reform (Miller 2013). Michael Bloomberg's funding on gun reform includes basic research, public education, policy advocacy, grassroots organizing, and campaign contributions.

² I thank Professor Philip Cook of Duke University for his observation about marginal value.

supporting traditional charitable endeavors (funding scholarships and hospital wings), but rather in tackling the systemic forces that produce and perpetuate public problems – and doing so through the policy process.³ Certainly some plutocrats – Bill and Melinda Gates, Michael Bloomberg, and a handful of other especially prominent donors – do fit this mold. They are generating policy ideas, mobilizing pressure campaigns, trying to influence who holds office, and reforming the systems through which policy is implemented. But are these policy-engaged “philanthrocapitalists” representative of today’s billionaire donors? This study uses an original dataset of nearly 200 prominent philanthropists to explore three questions:

1. What is their philanthropic capacity?
2. How many of them have serious ambitions to influence public policy, and what issues concern them?
3. What mix of charitable, advocacy, and electoral giving strategies are they deploying?

The article proceeds as follows. First, I set the stage by briefly reviewing prominent work on the role of major donors in the democratic process, a literature that mainstream political science might incorporate more fully. I then describe the data used to assess the scope and interests of what I term “policy plutocrats”: those wealthy donors (including but not limited to philanthrocapitalists) who have serious policy interests. Next, I turn to the empirical questions about today’s policy plutocrats: Who are they, what are they funding, and what strategies are they using? I conclude with brief thoughts about why policy plutocrats should matter to political scientists and everyone concerned with democratic governance. This essay’s aim is modest: to

³ A distinction is commonly made between “charity” – “an uncomplicated and unconditional transfer of money...to those in need with the intent of helping” – and “philanthropy,” which implies a strategy of attacking the “root causes” of public problems (Frumkin 2006, 5, 7). In this article, I use the term “charitable” in a legalistic sense: donations to public charities, recognized under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. The strategy behind such donations may be charity or philanthropy or some combination of the two.

create a broad intellectual foundation for a more deeply focused inquiry.

Wealthy Donors and the Democratic Process: An Overview

America's philanthropic and political donors enjoy broad liberties thanks to the First Amendment's free speech guarantees, loose federal regulation and oversight, and a political consensus on the value of nongovernmental approaches to public problems. The wide berth given to donors has engendered a longstanding, nuanced debate over their impact on democratic governance and the appropriate level of oversight to which they should be subject. Broadly speaking, one dominant perspective holds that plutocrats and their philanthropic foundations enhance democracy by promoting a pluralism of ideas, solving collective action problems, and funding innovative models that government might adopt (Bishop and Green 2008; Fleishman 2007; Frumkin 2006; Walker 1991). This salutary view implies that the state should have a light regulatory touch, perhaps requiring donors to disclose the broad contours of their activities and prosecuting the misuse of funds, but otherwise allowing donors to operate free of government intervention. Another, less sanguine perspective holds that wealthy donors and their giving reinforce social and political inequalities by replicating elite institutions, quashing political dissent and other minority viewpoints, and channeling activism into organizations unlikely to change existing power structures (Jenkins 1998; Roelofs 2003). In this view, wealthy donors are anti-democratic actors meriting a great deal more government scrutiny and regulation.

This longstanding debate has reignited in recent years as donors' capacity to influence policy has grown. Booms in the technology and hedge fund sectors, combined with a favorable tax system, have created a generation of youthful entrepreneurs and financiers with more money than they could possibly spend on themselves. Scores of leading donors are using moral suasion to establish a norm that wealthy people's "excess" money should go toward public purposes.

Indeed, establishing mega-philanthropy as an elite norm is a goal of the Giving Pledge, through which roughly 140 donors have publicly vowed to give away the majority of their wealth during their lifetime. To enhance their impact, people of wealth are increasingly combining in networks to share strategies, intelligence, and funding targets (Vogel 2014; Bishop and Green 2015). Some of these collaborations, such as the Koch network on the right and the Democracy Alliance on the left, share ideological goals; others, such as the Giving Pledge network, are oriented around mutual learning; and yet others, such as the Elders, are focused on issue domains, such as global challenges (Bishop and Green 2015). On the political front, recent court rulings – notably *Citizens United v. FEC* (2010), *SpeechNow v. FEC* (2010), and *McCutcheon v. FEC* (2014) – have allowed wealthy people to give unlimited sums to influence elections through ideologically and issue-focused organizations. Such spending rose dramatically after 2010 (Burns and Haberman 2013; OpenSecrets 2015a).

Philanthrocapitalists and their activities have generated a lively debate over donor accountability, both procedural and substantive. The procedural-accountability critique holds that philanthropists are “bastions of unaccountable power” (Ravitch 2010) who are hastening “the transition from public deliberation by an elected government to decisions of self-appointed individuals with no accountability to the public” (Kumashiro 2012), often with little transparency or public debate (Edwards 2010). Major donors “can become ‘mini-governments’ that can, through their individual funding decisions, make public policy decisions on their own, without input from other citizens or elected representatives” (Eikenberry 2006), with the effect of “outsourcing” major policy areas to the private sector (Katz 2012). Highly directive, arguably paternalistic giving styles may disempower civil society leaders on the ground and increase the power of elites vis-à-vis non-elites, whose interests civil society organizations often represent

(Jenkins 2010-2011, 759). In this view, leadership qualities that may be appropriate for business may be ill-suited for making social and policy change, which “can alter the life chances of millions of other people” (Bustillos 2012).

The substantive-accountability critique questions philanthrocapitalists’ theories of change and raises doubts about their success (Edwards 2011). In this view, philanthrocapitalists are prone to “imperious overreaching” (Barkan 2011) and blinded by naiveté, seeing entrenched social problems like poverty “as an engineering problem” easily solved by “their brain power” (Stanley 2015). The substantive-accountability critique asserts that philanthropists are imposing failed policy experiments on an unwitting public while incurring no personal penalty for harm caused. As Herbert (2014) noted, Bill Gates “spent \$2 billion and disrupted 8 percent of the nation’s public high schools before acknowledging that his experiment was a flop.”

In practice the line between procedural accountability and substantive accountability is blurry. Both sets of critiques raise questions about, as Rogers (2015, 539) puts it, “the potential of philanthropy to further entrench – or to diminish – the power divide between the haves and the have-nots.” (For an insider critique along these lines, see LaMarche 2014.) If these critiques have merit, then philanthrocapitalists demand greater study by political scientists concerned with public policy and democratic governance. With some notable exceptions, largely focused on donors’ school-reform efforts (Ravitch 2010; Reckhow 2013; Reckhow, this volume) and conservative movement building (Skocpol and Williamson 2012; Teles 2008), there have been few systematic, scholarly efforts to understand the scope of plutocrats’ policy activities, let alone their political impact and the normative implications of their work. Instead, critiques have been based on a handful of publicly visible billionaire donors – especially Bill and Melinda Gates, Warren Buffett, George Soros, and Charles and David Koch – whose strategic orientation and

policy focus may not be representative of mega-philanthropists, including those who have pledged to give away the bulk of their wealth during their lifetimes. While the debate over philanthrocapitalism has raised important issues, it has been short on systematic data.

Data and Methods

This article presents results from an original dataset of major, U.S.-based philanthropists whose giving is focused (at least in part) on domestic organizations or causes.⁴ The data capture the publicly identifiable population of major *philanthropic* donors, allowing us then to assess the extent of their policy and political giving. Thus, the data should not be construed a census of major *political* donors (or even a representative sample thereof). Naturally, many major philanthropists are also major political donors, as reported below, and that group is of special interest. The dataset includes 194 individuals (or couples/families) assembled from three sources: (1) the Giving Pledge, through which people of wealth publicly identify themselves as intending to donate more than half of their wealth during their lifetime (givingpledge.org); (2) The Philanthropy 50, a yearly list compiled by *The Chronicle of Philanthropy* of the most generous charitable donors (data are for 2012, 2013, 2014; bequests are excluded); and, (3) foundations that made the Foundation Center's "Top 100" lists of the largest philanthropies (by assets and by grants) *and* had the donor(s) at the helm.

For each philanthropic donor, I collected as much data as was publicly available on their policy-oriented giving. I defined such giving as that going toward influencing the policy-making process at any stage by 1) conducting and disseminating policy-relevant research; 2) shaping or amplifying public opinion; 3) subsidizing organizations working for policy change through the

⁴ Some major philanthropists, including the Gates family, are heavily engaged in activity outside the U.S. Examining this work is beyond the scope of this study, but many of the same empirical and normative questions arise in the global context.

legislative, executive, or judicial branch; 4) intentionally providing models for new ways that government can deliver public services (e.g., K-12 education); or 5) partnering with government to reconfigure public spaces. Donors were coded as policy-oriented givers if they 1) identified one of these goals in their Giving Pledge; 2) gave at least one \$100,000 grant from their private foundation, in the most recent reporting year, to further a policy goal; 3) identified public policy interests on their foundation or personal website; 4) contributed any amount to a campaign organization oriented around a specific policy issue (e.g., abortion rights) between 2010 and mid-2015; or 5) were publicly identified as having founded a policy advocacy organization.⁵

For each donor, policy interests were coded according to the scheme developed by the Policy Agendas Project (policyagendas.org). That scheme includes 32 major topic areas. The philanthropists in my dataset had significant giving interests in 20 of them, including education, civil rights and liberties, energy, macroeconomic policy, and international affairs, among others.

Although different sources of public information are likely to catch many policy plutocrats, an unknown number no doubt eluded my data-gathering net. First, the net would miss at least some significant donors who give directly from a personal bank or investment account and who did not turn up in *The Philanthropy 50*. The net would also miss donors who give anonymously through donor-advised funds housed in community foundations, other giving aggregators, and LLC's. [Donations that are channeled through a donor's own 501(c)(3) private

⁵ Data on giving pledge intentions were collected from donors' public statements on GivingPledge.org. Data on philanthropic grants to policy-oriented groups came from the informational tax return (Form 990-PF) filed by the donor's family foundation(s) for the most recent year (typically 2013), as well as from the donor's foundation website when present. Data on the donor's political contributions came from the OpenSecrets.org database, maintained by the Center for Responsive Politics. In a handful of cases, I also included contributions to state ballot initiatives when news reports flagged donors' contributions *and* they could be confirmed on a state database tracking money in politics. In addition to these sources, I utilized web searches to locate news reports about donors' policy-related activities, including organizations founded.

foundation would be disclosed on the foundation's publicly accessible informational tax return.^{6]} Second, the dataset omits major policy or political donors whose philanthropic activities do not clear one of the three thresholds for inclusion (signing the Giving Pledge, appearing on The Philanthropy 50, or overseeing a Top 100 Foundation). Thus, while some major policy donors are in my dataset – because they are also major philanthropists – donor-privacy laws governing so-called dark money organizations, such as 501(c)(4) social welfare organizations, prevent me from painting a complete picture of my donors' policy-centered donations. Finally, the dataset omits donors who show up in media accounts as caring about an issue – perhaps by testifying before Congress – but whose donations to influence that issue could not be documented. The non-public nature of much giving means that, far from being able to assess *how* wealthy donors influence public policy, one cannot even compile a definitive list of *who* these political actors are. The findings from this study suggest, however, that even an incomplete sample yields a useful contribution.

The Philanthropic Capacity of America's Policy Plutocrats

The especially public, generous philanthropists in my sample have both a great capacity and an indicated willingness to give large sums for public purposes. Nearly half of the 194 individual and family donors in the dataset (47%) made the most recent Forbes 400 list of the wealthiest Americans; these donors had a combined fortune of \$904-billion.⁷ The net worth of the other 53% of donors (n=104) in the dataset cannot be determined. However, if their

⁶ Some donors who typically evade disclosure by giving from a private account may have publicly identified themselves or allowed the recipient organization to do so for purposes of The Philanthropy 50. Hence, my data sweep may have caught some major donors who otherwise would have gone undetected.

⁷ As of September 2015, when the donors' wealth data were collected, one needed to have a net worth of at least \$1.7-billion to make the Forbes 400 list. *Forbes* noted that 145 billionaires did not make the list (<http://www.forbes.com/forbes-400>; accessed November 14, 2015).

combined assets equal even one-quarter of the donors who made the Forbes list, the wealth represented in my dataset would exceed \$1.1-trillion, nearly one-third of U.S. government outlays in 2014.⁸ Under this assumption, if these donors were a country, they would constitute the 16th largest national economy in the world.⁹ Zeroing in on U.S.-based “Giving Pledgers,” (57% of those in my dataset), we see that half made the Forbes 400, and their combined assets are estimated at \$546-billion.¹⁰ Adding to that the untallied fortunes of Pledgers *not* on the Forbes 400, it appears that these especially eager donors have a philanthropic capacity, even after estate taxes, exceeding a half-trillion dollars.

The vast majority of the donors in the dataset (at least 83%) have institutionalized their giving by establishing a private foundation or other giving fund. These endowments held at least \$144.5-billion in assets and distributed an estimated \$10.4-billion in grants in the most recent year for which tax returns are available.¹¹ Providing circumstantial evidence that they are serving as drivers (Fleishman 2007) of their giving, more than three-quarters of these donors do not

⁸ Total outlays were \$3.5-trillion in 2014 (see <https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2016/assets/tables.pdf>).

⁹ <http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/GDP-ranking-table>

¹⁰ It is worth noting that the Giving Pledge is not legally binding. A media investigation of the estates of 10 billionaires who have died since making the pledge raised questions about the extent to which the pledge is being fulfilled and in particular how the “majority” of a donor’s wealth is calculated (Coffey 2015).

¹¹ With two exceptions, these figures exclude the donor-advised funds and other non-transparent giving vehicles that people in my dataset have created. Gifts to such vehicles are not publicly visible, unless they come from private foundations or the donor chooses to disclose them. Once the transfer has occurred, we cannot see how the fund’s assets have grown over time or how much of the fund has been disbursed. I included in these figures two families’ transfers reported in the media (Mark Zuckerberg’s and Priscilla Chan’s \$1.49-billion in gifts to the Silicon Valley Community Foundation in 2012 and 2013 and Nicholas and Jill Woodman’s \$500-million gift to the same foundation in 2014). These sums have certainly grown with the stock market (see Callahan 2014). To estimate the grants made off of such funds, I conservatively entered 5% of asset value, corresponding to the annual payout rate that federal law generally requires of foundations.

welcome unsolicited grant inquiries. Jenkins (2010-2011, 781) found that the fraction of large foundations with such policies increased fivefold between 1994 and 2008.

The Policy Pursuits of Major Philanthropists

More than half of America's most prominent philanthropists (56%) have serious policy interests: They are seeking to inform, advocate for or against, or reform the implementation of public policy through charitable, advocacy, and/or issue-specific electoral donations. This estimate surely underestimates philanthropists' policy engagement, which may occur through non-transparent donations and take non-donative forms, such as speaking publicly on a cause. Among Giving Pledgers – those who have publicly promised to donate the bulk of their fortunes to charity – the rate of policy engagement is significantly greater. Roughly two thirds of U.S.-based Pledgers (63%) have indicated and typically acted upon their commitment to informing or changing public policies. That figure is significant given that only 27% (n=30) of Giving Pledge signees wrote a pledge letter that attested to policy interests.

Table 1 shows the general interests of the policy plutocrats, as well as specific issues within each category. All told, 108 of the 194 donors in the sample had traceable interests in policy, either through charitable giving, advocacy group formation, or issue-centered outside spending, or some combination.

TABLE 1: What Interests Policy Plutocrats? Issues Attracting at Least 10 Donors

Policy Domain	Common Issues
Education (44)	Public school reform (44)
Government Operations (31)	Public policy (multi-issue) (21)
Civil rights, minority issue, civil liberties (28)	Abortion (17); LGBT (10)
Law, crime, and family issues (23)	Gun regulation (10); criminal justice reform (7)
Energy (20)	Climate change (16)
Environment (17)	Environmental conservation (17)
International Affairs and foreign aid (16)	US-Israel relations (9)
Health (12)	Health care access, system reform (8)
Immigration (12)	Immigration policy reform (11)
State/Local Government Administration (11)	Planning for urban spaces (8)
Agriculture (10)	Animal rights/hunter rights (6), food policy (4)

Policy domains correspond to those of the Policy Agendas Project (policyagendas.org). Figures in parentheses indicate the number of donors for whom the domain or issue was of interest.

A review of the policy interests of these donors suggests that, with some key exceptions, their orientation toward these policy issues is liberal: they are overwhelmingly pro-abortion rights, pro-gay rights, concerned about climate change, supportive of health care and immigration reform, pro-gun regulation, and in favor of animal rights. By way of comparison an analysis of policy plutocrats' political donations since 2010 suggests that these individuals are evenly divided between Democrats (35%) and Republicans (37%), with the rest either not giving politically or giving to committees from both parties. Conservative interests emerge in several ways. Approaches to public school reform, the top issue interest of policy plutocrats, often reflect market principles embraced by conservatives. Another cluster of right-leaning policy giving is focused on supporting fiscal policy reforms and conservative think tanks.

What Mix of Giving Strategies Do Big Donors Use?

One strategic approach to policy reform would be to integrate different giving modalities: donations to 1) public charities specializing in research and public education, 2) advocacy organizations focusing on grassroots mobilization and inside lobbying, and 3) electoral

organizations (candidates, parties, outside groups) focusing on influencing campaign issues and outcomes. Privacy laws prevent us from gathering systematic data on donor activity in the advocacy realm; however, much charitable giving and federal electoral spending is publicly traceable, providing an imperfect but instructive measure of strategic integration.

Most philanthropists in the dataset (83%) gave at least one publicly reported electoral contribution between 2010 and mid-2015. However, very few of the major charitable donors also showed up as major donors to outside money groups, the vehicles of choice for electoral donors wishing to advance issue-based and ideological interests. Just 18% (n=35) of major philanthropic donors in the dataset were also among the top 100 donors to outside groups in either the 2012 or 2014 election cycle (Open Secrets 2015b; Open Secrets 2015c). This finding suggests that many donors are specializing in charitable *or* electoral contributions, rather than channeling both types of donations toward a common policy goal. Supporting evidence for this conclusion comes from a separate analysis of the Top 50 charitable givers of 2012. With a handful of exceptions, these people's political donations were modest – with a median total of \$13,900 over the prior five years compared to a median charitable donation of \$54.9-million (DiMento 2012). Likewise, not one of the 31 guests at a recent Koch Brothers gathering of conservative political donors appears in the dataset of major philanthropists (see Kroll and Schulman 2014 for the list of attendees).

Discussion: Policy Plutocrats & Political Science

A lively and important debate is unfolding in America over the role of wealthy people in democratic governance. With more than half of America's most prominent philanthropists actively engaging in the policy process, and other billionaires doing so in less-visible ways, this debate will no doubt grow louder and calls for policy reforms more urgent. Political scientists

have much to say, both normatively and empirically, to inform these conversations. With further attention to philanthropy, especially policy-oriented philanthropy, we could say even more.

Empirically, political science needs to pay much greater attention to how billionaires spend their wealth. While studies of campaign contributions are valuable, America's wealthy are seeking policy influence through a wide array of other means. Lester Salamon (2014) argues that a "significant revolution" in philanthropy is underway, with a "massive explosion" both in the tools available for social investment (not just grants, but also loans, social-impact bonds, equity-type investments, etc.) and in the "instruments and institutions being deployed" (not just foundations, but also capital aggregators, social stock exchanges, etc.). While we can see some of the ways that donors are using these tools to influence political agendas and policy outcomes, we must also be attentive to how wealthy people may be exercising the "second face of power" to discourage consideration of alternative ideas (Bachrach and Baratz 1962). Although privacy laws pose challenges to large-scale data collection, scholars have demonstrated that such studies can be done using a combination of publicly available sources (e.g., foundation grants) and qualitative methods (see, for example, Reckhow 2013 and Teles 2008).

Normatively, the era of philanthrocapitalism calls for a revival of serious theoretical work on equality and democracy. For example, are we to think differently about billionaires who champion public philosophies that happen to benefit elites (for example, a smaller state) compared to billionaires who champion causes benefiting hard-to-organize groups, including the diffuse public or marginalized people? The articles in this Symposium make one conclusion clear: The era of philanthrocapitalism has opened up a vast research frontier filled with intriguing questions ripe for scholarly investigation.

Sources

- Allen, Mike. 2015. "Michael Bloomberg: Philanthropy should 'embolden government.'" Politico. April 6. <http://www.politico.com/story/2015/04/michael-bloomberg-philanthropy-government-116686> (Accessed November 17, 2015).
- Bachrach, Peter, and Morton S. Baratz. 1961. "Two Faces of Power." *American Political Science Review* 56 (4): 947-952.
- Barkan, Joanne. 2011. "Got Dough? How Billionaires Rule Our Schools." *Dissent*. Winter. <https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/got-dough-how-billionaires-rule-our-schools> (Accessed November 17, 2015).
- Bartels, Larry. 2010. *Unequal Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Beinart, Peter. 2014. "Mega Donors Are Now More Important Than Most Politicians." *The Atlantic*, April. <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2014/04/mega-donors-are-now-more-important-than-most-politicians/360192/> (Accessed November 14, 2015).
- Bishop, Matthew, and Michael Green. 2008. *Philanthrocapitalism*. 2008. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Bishop, Matthew, and Michael Green. 2015. "Philanthrocapitalism Rising." *Society* 52 (6): 541-548.
- Burns, Alexander, and Maggie Haberman. 2013. "2013: Year of the liberal billionaire." Politico. November 1. <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/11/liberal-billionaires-fundraising-2013-elections-tom-steyer-mark-zuckerberg-michael-bloomberg-099207> (Accessed November 17, 2015).

- Bustillos, Maria. 2012. "Our Billionaire Philanthropists." *The Awl*, June 13.
<http://www.theawl.com/2012/06/our-billionaire-philanthropists> (Accessed November 18, 2015).
- Callahan, David. 2014. "Mark Zuckerberg's \$2.5 Billion Foundation." *Inside Philanthropy*.
<http://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/2014/7/25/mark-zuckerbergs-25-billion-foundation.html> (Accessed November 17, 2015).
- Carnes, Nicholas. 2013. *White-Collar Government*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Coffey, Brendan. 2015. "Pledge Aside, Dead Billionaires Don't Have to Give Away Half Their Fortune." *BloombergBusiness*, June 4. <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-06-04/as-billionaires-bask-in-glow-of-pledge-giving-half-is-optional> (Accessed November 18, 2015).
- DiMento, Maria. 2012. "Charitable Giving Dwarfs Political Donations by America's Most-Generous Philanthropists." *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, October 14.
<https://philanthropy.com/article/Big-Donors-Philanthropy/155973> (Accessed November 17, 2015).
- Edwards, Michael. 2011. "Impact, Accountability, and Philanthrocapitalism." *Society*. 48, 389-390.
- Eikenberry, Angela M. 2006. "Philanthropy and Governance." *Administrative Theory & Praxis* 28 (4): 586-592.
- Fleishman, Joel L. 2007. *The Foundation: A Great American Secret*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Freeland, Chrystia. 2012. *Plutocrats*. New York: Penguin.

- Freeland, Chrystia. 2013. "Plutocrats vs. Populists." *The New York Times*. November 1.
http://www.nytimes.com/2013/11/03/opinion/sunday/plutocrats-vs-populists.html?_r=0
(Accessed November 17, 2015).
- Frumkin, Peter. 2006. *Strategic Giving: The Art and Science of Philanthropy*. Chicago:
University of Chicago Press.
- Gilens, Martin, and Benjamin Page. 2014. "Testing Theories of American Politics: Elites,
Interest Groups, and Average Citizens." *Perspectives on Politics* 12 (3): 564-581.
- Goldenberg, Suzanne. 2013. "Billionaires Secretly Funded Vast Climate Denial Network."
Mother Jones, February 15. <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2013/02/donors-trust-climate-denial> (Accessed November 17, 2015).
- Hacker, Jacob S., and Paul Pierson. 2011. *Winner-Take-All Politics*. New York: Simon &
Schuster.
- Harvey, Charles, Mairi Maclean, Jillian Gordon, and Eleanor Shaw. 2011. "Andrew Carnegie
and the Foundations of Contemporary Philanthropy." *Business History* 53 (3): 425-450.
- Herbert, Bob. 2014. "The Plot Against Public Education: How millionaires and billionaires are
ruining our schools." *Politico Magazine*. October 6.
<http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2014/10/the-plot-against-public-education-111630> (Accessed November 17, 2015).
- Jenkins, Garry W. 2010-2011. "Who's Afraid of Philanthrocapitalism?" *Case Western Reserve
Law Review* 61: 753.
- Jenkins, J. Craig. 1998. "Channeling Social Protest: Foundation Patronage of Contemporary
Social Movements." In *Private Action and the Public Good*, ed. Walter W. Powell and
Elisabeth S. Clemens. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 206-216.

- Katz, Stanley N. 2012. "Beware Big Donors." *The Chronicle Review/The Chronicle of Higher Education*. March 25. <http://chronicle.com/article/Big-Philanthropys-Role-in/131275/> (Accessed April 14, 2016).
- Kroll, Andy, and Daniel Schulman. 2014. "The Koch Brothers Left a Confidential Document at Their Donor Conference." *Mother Jones*. May 5. <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2014/02/koch-brothers-palm-springs-donor-list> (Accessed November 17, 2015).
- Kumashiro, Kevin K. 2012. "When Billionaires Become Educational Experts." *Academe*. May-June. <http://www.aaup.org/article/when-billionaires-become-educational-experts#.VkucEIRN10s> (Accessed November 17, 2015).
- LaMarche, Gara. 2014. "Democracy and the Donor Class." *Democracy: A Journal of Ideas* 34 (Fall). <http://www.democracyjournal.org/34/democracy-and-the-donor-class.php?page=all> (Accessed November 18, 2015).
- Mann, Thomas E., and Norman J. Ornstein. 2012. *It's Even Worse than It Looks*. New York: Basic Books.
- Miller, Claire Cain. 2013. "Laurene Powell Jobs and Anonymous Giving in Silicon Valley." *The New York Times*, May 24. http://bits.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/05/24/laurene-powell-jobs-and-anonymous-giving-in-silicon-valley/?_r=2 (Accessed November 17, 2015).
- OpenSecrets. 2015. "Outside Spending." <https://www.opensecrets.org/outsidespending> (Accessed November 17, 2015).
- OpenSecrets 2015b. "2014 Top Donors to Outside Spending Groups." <http://www.opensecrets.org/outsidespending/summ.php?cycle=2014&disp=D&type=V&superonly=N> (Accessed November 18, 2015).

OpenSecrets 2015c. "2012 Top Donors to Outside Spending Groups."

<http://www.opensecrets.org/outsidespending/summ.php?cycle=2012&disp=D&type=V&superonly=N> (Accessed November 18, 2015).

Ravitch, Diane. 2010. *The Death and Life of the Great American School System: How Testing and Choice Are Undermining Education*. New York: Basic Books.

Reckhow, Sarah. 2013. *Follow the Money: How Foundation Dollars Change Public School Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rogers, Robin. 2015. "Reimagining Education: Philanthropy And Public Policy." HistPhil blog, September 21. <http://histphil.org/2015/09/21/reimagining-education-philanthropy-and-public-policy/> (Accessed November 17, 2015).

Rogers, Robin. 2015a. "Why the Social Sciences Should Take Philanthropy Seriously." *Society* 52 (6): 533-540.

Rogers, Robin. 2012. "The hidden dangers of million-dollar donations." *The Washington Post*. January 1, B3.

Rogers, Robin. 2011. "Why Philanthro-Policymaking Matters." *Society* 48 (5): 376-381.

Salamon, Lester M. 2014. *Leverage for Good*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Skocpol, Theda. 2003. *Diminished Democracy*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Skocpol, Theda, and Vanessa Williamson. 2013. *The Tea Party and the Remaking of Republican Conservatism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stanley, Alessandra. 2015. "Silicon Valley's New Philanthropy." *The New York Times*, October 31. http://www.nytimes.com/2015/11/01/opinion/siliconvalleys-new-philanthropy.html?_r=0 (Accessed November 18, 2015).

Teles, Steven M. 2008. *The Rise of the Conservative Legal Movement*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Vogel, Kenneth P. 2014. *Big Money*. New York: PublicAffairs.

Walker, Jack L. 1991. *Mobilizing Interest Groups in America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

West, Darrell. 2014. *Billionaires: Reflections on the Upper Crust*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.