The Beijing Consensus and Evolving Sectoral Relations

Abstract

This paper explores the possible impact of an emerging “Beijing Consensus” on the future evolution of government-nonprofit relations around the world. In contrast to the neoliberal Washington Consensus, the Beijing Consensus promotes variants of neoauthoritarian State-capitalism in which non-State actors can only operate within the narrow parameters permitted by the ruling regime. This illiberal political-institutional model is increasingly attractive to many developing and transitional countries, and may severely restrict the operational spaces for nonprofits in the next decades.

Introduction

Nonprofit relations with the other two sectors are largely dependent on the political-institutional model in which they work. Social origins analysis has identified a number of “cultural models,” based on both historical traditions and on the contemporary dynamics of political and economic change that have coincided with the rise of the nonprofit sector in the last decades (Boli, 1992; Bullain & Toftisova, 2005; McCarthy, Hodgkinson, & Sumariwalla, 1992; Salamon & Sokolowski, 2004, 2010; Taylor et al., 2009). Earlier typologies of nonprofit sectors focused on welfare state dynamics in industrialized democracies, on the distinction between developing and industrialized countries, and on regional groupings (see in particular the “clusters” in Salamon & Sokolowski, 2004).

These factors remain crucial to our understanding of the differences between national nonprofit sectors, as they create a habitus of structures and actions (Ebrahim, 2005; Taylor et al., 2009), even as changing realities increasingly cut across regions. In a globalized world, with heightened information flows and convergences in policy and practices, the differences are becoming less distinct as the influence on the global discourse of U.S. literature on nonprofits and of Northern-Western models, has meant that they have become the lens through which nonprofit sectors around the world are examined (Fowler, 2012). While the cultural models remain relevant, there is convergence of practices and discourses.

In this paper, I postulate that this convergence is potentially to a U.S.-inspired neoliberal norm. But this convergence is contingent on the continued hegemony of American power and of the Western democratic model, yet there is a steady stream of authors who portend their decline (Kupchan, 2012; Zakaria, 2009). The recent global financial crisis has engendered reticence towards market-based and liberal small-government ideologies, while the rise of China and its increasing economic and political influence means a more State-centric illiberal model is regarded more favorably by
governments and the public, particularly in those developing nations and where there has already been an authoritarian bent to the regime.

The Washington Consensus of the post-Second World War period may have entrenched the neoliberal model of nonprofits in many parts of the world, but there is now also an emerging Beijing Consensus (Halper, 2012) based on neoauthoritarian State-capitalism in which non-State actors (whether they are for-profit or nonprofit) are allowed to operate, but only within the narrow parameters permitted by the ruling regime. In 2013, an internal document of the Communist Party of China, known as Document 9, warned against subversive Western tendencies, including “constitutional democracy”, “universal values of human rights”, “civic participation” and “pro-market neoliberalism” (Buckley, 2013) . Many regimes around the world share such sentiments, even as they allow a nascent nonprofit sector to gain a foothold.

Even when the growth of the nonprofit sector is not necessarily seen as such a direct threat, the primary alternatives to neoliberalism currently being touted usually signify greater State control of nonprofits. As South-South dialogues between developing countries increasingly compete with traditional North-South development logics, new paradigms for the nonprofit sector may emerge.

This paper explores the parameters of the convergence to the U.S model and the possible impact of a “Beijing Consensus” on the future evolution of inter-sectoral relations around the world.

The Triumph of The “American” Model?

“The American social revolution that Alexis de Tocqueville observed in the early 19th century, of citizens joining groups of every conceivable kind, is about to go global, forever changing the relationship between citizens and their governments, and
governments with each other. The Arab revolutions are but the first
taste of this larger change” (Slaughter, 2011, p. 2).

There has been a worldwide expansion of the nonprofit sector – in countries with a longer tradition of an active nonprofit sector there has been a significant growth spurt in the last decades; in countries where independent nonprofits have in the past been largely absent, there is clear evidence of the emergence of a growing and newly confident sector seeking wider legitimacy.

Each country is unique, subject to the path dependency generated by its national historical baggage, as well as by contemporary institutional transformations, and even by the personal dynamics of key policy entrepreneurs or champions. But, decontextualized, the rhetorics and processes of change in countries around the world seem remarkably similar, with a marked convergence in discourses and models. There is a common international trend towards an increased capacity of the population for independent organizing and action; changing public expectations of the role of nonprofits; a shift to governance and partnership approaches that involve third-party arrangements and the privatization of the public sector; the increasing commercialization and marketization of the work of nonprofits; and the corporatisation of an elite segment of the nonprofit sector.

The quote from Slaughter above suggests that this convergence is a to U.S.-style combination of neo-Tocquevillian civic participation and neoliberal outsourcing in search of efficient and effective service delivery. Similarly, Eberly (2008) sees compassion, in the form of a bottom-up organized civil society, as “America’s most consequential export.”

Are these claims mere chauvinism or do they truly reflect a global Americanization of nonprofit sectors and of the broader economic and social systems and cultures? The U.S. nonprofit sector is not the largest in numbers – that distinction
goes to India – but in terms of its economic strength and influence within its own domestic polity and international discourses, it is arguably the world’s most powerful. The international flow of ideas about the nonprofit sector is largely driven by the economic muscle of U.S. foundations, government aid programs, and the sheer volume of U.S. academic and professional publications that directly spread the nonprofit gospel, as well as by a range of institutional counterparts that promote wider concepts such as democracy, transparency, and civil and human rights, which are correlated with a stronger nonprofit sector (Hammack & Heydemann, 2009). The U.S. nonprofit model may be one more of the economic and cultural artifacts it exports, along with Coca-Cola and Hollywood movies (Hunter & Yates, 2002).

It is also driven at more micro-levels by human mobility – there is a growing global cadre of nonprofit professionals who have worked or studied in the U.S., absorbed its world view and then returned home or moved on to other countries, as well as stronger “diaspora philanthropy” links created between immigrant communities in the U.S. with their home countries. The sum of these dynamics is resulting in a “mimetic and normative isomorphism” (Abzug & Webb, 1996; Anheier, 2005; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), as the globetrotting cadre grows and as U.S. nonprofit workers and consultants are called on to share their wisdom with colleagues in emerging democracies.

**What is the U.S. Model?**

The U.S. is the quintessential [neo]liberal country with an extensive and powerful nonprofit sector. Some commentators compare its influence – with only the merest hint of hyperbole or jest – to that of the military, defense and security industries by speaking of a “nonprofit industrial complex” (Buffett, 2013; Incite, 2007).
The path dependency of the U.S. national script is well-documented: the cultural, political, and institutional roots of the contemporary sector can be traced back to collective ethos of the colonial settler communities, and to the protection of individual liberties and voluntary association embodied in the founding charters of the new nation (Hall, 1992, 2010). The U.S. nonprofit sector has grown dramatically in the last decades, but the conditions for its growth continue to be attributed to a historical predisposition. Given the preference for, and the size of, the nonprofit sector, in the U.S., the equilibrium in the social contract between the State and its citizens has moved away from the funding of many public goods and services through tax revenues and their provision by government employees. Historically in the U.S. there has always been a significant presence of nonprofit organizations in higher education, health, and culture, but in the mid-20th Century, there was also a social and political consensus that tax revenues should pay for, and government agencies should deliver, services in key areas such as primary and secondary education, child protection, arts and culture, and parks and recreation.

This consensus has largely disappeared over the last 30 years and many public goods and services which in other countries are directly publicly funded and government operated, or closely associated with government, are operated by nonprofits in the U.S., and increasingly relying on private funding. This includes national “public” radio and television networks, broad swathes of health and social service provision, and public amenities such as parks. An increasing amount of public infrastructure (buildings, parks, monuments, etc.), is sponsored by, and often named after, major donors, and increasingly the default option for funding new social initiatives is to seek private funding.

Nonprofit activity has long been touted an integral element of the economic and social development of the U.S. (Drucker, 1990, 1994; Filer Commission, 1975), and it continues to be a key marker of contemporary public affairs. As an Italian commentator
notes: “The U.S. government recognized, perhaps earlier than any other democratic country, that [the nonprofit sector] was essential to economic and political growth ... [and that nonprofits] supported the entrepreneurialism, comity, stability, and innovation that America has used to prosper over time (Gaudiani, 2007, p. 1)

The sector is generally considered to be a driver of progressive reforms, (notwithstanding the substantial presence of deeply conservative nonprofits such as the National Rifle Association and the Christian Coalition). However, the boundaries of reform continue to be highly contested. A broad spectrum of progressive liberals, neopluralists, and neomarxists (often buttressed by conservative critics) combine ideological, structural and operational analyses to argue that the operations of nonprofits help legitimize economic structures that have fostered the accumulation of private wealth, and so mask exploitation and perpetuate societal hierarchies (Abzug & Webb, 1996; Brecher & Wise, 2008; Fisher, 1998; Incite, 2007; Joassart-Marcelli, 2012; Roelofs, 2003, 2006; Wallace, 2003).

Is There Convergence to the U.S?

U.S. nonprofits are supported by a strong philanthropic culture that contributes a significantly larger share of GDP than other countries to both domestic issues and international aid (Charities Aid Foundation, 2006, 2011; Hudson Institute, 2012). The large, powerful nonprofit sector enjoys a high level of public trust and demonstrates a strong entrepreneurial spirit, combined with highly developed governance processes and strong transparency mechanisms, increasingly based on a performance culture that is continually seeking to document and disseminate its achievements. There is a strong skill base in the sector, with a particularly skilled and aggressive fundraising profession, and there is a strong labor market that can compete with other sectors for the best and brightest professional talent. Powerful industry associations lobby on
behalf of the sector and knowledge generation is supported by an extensive network of education and research through universities, think-tanks, and consulting companies. The tax returns of some 1.6 million registered nonprofit organizations are freely available in the public domain through organizations such as GuideStar, Charity Navigator, ProPublica, and the Urban Institute’s National Center for Charitable Statistics provides open source data tools that allow interested observers to dissect the sector from multiple perspectives.

The U.S. nonprofit sector has long been admired by foreign commentators (see Skocpol, 2011), and the expansion of national nonprofit sectors around the world appears to reflect an increasingly shared discourse ostensibly based on these U.S. templates. Practical examples abound in both the developed and developing world:

- In Newcastle, Australia, local government subcommittees charged with reviving neglected commercial areas of the city have been converted to independent nonprofit business improvement associations.
- A German foundation sponsors an annual study tour to the U.S. which focuses on teaching fundraising to executives of nonprofits so that they can attract donations to organizations that have previously been fully supported from tax revenues.
- In India, new private foundations are being created to restore historical monuments that have fallen into disrepair under government tutelage.
- In Latvia, public universities are for the first time creating foundations to attract alumni donations.
- The Mexican government is working closely with local and foreign foundations to develop strategies for expanding and strengthening the nonprofit sector, which has traditionally been one of the smallest in Latin America.

The U.S. philanthropic culture and environment are used as a benchmark to which other countries aspire (Charities Aid Foundation, 2014) and U.S. entities are
frequently called on to teach about fundraising and resource development. On a more
conceptual level, policy shifts and official discourses also indicate convergence, with an
increasingly broad accord in favor of expanding the nonprofit sector and encouraging it
to deliver a greater share of public goods and services. In 1999, the Labor Party Prime
Minister of the U.K., Tony Blair, and the Social Democrat Chancellor of Germany,
Gerhard Schroeder jointly issued their *Third Way-Die Neue Mitte* (New Middle)
manifesto culminating more than a decade of social democrat governments around the
world embracing New Public Management approaches. The Third Way ideology
sought to combine neoliberalism with a communitarian agenda and although the
manifesto itself did not directly address the role of nonprofits – indeed there is no direct
mention of them – it contained language such as “the State should not row, but steer,”
and “the public sector bureaucracy at all levels must be reduced,” which promoted the
opening of government services to contestation and decentralization, and so elevated
nonprofits to a more central role in service delivery and policymaking (Blair &
Schroeder, 1999). While the labels *Third Way* and *Neue Mitte* quickly fell out of favor as
they were too closely identified with the personal political projects of Blair and
Schroeder, their attempts to create a middle path between statism and neoliberalism
helped reframe discourses on the role of non-State actors.

While commentators note the continuing differences between neoliberals who
seek change through marketization and social democrats who stress active citizenship,
at an operational level the impact of these contrasting ideologies are much the same –
government retrenchment and an expanded nonprofit sector. The expansion of
outsourcing is generally cited as a conservative, neoliberal agenda, but progressive
agendas use the language of citizen participation, coproduction and entrepreneurship
to seek a “reorganization” of the delivery of public goods (Anheier, 2005; Pestoff &
Brandsen, 2010) that implies a larger nonprofit sector.
Since the Blair-Schroeder era, the shift to the nonprofit sector has become even more evident in the English-speaking industrialized world, particularly where conservative governments have [re]gained office. The Big Society rhetoric of the U.K. Conservative Party-Liberal Democrat coalition that won government in 2010 highlighted the importance of volunteering and local decision-making in responding to community needs through the provision of services previously delivered by the State, and the government has continued to open more public services to be run by the private and voluntary sector. In 2011, the ongoing reforms of the Conservative Harper government in Canada were dubbed as being “inspired by British Prime Minister David Cameron’s Big Society experiment, in which social responsibilities that traditionally fell to the State are put in the hands of the citizenry and private sector” (Curry, 2011).

In Sweden, the quintessential social democratic country, a parliamentary panel known as the Ansvarsutredning (Responsibility Investigation) focused on the need for citizens to take greater responsibility, for their own welfare by becoming co-producers of the services they use (Pestoff, 2009), and even State-centric Asian regimes are increasing opening spaces for civil society to participate in service delivery. While Asian welfare provisions are still lean by Western standards, there is rising prosperity in that region and a growing middle class that has less faith in the State-centered outcomes offered under current regimes. As many developing nations around the world surpass the level of wealth that in the early 20th Century helped drive the creation of the welfare state in industrialized democracies, there is an increasing search for institutional structures that can help redress inequalities.

The narratives and statistics on the evolution of the nonprofit sector around the world certainly suggest that most countries are becoming a little more “American”. But are there limits to the convergence? Will the sum of incremental changes eventually institute the American system everywhere? Is there an inevitable “death spiral” in which atrophied government services reach out to private initiative to top-up funding,
only to find that when they are successful governments use that as an excuse for further reducing funding, and for citizens to pay fewer taxes? Will increasingly effective fundraisers in more countries convince the public that nonprofits do it better, and so they should give directly to nonprofits instead of paying taxes? There may still be competing ideologies, but is the “American way” winning most of the battles and eventually the war, if for no other reason than the dynamics of unintended consequences?

In recent years, there have been controversies over philanthropy and foundation activities in countries around the world, which seem positively quaint when seen from a U.S. perspective. In China and Australia, there have been protests when universities have named buildings after prominent donors (universities in those two countries are mostly public sector institutions and until recently their buildings were generally only named to honor distinguished scholars and public figures). In Barcelona, Spain, when the city council allowed the Fundació Barcelona Comerç, the coordinating body for the business improvement associations in the city, to install a seasonal fee-based ice-skating rink in the main square there were protests against the privatization of public spaces. Perhaps the most important feature of all these cases is not that there were protests against commercialization, but that they essentially fell on deaf ears, and that such philanthropic naming rights are now becoming the new norm in those countries.

Now, with the global financial crisis there are considerable cutbacks in social services education, culture and international aid, and organizations providing these services are increasingly looking towards philanthropy for support. As industrialized democracies become less able and willing to continue to function as 20th Century welfare states, their citizens look elsewhere for what they had expected the State to provide.

What label should be put on such dynamics of a potential homogenization to a political and cultural norm? Is this a process of “Americanization”, “Westernization”,
“modernization”, “neoliberalization”, or even the much-debated “end of history” triumph of liberal democracy? Is this part of the global imposition of the U.S. model; an inexorable consequence of a more prosperous, more middle class and more democratic world that is fostering universal desires for self-organization; or is it simply organizational isomorphism driven by the easy instant availability of information about good practice? With the influx of foreign advisors into transitional countries, is it inevitable that traditional grassroots collective structure and formerly clandestine political oppositions (historically described with terms such as community, social capital, civil society, social movements, or political activism) are transformed into a contemporary nonprofit sector, and which model does the emerging sector reflect?

Perhaps it is a cultural-generational dynamic fostered by the emergence of a globally-connected “NGO generation” that has fully assumed post-industrial cosmopolitan values and places an increasing trust in independent collective action and nongovernmental organizing? There may even be a “Sean Penn – Angelina Jolie effect” as youth around the world seek to mimic the charitable work of celebrities, just as they adopt U.S. fashions, music and culture. In recent years, many countries have adopted the U.S. custom of Halloween and trick-or-treat, so why shouldn’t they adopt its nonprofit culture?

The “Beijing Consensus as a Countervailing Convergence

Instead of a convergence to a U.S.-inspired neoliberal model, there may be an evolution to the newer emerging post-neoliberal frameworks such as neocorporatism (Reuter, Wijkström, & von Essen, 2012), a resurrection of the mutualist and cooperative ideals of the sector through new mutualism (Birchall, 2001), or the renewal of social economies through the blurring of the sectors and social enterprise. The global reach of U.S. political and cultural influences may be combining in different countries with existing
models to create new dynamics that have yet to be labeled. Do we have the terminology to describe the different national variants of the emerging post-industrial, post-partisan political cultures that promotes values such as self-administration, voluntary community service and citizenship, all of which embody some version of the shifting power from political elites and bureaucracies and dispersing it to a broader range of collective actors?

But most importantly, convergence to a U.S. model is contingent on the continued hegemony of American power and of the Western democratic model, yet there is a steady stream of authors who portend their decline (Kupchan, 2012; Zakaria, 2009). The Japanese decade-long stagnation and the recent global financial crisis have engendered reticence towards market-based small-government ideologies, while the rise of China and its increasing economic and political influence means a more State-centric model is regarded more favorably by governments and the public, particularly in those developing nations and where there has already been an authoritarian bent to the regime.

The Washington Consensus of the post-Second World War period may have entrenched neoliberalism in many parts of the world, but there is now also an emerging “Beijing Consensus” (Halper, 2012) based on neoauthoritarian State-capitalism in which non-State actors (whether they are forprofit or nonprofit) are allowed to operate, but only within the narrow parameters permitted by the ruling regime. In 2013, an internal document of the Communist Party of China, known as Document 9, warned against subversive Western tendencies, including “constitutional democracy”, “universal values of human rights”, “civic participation” and “pro-market neoliberalism” (Buckley, 2013), Many authoritarian and illiberal regimes around the world share such sentiments. Victor Orban, the Primr Minister of Hungary, recently became the international face of this approach, declaring that his country would follow “illiberal nationalism” and that “nations whose systems are capable of making us competitive in
the global economy are not Western, not liberal, not liberal democracies, maybe not even democracies” (The Washington Post, 2014). The primary alternatives to neoliberalism currently being touted usually signify greater State control of nonprofits, and so as South-South dialogues between developing countries increasingly compete with traditional North-South development logics, new paradigms for the nonprofit sector may emerge.

Nonprofits in Illiberal Regimes.

Under single-party and authoritarian regimes any political or social organizations not associated with the dominant regime (or dominant religion in the case of theocracies) are banned or allowed only limited participation. Although there is a clustering of such regimes at the bottom end of the economic scale, there are also higher income countries that have authoritarian governments or are dominated by a single leader or party that curb political freedoms.

In these illiberal countries there are considerable institutional and informal barriers to the operations of nonprofits, both domestic and international, although international nonprofits may be given marginally more leeway, but always within the strict constraints of the activities deemed acceptable to the regime. The most authoritarian, predatory, and extractive regimes use “hard power” repression, including the detention, torture and murder of those considered a threat. The focus of repression is most directly on rivals, but it also usually includes any watchdog organizations seeking to expose human rights violation or corruption, and even social service, community development or education organizations that are working outside the narrow parameters allowed by the regime. Criminal gangs and militias working for oligarchs may also be operating with relative impunity to target nonprofits seen as jeopardizing their interests. When there is armed conflict, opposition militia may target
service and aid nonprofits whose activities they regard as legitimating or propping up the regime in power.

In contrast, more developmental and distributary single-party regimes tend to use “soft power” controls – a combination of barriers to registration, constraints on funding and income generation, as well as oversight provisions that make the continued existence of the organization subject to the veto of the authorities (International Center for Not-for-Profit Law, 2013b; Richter & Hatch, 2013). These go hand in hand with general laws that restrict the right of association and protest, control the press and hinder transparency (see examples from Sub-Saharan Africa in International Center for Not-for-Profit Law, 2014). The government has the right, or simply the power, to shut down any organizations whose activities are no longer sanctioned and to detain recalcitrant holdouts. Attempts to maintain independent organizations are quickly met with pressures towards clientalism and cooptation, and those that do not conform are forced to act at the margins under constant vigilance and harassment. Service-focused nonprofits may be tolerated, or even encouraged if they are seen as complementing government service provision.

The reluctance to open spaces for the work of nonprofits may also be based as much on models of economic growth as on political restrictions. A number of Asian countries based their economic growth of the 1980s and 1990s on State-centric “paternalist” models that celebrated thrift, hard work and duty to family and society, and eschewed the creation of Western-style welfare states as superfluous to societies in which employers and family provided the safety net. Policy development was State-controlled and there was little encouragement for service provision, so there was a restricted political or operational space for a nonprofit sector.

At the same time there are shifts as regimes evolve. China and Vietnam are continuing as single-party regimes while also accommodating themselves to a globalized economy and changing social values and permitting the activities of
nonprofits that are seen as providing needed services. On the other hand, countries such as Venezuela and Nicaragua appear to be moving back towards more authoritarian rule and have increasingly harassed nonprofits that refuse to toe the party line, at the same time as they promote discourses about civil society based on “popular movements” that work in accord with the regime.

In illiberal regimes there are government-sponsored organizations that take on the form and use the language of nonprofits. These are most often mass movement, party-based organizations tightly controlled by the ruling regime, which usually focus on cultural and recreational activities, but also on charitable work. Typically, the wife of the president-dictator is the head of the national women’s mass movement organization and a charity figurehead. Given the pervasive intrusion of authoritarian governments in their citizens’ lives, there is much less distinction between the public and private, and many social and economic privileges are typically dependent on membership in such organizations, although they are formally voluntary. The politics of language play an important role, with authoritarian-minded regimes adopting variants of democratic terminology to describe their rule and to legitimize the organizations it engenders, such as the realistic democracy and State democracy.

Many authoritarian countries also have “nonprofit sectors in exile.” Those who fled the regime and have found refuge in democratic countries form “solidarity committees”, often in conjunction with local activists. While these committees usually have the overtly political goal of regime change in their country of origin, they often also maintain some type of aid and cultural exchange activities that links the country of exile with their homeland. The refugees in exile are schooled in the nonprofit sector and regulatory regime of the host country and often take that orientation back with them when a transition establishes a more pluralistic system that permits return.
The Rise of Illiberalism?

The nonprofit sectors in almost all countries will continue to expand, so that at a broad brush level they are all becoming more like those liberal industrialized democracies. But there are also cultural, ideological, and structural “glass ceilings” that make it unlikely that other countries will fully adopt the neoliberal model (Charities Aid Foundation, 2014). While there is increasing mistrust in the ability of current governments around the world to deliver services and an increasing clamor for expanded spaces of non-State actions, nonprofits in other countries are unlikely to be handed the reins of a broad swath of services or to be allowed to openly engage in contestation.

The growth of the nonprofit sector around the world over the last decades has occurred in various waves, some successive and some parallel. Drivers of growth have included the implementation of New Public Management in industrialized English-speaking liberal countries; transitions to more democratic regimes in Eastern Europe and Latin America; the restructuring of the welfare state in social democratic and corporatist countries; and the economic growth of Asia. The current wave appears to be the rising economic and political influence of the global South. In part this overlaps with the aforementioned changes in Latin America, Eastern Europe and Asia, but it is also a new dynamic created by some of the earlier changes reaching the “critical mass” needed for their global projection, as well as by the economic and political development of Sub-Saharan Africa and the recent transitions in Arab countries. There are more, and more powerful, nonprofits from outside the North, including new grassroots and domestic organizations in low- and middle-income countries, and new regional and international players from the BRICS, Gulf States and other emerging economies.

Optimists argue that this changing geopolitical stage will pave the way for more locally relevant Southern organizations to emerge and to mobilize using indigenous bottom-up approaches with operational philosophies that do not necessarily mirror
those of their Northern counterparts. However, the majority of the funding for the nonprofits in the South will continue to flow from the North, and the push for global standards suggests isomorphism towards established international operating norms based largely on the liberal model of nonprofits. At the same time, it is yet to be seen what impact there will be on the nonprofit sector of political dynamics influenced as much by Beijing, Ankara, Moscow and other illiberal regimes as by Washington. The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace reports a “viral-like spread” of new laws restricting foreign funding for domestic nonprofit and a shrinking of the political space for independent civil society (Carothers & Brechenmacher, 2014). Nonprofit sectors around the world may grow, but many regimes will continue to erect significant institutional barriers, to contain and channel the expansion of nonprofits, and occasionally resort to hard power repression.
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