

Donor Research Project
Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society
The Graduate Center, The City University of New York

Latino Philanthropy
Literature Review

This review has been funded by support from
The Ford Foundation and the Coalition for New Philanthropy in New York*

Copyright © 2003, Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society
All Rights Reserved

* Additional support was provided by the William Randolph Hearst Endowed Fund for graduate assistantships for women and minorities.

Latino Philanthropy Literature Review¹

Introduction.....	2
The Colonial and Early National Periods	3
Latinos in the United States	5
Religious Giving.....	6
Mutual Aid Societies	6
Remittances	7
Organizations and clubs.....	7
Individual Histories Pre-1960.....	8
Mexicans.....	8
Puerto Ricans.....	8
Dominicans.....	9
Cubans	10
1960s-Present.....	11
1960s—Civil Rights & Political Mobilization	11
Other Developments	13
The Latino Funds Collaborative	13
The Study of Latino Philanthropy.....	15
Debates.....	17
General Characteristics of Latino Philanthropy.....	18
Market Research	19
LATINOS: DATA AND RESOURCES	19
Demographic Information (Census 2000) http://www.census.gov/	19
Hispanic Demographics.....	19
Other Information	19
Bibliography	22

¹ The Center would like to acknowledge the contributions of the following individuals in the compilation of this document: Antoinette Pole, Eugene Miller, Felinda Mottino and John Gutiérrez.

Introduction

The study of philanthropy as a field of interest in the humanities and social sciences is a comparatively new area of scholarly inquiry. The rise of social history in the 1960s—with its attendant turn away from grand political and diplomatic narratives—opened the door for historians and others to research aspects of daily life. Not surprisingly, charitable activities—whether personal or public—have provided fertile ground for historical inquiry.²

Much of the recent work on philanthropy has focused on organizations and communities with already ample historiographical traditions. Large philanthropic institutions like the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller and Ford Foundations have enjoyed substantial historical attention.³ Much the same can be said for large non-profit civil rights and service organizations like the NAACP and the Salvation Army, as well as for large religious denominations, particularly Roman Catholic, Jewish, and mainline Protestant charities.

At much the same time that studies of philanthropy began to appear, many historians and social scientists were also turning their attention to analyses of ethnic and racial minority groups. Because of the central role of slavery, abolition, and reconstruction to American history, studies of African American communities in slavery and freedom have proliferated. Today, few groups enjoy as wide a historiographical landscape as African Americans.

For the nation's other two major ethnic and racial minorities—namely, Asians and Latinos—the story has been somewhat different. Studies of Asian American communities—especially in California and New York—have only recently begun to appear.⁴ Most of the historiographical attention has focused on the histories of countries like China, Japan, Korea, and the Philippines and not on the lives of immigrants from these countries in the United States.

Much the same case holds true for Latinos.⁵ Beginning in the 1960s, and in response to challenges posed by the Cuban Revolution, American universities established research centers and academic departments dedicated to the study of Latin America. Today, few universities in the country do not count a historian or political scientist of Latin America among their faculty.

² Some of the more recent work to emerge on philanthropy and charity in the United States see Robert H. Bremner, American Philanthropy. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988); Ellen C. Condliffe, The Politics of Knowledge: The Carnegie Corporation, Philanthropy, and Public Policy. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); Judith Sealander, Private Wealth and Public Life: Foundation Philanthropy and the Reshaping of American Social Policy from the Progressive Era to the New Deal. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997); Kathleen McCarthy, Women's Culture: American Philanthropy and Art, 1830-1930. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); and Conrad Edick Wright, The Transformation of Charity in Postrevolutionary New England. (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1992).

³ These large foundations have large repositories of materials that make them natural subjects of inquiry for historians and others. The Rockefeller Archives in Westchester County, New York, for example, are one of the richest deposits of primary source materials on twentieth century philanthropy in the United States.

⁴ One of the more recent of these works is Nayan Shah, Contagious Divides: Epidemics and Race in San Francisco's Chinatown. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001)

⁵ Please note that the terms Latino(s) and Hispanic(s) are used interchangeably in the text.

But while Latin America has become an established field of inquiry in American universities the study of Latin American immigrant groups in the United States and of Latino communities in this country is largely in an embryonic stage.⁶

The lack of a wide-ranging and varied historical and social scientific assessment of Latinos in the United States has had a profound impact on our understanding of the role of philanthropy in Latino communities. Studies of individual Latino philanthropists are few and only recently are studies of Latino organizations and charitable endeavors coming to light.⁷

Nevertheless, with a recent surge in research on philanthropy among communities of color in the United States, our understanding of Latino philanthropy has been enhanced. Early findings from this new body of research point to two trends: first, Latinos in the United States do not have a strong tradition of systematic or formal charitable giving and, second, Latinos lag behind other US groups in making philanthropic contributions.

This overview traces the interwoven debates and discussions that shape our perception of Latino philanthropy. While this review focuses on four Latino communities in the US— Cuban, Dominican, Mexican and Puerto Rican—the Latino community stems from the varied traditions and experiences of the peoples who claim heritage from the countries of Mexico, Central and South America and the Caribbean.

The Colonial and Early National Periods

Informal charity among Latinos dates back to colonial Latin America when informal family and kin networks provided the major source of charity. It was during this period as well that the Roman Catholic Church assumed its role as the region's principle source and recipient of charity. The scope of the church's charitable endeavors was sweeping, covering everything from the controversial rural *reducciones* in modern-day Paraguay to hospitals in major urban centers.

Some of the earliest charitable institutions in Latin America were the church-affiliated *cofradías religiosas*. These lay brotherhoods—generally organized around devotion to a particular parish or saint and intended to promote Christianity among indigenous or free-black populations—provided financial and legal support to members.

The church's role as social service provider made it the principle public vehicle through which individual Latin Americans engaged in charity. Wealthy Latin Americans often funded expansive building projects including churches and chapels or funded the creation of hospitals and orphanages all to be run by the secular clergy or one of the many religious orders in the

⁶ This is not to say that there have not been important strides in research on Latinos. Across the disciplines, new studies have begun to turn away from the decidedly jeremiad-like writings of the 1960s and 1970s to more local studies of particular Latino communities. For the former see for example, Rodolfo Acuña, *Occupied America: The Chicano's Struggle Toward Liberation*. (San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1972); Piri Thomas, *Down these Mean Streets*. (New York: Knopf, 1967). For newer work see Félix Matos Rodríguez and Pedro Juan Hernández, *Pioneros: Puerto Ricans in New York City, 1896-1948*. (New York: Arcadia, 2001) and Mario T. García, *Desert Immigrants: The Mexicans of El Paso, 1880-1920*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1982).

⁷ See for example the recent work on NCLR, MALDEF, the American GI Forum and LULAC among others.

Americas. As Henry Ramos has pointed out “governments and churches played a pivotal role in mitigating social inequalities in most Latin American countries. Traditionally it was these institutions that helped the poor and destitute.”⁸

By the eighteenth century—with the advent of Bourbon-driven reforms—charity in Latin America became more organized.⁹ Colonial governments from Mexico to Peru created, reformed, or expanded charitable institutions like orphanages, hospitals, and asylums. The institutions generally were staffed by religious personnel but administrative control rested with creole and peninsular leaders.

Beginning in the late 1800s, as Latin American populations began to move from rural villages to urban centers, voluntary associations emerged—usually organized by natives of one town or village—to provide monetary assistance, cushion economic hardships faced by newcomers to the city, and advocate on behalf of members with urban political leaders and employers. Associations endorsed political ideas, but emphasized cooperation, service and protection.

These organizations, called *mutualistas*, were not singular in their goals. For example, some mutualistas focused on labor issues, while others focused on civil rights. In Puerto Rico mutualistas were comprised largely of skilled workers such as cigar makers.¹⁰ Scholars such as Garcia argue that *mutualistas* were not commonplace in Mexico. “In some communities the *caudillo* (local patron) provided assistance, whereas in other places people turned to the local parishes.”¹¹ Pycior contends, however, that by 1890 over 100 *mutualista* organizations existed in Mexico, with approximately 50,000 members.¹²

Overall, men participated more frequently than women in *mutualista* organizations, though there were some female *mutualistas*.¹³ For example, in Cuba women played an integral role in creating voluntary associations during the late 1800s. Women formed clubs, labor organizations and health facilities. These voluntary organizations, however, were not formally called *mutualistas* in Cuba. By 1892 women formed clubs supporting Cuban independence efforts as well as social welfare organizations like the Sociedad de Beneficencia.¹⁴ In Tampa, Florida, Cuban women were instrumental in organizing cigar workers.¹⁵

⁸ (Ramos 1999:149).

⁹ These reforms, enacted by the French royal family, were implemented from 1713 through 1789. Their objective was to rationalize the administration of the colonies by imposing a ministerial, more market-driven governance structure to replace the personalistic system put in place by the Spanish (Hapsburg) crown.

¹⁰ (Miller 1999:31).

¹¹ (Garcia 1996:158).

¹² (Pycior 1996).

¹³ (Pycior 1996:1133).

¹⁴ (Miller 1999:37).

¹⁵ (Hewitt 1987).

Latinos in the United States

The annexation of large areas of Mexican territory by the United States in 1848 and the arrival of scores of immigrants from the Spanish-speaking Caribbean in the late 1800s led, for the first time, to the existence of large groups of Latin Americans living within the borders of the United States. These new residents struggled to make sense of American systems and norms and often created institutions that provided material support to members as well as preserved cultural practices.

In the Southwest and West, where Spanish and Mexican societies were overwhelmed by the onslaught of Manifest Destiny, Mexicans and now Mexican-Americans responded by recreating old-world charitable institutions in a new setting. The *mutualista* organizations that were visible in Mexico were imported into places like New Mexico, Arizona and California. Much as in Mexico, these voluntary organizations provided needed material and social support to members.

The Mexican Revolution (1910) sent thousands of Mexicans fleeing into the United States where many were confronted with exploitative economic and political conditions. In response to these challenges, Mexican immigrants and Mexican-Americans developed a host of organizations dedicated to both providing direct services (health care, legal assistance, etc.) and to protecting members' civil rights.

In places like New York and Florida where Cuban and Puerto Rican immigrants settled beginning in 1868 and throughout the last third of the 19th century, other voluntary organizations emerged. For Cuban immigrants—many of whom were closely tied to the insurrectionist movements of 1868-1878 and 1895-1898—organizations were as varied as the political *Partido Revolucionario Cubano* or mutual aid societies like the ones that sustained Tampa's Cuban cigar workers for some fifty years between 1868 and 1920. Decades later the triumph of the Cuban Revolution in 1959 led to the creation of a number of anti-revolutionary political groups. These groups raised money mainly from Cuban exiles and engaged in both political organizing and lobbying as well as direct (and often violent) action against the Cuban government and its institutions.

Among Puerto Ricans, many of whom settled in New York City, the pro-independence organizations of the late 19th century gave way to labor and mutual-aid associations in the 1920s and 1930s before turning to full-fledged non-profit organizations in the 1960s and 1970s. The shift from political and mutual aid organizations to social service agencies also signaled a shift in the nature of Puerto Rican philanthropy in New York City. Where the earlier organizations had drawn most of their revenues from members, the new organizations—energized by the War on Poverty—came to depend on ever-increasing amounts of government support.

In the 1960s, the outbreak of civil war in the Dominican Republic brought thousands of Dominicans to New York City neighborhoods like Washington Heights and Corona. Many of these organizations were structured around providing support to natives of particular towns. New arrivals from towns like Santiago and Montecristi were met in New York by fellow townspeople who—already established in New York—were able to provide a network of contacts to secure housing and employment.

Broadly speaking, the period from 1898 to the present has been characterized by five giving areas, each of which is discussed below: donations to the Catholic Church; the formation of *mutualista* groups; remittances to families and relatives—which ties in with the notion of *personalismo*; the development of advocacy organizations that address anti-discrimination and political incorporation; and the development of Pan-Hispanic organizations.

Religious Giving

Giving to the Catholic Church is commonplace in Latin American communities, though this has gradually and more recently broadened to include evangelical Protestant orders in the region.¹⁶ Among Hispanic households that regularly contribute to a charity, approximately 41 percent of households give to a religious organization, followed by 17 percent of households giving to human service oriented charities. This level of giving to religious organizations is similar among Hispanic and non-Hispanic organizations.¹⁷ Given that Latinos are often portrayed as reluctant donors, the rate of religious giving is indicative of Latino generosity. However, it is important to note that the church constitutes institutional giving and has a well developed system in place for the “ask,” two attributes less prevalent in the Latino community, outside the church.

Over 70 percent of Hispanic Americans are Catholic and the Catholic Church has been the traditional recipient of most donations, but Protestant churches and organizations are making inroads among Latinos. A new study on Hispanics and religious affiliation sponsored by the Pew Foundation, “Hispanic Churches in American Public Life,” found that there has been a generational shift among Latinos to Protestantism. The number of Protestant Hispanic-Americans increased “from 18 percent to 32 percent across three generations while the number of Catholics declined from 74 to 59 percent over the same period. Overall, 71 percent of Hispanics are Catholic.” For example, “World Vision, one of the nation’s leading Christian charities, dedicated to assisting ministries in developing countries around the world received approximately 34 percent of its contributions from Latino-Americans”¹⁸ Gaston Espinosa, who headed the Pew study, believes the shift from Catholic to Protestant churches, in part, was due to the smaller size of some Protestant congregations. Smaller congregations are more interactive and personal, which was often absent in Catholic churches because of their large membership.¹⁹

Mutual Aid Societies

The development of sociedades mutualistas or mutual aid societies in the United States began in the late 1800s.²⁰ Following the US-Mexican War, which ended in 1848 with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, mutualistas were developed in Mexican American communities to help

¹⁶ (Murguía 1995) and (Ramos 1999:149)

¹⁷ (Diaz et al. 2001)

¹⁸ (Ramos and Kasper 2000:7)

¹⁹ <http://pewforum.org/news/display.php?NewsID=1171>

²⁰ Cortes (1989), Garcia (1996) and Camarillo (1991)

settle newcomers, to provide burial plans, and to provide insurance to workers.²¹ In essence, mutualistas served as an informal, non-institutional safety net for Mexicans. Among Mexican Americans, mutual aid societies initially addressed specific concerns associated with settling, but eventually their scope widened to include larger problems of discrimination, segregation and exploitation.²²

Mutualistas were present not only in Mexican American communities, but also in Puerto Rican communities in the US as well. “In New York, Puerto Rican workers joined existing mutual aid societies or established new ones to address their social, economic and spiritual needs.”²³

Remittances

In addition to the Church and *mutualistas*, there is a tradition of giving to relatives living abroad or other family members, before giving to non-religious institutions.²⁴ A network of personal relationships plays an important role in the Hispanic American community, more so than corporate models, clubs or voluntary associations.²⁵

Remittances to the countries of Latin American and the Caribbean are significant. They totaled US\$32.04 billion in 2002, an increase of 17.6% from 2001.²⁶

According to Rivas-Vasquez, the notion of *personalismo*—where giving is directed toward family and friends—is commonplace, though this does not necessarily fit in with traditional institutional models of US philanthropy. Since Hispanics are less accustomed to giving through philanthropic institutions (outside the Church), social networks are very important. According to Diaz, the individual who solicits the donation is key in motivating people to give. A particular organization or a particular individual plays an integral role in prompting Latinos to make a donation, rather than institutional or tax incentives.²⁷

Organizations and clubs

The fourth and fifth traditions of giving, which are discussed in further detail later, are the creation of advocacy organizations and clubs to facilitate assimilation and the development of Pan-Hispanic organizations. These organizations initially focused on anti-discrimination, but

²¹ (Garcia 1996:160)

²² (Garcia 1996:160)

²³ (Gallegos and O’Neill 1991:35).

²⁴ (Murguía 1995).

²⁵ (Butterworth and Chance 1981:136).

²⁶ Multilateral Investment Fund, Inter-American Development Bank, *Sending Money Home: An International Comparison of Remittance Markets* (February 2003). There is a growing literature on diaspora giving. See for example, *Hometown Associations As Catalysts For The Development of Community Foundations: The Zacatecan Case* by Alejandra Cervantes, Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society, May 2003.

²⁷ (Diaz et al. 2001:3).

later they concentrated on political mobilization and incorporation. A trend toward Pan-Hispanicism follows the growth of advocacy organizations.

Henry Ramos suggests that organized philanthropy is still an emerging concept among Latinos because the government and the Church have played a central role in addressing social inequalities. More importantly, perhaps, poverty and the dearth of private philanthropies in Latin America and the Caribbean have an impact on patterns of giving in the United States.²⁸ The lack of stable, non-religious philanthropic traditions and institutions in Latin America has meant that many Latinos arrived in the United States without the background in organized community-based philanthropy that characterized many European communities.

Individual Histories Pre-1960

Mexicans

The 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo ended the war between Mexico and the United States. Mexico ceded parts of California, New Mexico, Arizona and Texas. Mexicans living in the aforementioned areas suddenly became minorities in what was originally their own land.²⁹ During this period *mutualistas* enabled Mexicans to undertake advocacy, service delivery and cultural preservation.

The collapse of the *Porfiriato* and the rise of revolutionary politics as a result of the 1910 revolution, led to massive out-migration of Mexicans to the United States. “From 1900-1939,” approximately one million people left Mexico for the US as a result of revolutionary turmoil. With the advent of World War I, increasing anti-immigrant and racist sentiments were present. This led to the development of statewide networks comprised of disparate groups and organizations.”³⁰ Among these organizations was The League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), which was formed in 1929 and reflected middle-class, conservative values in American society.³¹

Puerto Ricans

Unlike other Latin American immigrant groups, Puerto Ricans held US citizenship, which facilitated their entry and settlement in the continental United States. Puerto Ricans arrived *en masse* beginning in the 1940s, but unlike Mexican Americans, who were primarily located in the Southwest, Puerto Ricans settled in northern urban centers like New York, Newark and Chicago.

²⁸ (Ramos 1999:158).

²⁹ (Gallegos and O’Neill 1991:3).

³⁰ (Miller 1999:22).

³¹ (Marquez 1993).

Growth of the New York City community was facilitated by the existing *colonias* (settlements) in East Harlem and the Navy Yard section of Brooklyn, as well as job opportunities in manufacturing and service sectors.³²

Puerto Ricans used organizations and associations to aid the process of assimilation. Since the mid-to-late 1800s the Puerto Rican community had relied on mutual aid societies, which were largely comprised of skilled workers, particularly in the booming New York City tobacco trades.³³

While the New York tobacco industry collapsed by the 1920s, the rise of other manufacturing and service opportunities in the city led to increased Puerto Rican migration to New York during the second-half of the twentieth century. Increased migration meant a larger pool from which to build organizations; and in places like Brooklyn and El Barrio, organizations of Puerto Rican migrants flourished.

The advent of the War on Poverty coupled with the endemic condition of poverty facing many Puerto Ricans in New York led to the development of non-profit social service providers; organizations like PROMESA, Aspira, the Puerto Rican Association of Community Affairs and the Puerto Rican Family Institute addressed issues like foster care, substance abuse and education, and housing. Funded by government grants, these organizations were the lynchpins of a growing Puerto Rican/Latino social services network, a network that reflected the shift from voluntary association philanthropy in the community to organized, government-subsidized social services.

Dominicans

Following the death of Rafael Leonidas Trujillo in 1961, Juan Bosch was elected President of the Dominican Republic. He was quickly ousted by a military coup; a number of provisional governments ruled until civil war broke out. In 1965 President Lyndon Johnson, fearing the loss of the island to a Cuban-style revolution subsequently sent troops to the region to intervene. As a result of political and economic instability, many Dominicans began migrating to the US in the 1960s.³⁴ Pessar notes that political repression was the dominant reason.³⁵

Unlike Puerto Ricans, the first significant influx of Dominicans was “primarily urban and middle-class.”³⁶ Like Puerto Ricans, Dominicans formed networks that helped immigrants to assimilate.³⁷ Unlike Puerto Ricans, however, the Dominican community settled mainly in one

³² (Gallegos and O’Neill 1991:35).

³³ (Gallegos and O’Neill 1991:36).

³⁴ (Hendricks 1974).

³⁵ (Foner 1987:105).

³⁶ (Foner 1987:105).

³⁷ (Hendricks 1984).

area, creating an enclave community unlike any other in the history of the city's Latino communities. Northern Manhattan—"Quisqueya on the Hudson" as Jorge Duany has called it—became (and remains) the center of Dominican life in the city.³⁸ Not surprisingly the area is home to a number of Dominican charitable associations and organizations ranging from women's organizations like the Dominican Women's Development Center to multi-service providers like the Community Association of Progressive Dominicans.

In studies of Dominican Americans, gender has played an important role. Women constitute a large portion of immigrants and they face significant challenges in securing employment in the US. As a result, women have formed networks within the workplace to preserve cultural norms. There is a powerful linkage between work and home. Dominican-American women have broken away from traditional gender household roles, and now share the head of household title.³⁹

There is an ongoing debate over whether Dominicans belong to a transnational community or if they are assuming a more traditional pattern of assimilation. Authors like Grasmuck and Pessar suggest that Dominicans essentially have bi-national households, sending large remittances to the Dominican Republic from communities in the United States.⁴⁰ Great economic success in the United States often allows many Dominicans to return to their native island. Many of these Dominicans will either establish a permanent residence on the island (for retirement purposes usually) or may purchase real estate on the island as an investment. In contrast many other analysts suggest that reports of Dominican return migration have been overstated and that like other immigrant groups before them, Dominicans tend to settle and remain in the United States.⁴¹ What is clear, however, is that many of those who do remain in the United States form local mutual benefit societies to preserve traditional contacts and facilitate the remittance of economic aid to their hometowns.⁴²

Cubans

Cubans began to arrive in the United States during the late 1860s as the island began its nearly thirty-year-long quest for independence from Spain. This was followed by a second wave of immigration in the 1960s. During the first wave of immigration, elites—particularly those tied to the separatist struggle—settled in Europe, while the working classes tied to the country's tobacco industry settled in the US.⁴³ Following the Spanish-Cuban-American War in 1898 the US government established a provisional government in Cuba until 1902. The freedom of subsequent Cuban governments was limited by the imposition of the Platt Amendment in the

³⁸ Duany's (1994)

³⁹ (Pessar 1995, Gurak and Kritz 1982).

⁴⁰ Grasmuck and Pessar (1991)

⁴¹ For this alternate view see, for example, Georges (1990), Hernandez and Torres-Saillant (1996), and Ricourt (1998).

⁴² (Georges 1990).

⁴³ (Miller 1999:37).

Cuban Constitution of 1902. The amendment guaranteed, among other things, that the United States would have final say over Cuba's foreign policy.

The fall of the Batista government and the subsequent rise of Fidel Castro triggered a large influx of Cubans to the US in 1959. Immigrants settled primarily in Miami. A decade later Cuba was faced with a serious problem of emigration as a result of the government's nationalization of land and enterprise. Individuals with connections to the previous capitalist regime and/or foreign interests were the first to flee the island. Bi-national family networks—where families were split between two nations—became common among Cubans.⁴⁴

In 1980, Cuba faced severe housing and job shortages, which coincided with a weakening economy. Castro announced to the Cuban-American community in Florida that relatives could retrieve friends and family from the Mariel Harbor, transporting them back to the US. Approximately 125,000 migrants arrived on the Florida shores. Just shortly after the boatlift began, a storm came through the area and several immigrants died as a result of capsized boats. Emigration to the US continued, with the help of the US Coast Guard.⁴⁵

Overall, Cuban Americans are viewed as distinct from other Hispanic groups because they are politically conservative and enjoy higher levels of education and economic status. Some scholars argue that Cuban Americans typically have not sent remittances and instead adhered to the economic embargo.⁴⁶ However, whether and to what degree remittances have been sent to the island is disputed. James Carragher, Coordinator for Cuban Affairs under the US State Department, contends that remittances to Cuba total \$400 to \$800 million annually.⁴⁷

1960s-Present

1960s—Civil Rights & Political Mobilization

The 1960s Civil Rights movement led to political activism, which served as a springboard for philanthropy. Nathan Glazer and Patrick Moynihan argue that immigrant groups assimilated differently and that among Puerto Ricans, organizations and clubs were precursors to increased levels of assimilation and political participation.⁴⁸ Radicals, for example, flocked to The Young Lords Party and the Puerto Rican Socialist Party during this period, while other Puerto Ricans became involved in local Democratic politics. The Civil Rights Movement and the development of the aforementioned organizations heralded in a new age of activism for Puerto Ricans.⁴⁹ Gallegos and O'Neill similarly note the development of national nonprofits during this period

⁴⁴ (Portes and Bach 1987:141-144).

⁴⁵ (<http://www.uscg.mil/hq/reserve/magazine/mag2000/apr2000/mariel.htm>).

⁴⁶ (Miller 1999:39).

⁴⁷ (Carragher 2002).

⁴⁸ (Glazer and Moynihan 1963)

⁴⁹ (Glazer and Moynihan 1963)

through legal, political and policy advocacy organizations.⁵⁰ In a similar vein, the first Dominican voluntary organizations were started in the 1960s and focused on education, though they had a political orientation.

The Chicano Movement (1965-1975) consisted of hundreds of organizations that focused on a variety of issues. Groups were found in barrios, schools and prisons. In terms of their approaches, they could be divided into those associations that sought to work through the political establishment and those that called for a major restructuring of the system, the moderate and radical wings of the movement respectively. By the mid-sixties, the moderates prevailed, and hundreds of organizations formed during the Civil Rights and Anti-War movements.

In 1962 Cesar Chavez founded the National Farm Workers Association, which later became the United Farm Workers (UFW).⁵¹ While initially few members paid dues, by 1970 the UFW claimed to have 50,000 dues paying members. The development of the National Farm Workers Association and subsequent agriculture-related groups led to the formation of numerous organizations and associations that dealt with migrant labor.⁵²

In 1969 the first National Chicano Youth Liberation Conference was held. A national Chicano political party was formed under the leadership of José Angel Gutiérrez and Rodolfo Gonzales called *La Raza Unida* Party. And in 1968 the National Council of *La Raza* (NCLR) was founded.

The 2000 NCLR annual report indicates that the NCLR received 23 percent of its funding from federal grants and 24 percent of its funding from corporate and foundation grants. Revenue from special events comprises another 33 percent of its income, with additional smaller revenues including membership fees. Memberships exceeded 31,000 in September 2000 and monies from dues are expected to approach \$800,000 by fiscal year 2001 (NCLR Annual Report 2000:36). The NCLR was established to reduce poverty and discrimination, and improve opportunities for Hispanic Americans. The NCLR has primarily attempted to do this through two complementary approaches. First, NCLR focuses on capacity-building assistance supports and strengthens Hispanic community-based organizations. NCLR provides organizational assistance in management, governance, program operations, and resource development to Hispanic community-based organizations in urban and rural areas nationwide, especially those that serve low-income and disadvantaged Hispanics. Second, the NCLR undertakes applied research, policy analysis and advocacy. Issues such as education, immigration, housing, health, employment and training, and civil rights enforcement are the primary areas of focus.⁵³

On the legal front, the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund (MALDEF) was created to provide litigation, advocacy and educational outreach services to Mexican-Americans

⁵⁰ (Gallegos and O'Neill 1991:5).

⁵¹ (Gonzalez 1999:191-222).

⁵² (<http://www.ufw.org/ufw.htm>).

⁵³ (<http://www.nclr.org/about/>).

in the United States. MALDEF was founded in 1968 in San Antonio, Texas. Like other organizations of its type, MALDEF receives substantial support from organized philanthropy. Grants from foundations and trusts totaled just over \$8 million and comprise 77 percent of total public support, while individual and corporate contributions totaled \$1.2 million comprising 12 percent of funding. An additional 10 percent of funding which totals \$1 million comes from special events. Finally, MALDEF also receives revenue from its capital campaign and professional fees and awards. MALDEF suggests a number of options for giving in its annual report, such as creating a trust, memorializing a loved one, giving through corporate matching-gift program, etc.⁵⁴

Other Developments

During the Reagan administration devolutionary federalism led to huge budget cuts. This adversely impacted funding at the state and local levels, particularly among non-profit and other charitable organizations that relied upon government grants. Nonprofits—the Hispanic-American community included—responded by seeking non-governmental grants and reducing their own budgets accordingly.

The Latino Funds Collaborative

One of the by-products of decreased government support for Latino-run community-based organizations was the creation in many communities of Latino-driven philanthropies dedicated to addressing local needs. The emergence of these “Latino Funds” was a significant development in the history of Latino philanthropy because it signaled the creation of American-style philanthropic entities intended to provide viable and stable sources of funding to Latino community-based organizations. Moreover, the emergence of the Latino Funds signaled a return to the central role of individual giving in Latino communities.

The first and arguable most successful of the Latino Funds is the Hispanic Development Fund (HDF) at the Greater Kansas City Community Foundation. Created in 1983 with a grant from the Hall Family Foundation, the HDF focuses on improving the quality of lives for Hispanic families in the Greater Kansas City area by supporting projects that support education and social services in Kansas City, Missouri and neighboring Kansas City, Kansas. What has set the HDF apart in recent years has been its success in securing support from individual Latinos in the greater Kansas City area. Working with a team that combined volunteers and paid fundraising staff, the HDF has built strong connection to individual Latino donors. In addition, while working as a fund within the Greater Kansas City Community Foundation, HDF board and staff have been able to serve as important points of contact between Latinos community-based organizations and the foundation's mainstream grants programs. Funding in 2000 totaled \$2.5 million.

[In the same year, Latinos working in organized mainstream philanthropies established Hispanics in Philanthropy (HIP). This national association of Latino philanthropic leaders, which originated with 50 members, currently has more than 450 individual and institutional members.

⁵⁴ (MALDEF Annual Report 2000-2001: 26).

It provides a forum to review ways in which Latino program officers and corporate grantmakers can increase Latino philanthropy and Latino representation in mainstream philanthropy, and direct grants to Latino charitable institutions that might otherwise not be on the giving radar of major philanthropic institutions.

In addition to sponsoring a biennial International Conference, the HIP operates two international programs, administers a major capacity building project—The Funders’ Collaborative for Strong Latino Communities—and operates the donors’ leadership program. The Funders’ Collaborative recently raised \$3 million in grants from 19 funders with multi-year commitments totaling more than \$4 million. In addition to grants, the HIP also receives revenue from membership fees.^{55]}

In 1989, the number of Latino-driven funds increased with the establishment of the Hispanic Community Foundation in San Francisco. Established in the heart of one of California’s major Latino communities the HCF was created to serve the needs of Latinos in six Bay Area counties - Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara. Funding from HCF ranged from support for research on the Bay Area’s Latinos to outright cash grants to local CBOs.

In 1990 the United Latino Fund in Los Angeles was created to “enhance the quality of life for Latinos through a concerted effort of voluntary giving,” the ULF provides support to new and developing nonprofit organizations that are committed to delivering social services in the Latino community. Most of the organization’s money comes by way of large-scale workplace campaigns run in Los Angeles and targeting Latino employees.

By the early 1990s other Latino funds had emerged across the country in places like New York, St. Paul, Minnesota and Lorain County, Ohio. In New York, the Latino CORE Initiative, a program of the city-based Hispanic Federation, became the largest single source of income to Latino CBOs from a Latino-driven philanthropy. The CORE Initiative has been successful in New York by investing in infrastructure-building projects and capital improvements that might often be ignored by mainstream funders. In Lorain and St. Paul, where Latino communities are disparate and have only recently come together to support local initiatives, the Latino funds have not only been points of contact to larger community foundations, but have also provided much needed support to local community organizations that have long been ignored by traditional funders.

By 1996, the fund had caught the attention of the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. The Kellogg Foundation, as part of its Emerging Funds for Communities of Color Initiative, supported the creation of a national Latino Funds Collaborative including the six Latino-driven philanthropic funds from Kansas City, Los Angeles, Lorain, Ohio, St. Paul, New York City and the Hispanic Fund from San Francisco. The LFC was the first national program to support Latino-driven philanthropy by underwriting extensive technical assistance to funds. Kellogg money has been used for a number of purposes not the least of which is a multi-year exercise focusing on preparing the LFC member funds to raise money for endowments. This endowment-readiness

⁵⁵ For a complete description of HIP and its programs see HIP 2000 Annual Report.

initiative has placed the LFC members in a strategic position to secure endowment support from national funders thus guaranteeing their long-term viability in Latino communities.

In 1999, independently of the Latino Funds initiative, a group of Hispanic American business leaders established the New American Alliance to promote “economic advancement for the American Latino community, with a focus on economic and political empowerment, and public advocacy to improve the quality of life in the United States.”⁵⁶ Employment opportunities, immigration and the administration of a scholarship fund are the primary focus of the New American Alliance. In addition, the New American Alliance has also focused its efforts on philanthropy, developing an awards program for those who have practiced exceptional civic and charitable responsibility. Since funding for the New American Alliance is comprised solely of membership donations it has become the most visible individual source of philanthropy among Latinos nationally.

The Study of Latino Philanthropy

The literature on Latino philanthropy is not very extensive. Henry A.J. Ramos’ June 1999 report, *Latino Philanthropy: Expanding US Models of Giving and Civic Participation*, argues that there are only five published works that focus on Latino donors.⁵⁷ Campoamor and Diaz, Rivas-Vazquez, Valdez, Estrada, and Claudio are among the seminal works noted in Ramos’ report. Not included, but equally important, is Cortes’ work, as well as that of Hodgkinson and Weitzman.

According to Campoamor and Diaz, the first set of “path-breaking” research came by way of a national conference at the University of San Francisco in November 1988 organized by Herman Gallegos and Michael O’Neill that was the first attempt to systematically and comprehensively look at the role and impact of nonprofits in Hispanic communities. Gallegos and O’Neill published the essays from the conference, which included a survey of the arrival and assimilation of Puerto Ricans and Mexican Americans, as well as an examination of the role of advocacy organizations and leadership in Hispanic communities. The editors claim not to offer any definitive answers, though their work attempts to answer many important questions. The role of nonprofits in the Hispanic community is an overarching theme in this edited collection. Chapters on the Mexican and Puerto Rican communities detail the development of important nonprofit organizations including the LULAC, La Raza, MALDEF and the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund. Also included in this volume is a discussion of advocacy and religious organizations as well as an exploration of leadership in nonprofit organizations. Overall, Gallegos and O’Neill’s work attempts to establish a research agenda that focuses on how Latino nonprofits can raise additional monies, while funneling funds directly to the Latino community for a host of programs. Their work is particularly important because it is the first to discuss the evolution of Hispanics and philanthropy. In their closing chapter, Gallegos and O’Neill make recommendations for improving the relationship between donors and grantmakers.

⁵⁶ <http://www.naaonline.org/about.htm>

⁵⁷ (<http://www.cof.org/culturescaring/contents.pdf>).

Hodgkinson and Weitzman conducted research for the Gallup Organization on charitable giving and volunteering for the Independent Sector. The authors found that Latinos are comparatively uncharitable, with only 53 percent of households giving money to charity compared to 73 percent of all US households. Criticism of the survey abounds, since it relies on self-reporting. One such criticism, from Bradford Smith and Associates, is that the definition of philanthropy that Hodgkinson and Weitzman employ is too narrow. In addition, their analysis fails to take into account differences between wealth and income, as well as differences among religious traditions, which may be more relevant than race or ethnicity.

In response to the Gallup survey, Cortes states that aside from discussing “money and labor donated to nonprofits,” which unfairly biases Latinos, the survey does not include or adequately explain other types of giving. Hence, Cortes asks three strategic questions, What traditions might predispose Latinos to give more? Does society provide disincentives that discourage Latino philanthropy? What new organizational and institutional arrangements might facilitate Latino philanthropy? The author claims that there are lessons to learn from past fundraising efforts and that these lessons should guide future philanthropic efforts. The most successful fundraising efforts include relying on mutual assistance and trust in personal relationships; assuring individuals that funds will be used as promised; and televising appeals.

Campoamor and Diaz’s edited collection of articles is something of a follow-up to Gallegos and O’Neill’s initial study, which was published in 1991. With the growth in Latino population accounting for 25 percent of the US population, the editors highlight the importance of the growing Latino nonprofit sector. As such, their collection stresses community needs and new philanthropic efforts.

De la Garza’s article, which examines native and non-native organizational participation in the US, finds that there are several emerging patterns. First, at the group level, Latino giving is lower than that of Anglos. Second, Hispanic membership rates are lower than those of Anglos with the exception of US-born Cubans. In general, Hispanic organizations are of low salience to Latinos. However, increased involvement in electoral politics correlates with higher organization participation levels. In the end, De la Garza finds those socioeconomic variables rather than ethnicity better explains organizational participation.

Ramos and Kasper examine the Latino Community Funds. According to the authors, community funds have emerged in response to a sense that organized philanthropic efforts were not addressing communities of color. It should be noted that there is some debate over whether ethnic funds create an inclusive environment within philanthropy. (However, the criticism can be judged unfair; many other groups have developed philanthropic efforts that were directed internally.) In general these funds have sought to increase community and institutional giving for Latino groups. Corporate and foundation support has been procured by many Latino funds.

The editors also offer recommendations for philanthropic leaders and practitioners. The recommendations are as follows:

- ◇ Support expanded research on Latino issues in the field.
- ◇ Encourage new models of Latino giving and philanthropy.

- ◇ Facilitate Latino trustee/leadership networking efforts to improve the scope of philanthropic efforts in Latino communities.
- ◇ Encourage coalitions with Latino and other grass roots organizations in the US.
- ◇ Foster increased exchange between US philanthropic/nonprofit leaders and their Latin-American counterparts.

Rivas-Vazquez examines donors and potential donors in five states. The author focuses on Hispanic culture, which, according to the author, influences charitable giving among Hispanics nationally. Rivas-Vazquez conducted 60 structured interviews and she finds that Hispanic philanthropy is very personal in nature. What is most important is who (or what organization) solicits donations. Cultural traditions related to family, education and religion within the Latino community are equally important. Cultivating a Latino donor base, according to Rivas-Vazquez, takes significant amounts of time and Latinos have little interest in planned giving.⁵⁸ In the end, she concludes that charitable giving will evolve as Hispanics remain in the US for a longer period of time.⁵⁹

Debates

While the literature on Latinos and philanthropy is growing, there is no coherent discourse. This results in an array of fragmented and disparate topics. It is not uncommon for many studies on Latino philanthropy to simply not include a literature review. Cortes is one of the few authors who attempt to undertake a literature review. Interestingly, criticism of the methodology employed by scholars appears to be pervasive, as well as recommendations for future action. Despite this, the section below examines some of the debates that have surfaced.

According to Estrada, Latinos have not established organized mechanisms for giving. However, Ramos, Murguia and Cortes argue the contrary, insisting that Latinos have long given through established organizing mechanisms (i.e. family, the Catholic Church and *mutualista* organizations). While these mechanisms are not the same as those used in mainstream philanthropy, these avenues nonetheless provide well-established patterns and vehicles for philanthropic efforts.

According to Cortes, “there may be more erosion rather than evolution in Latino philanthropy.”⁶⁰ Cortes suggests that individualism and the nuclear family are contrary to the Latino notion of the extended family and community, often influencing philanthropic endeavors. Traditional ties to the Catholic Church are eroding as a result of geographic mobility and exposure to Protestantism.⁶¹ In contrast, Ramos, Campoamor and others see philanthropic efforts as expanding, though they have not kept pace with the growing Latino population.

⁵⁸ Campoamor and Diaz 1999:121

⁵⁹ Campoamor and Diaz 1999:135

⁶⁰ Cortes 1995.

⁶¹ Cortes 1995:29

Debate ensues as to whether Latinos are philanthropic. Some authors contend that those of Latin American ancestry are not givers because there is not a tradition of philanthropy in their country of origin. Latinos have traditionally relied on the church and/or government institutions rather than secular organizations to aid local communities and the poor. When Latinos begin to settle in the US, they are largely unaccustomed to philanthropic vehicles outside of the Church. As a result, many scholars contend, though perhaps inaccurately, that this translates into reduced philanthropic efforts. It is important to note that religious organizations and affiliations comprise the largest sector of philanthropic giving at 36.5 percent of philanthropic efforts.

Interestingly, De la Garza attempts to disprove the notion that Latinos are “takers” and that they do not give as much as other groups. De la Garza looks at native and non-native Latino groups in the US, examining organizational participation and how ethnicity affects giving in the Latino community. Even recent immigrants, who demonstrate lower overall rates of giving and volunteering than native-born Latinos, learn predominant US patterns of giving and volunteering within one generation. These important findings defy conventional wisdom about Hispanics’ potential contributions to philanthropy as donors and volunteers by demonstrating that the Latino community’s readiness to support the field is virtually the same as that of mainstream US groups.⁶²

General Characteristics of Latino Philanthropy

A select number of characteristics can be generalized in the case of Latinos. They are as follows:

- Hispanics give to causes relating to children, education, and arts and culture.⁶³
- Latinos give in response to specific emergency needs such as hurricanes or earthquakes in Latin America.⁶⁴
- Hispanics give based on a strong sense of cultural heritage, with a desire to preserve traditions, a sense of responsibility to family, remittances to the country of origin and a preference for giving to groups that assist their ethnic communities.⁶⁵
- A personal connection is instrumental to giving.⁶⁶
- Factors that influence the degree to which people give include generation, national origin, length of residence in the US and standing within one’s social class.⁶⁷
- Affluent Latinos give to organizations where they hold a leadership position or know the leaders.⁶⁸

⁶² Campoamor and Diaz 1999:4

⁶³ Rivas-Vazquez 1999.

⁶⁴ Duran 2001.

⁶⁵ Rivas-Vazquez, 1999.

⁶⁶ Rivas-Vazquez, 1999.

⁶⁷ Ramos 1999.

⁶⁸ Estrada 1990.

Market Research

Although not focused on philanthropy or nonprofits, Arlene Dávila's important study, *Latinos, Inc.*, examines the creation of Hispanics and Latinos as marketing categories for American manufacturers over the past thirty years. Davila "rejects the simple categories of ethnic and culturally specific media."⁶⁹ Instead, she looks at the connection between marketing, culture, corporate sponsorship and politics. The author focuses on the political and economic interests and processes that shape production, and examines the power structures in which the Hispanic media is imbedded. She asserts that ethnic marketing, not only among Hispanics, occurs because of mainstream US society and its continual categorization of "others." For example, media portrayals categorize Latinos as outsiders and not an "intrinsic component of the US society."

LATINOS: DATA AND RESOURCES

Demographic Information (Census 2000) <http://www.census.gov/>

White non-Hispanic	69.1
Hispanic	12.5
Black	12.1
Asian	3.6

Hispanic Demographics

- There are 35 million Hispanics in the US as of the 2000 Census.
- Average household size is 3.9.
- Average family size is 4.14.
- Median age is 24 years old.
- 40.5 percent of respondents own their own homes.
- 8.4 percent hold a B.A. Degree
- 52.9 percent hold a High School Degree or greater.
- 2000 median income is \$33,455.
- Half of all US Hispanics live in two states, California and Texas, with New York being the next most populous state. Of the 35.3 million Hispanics, there are 20.6 million of Mexican origin; 3.4 million of Puerto Rican origin; 1.2 million of Cuban origin; 1.7 million Central Americans and 1.3 million South Americans.
(<http://ww.christianitytoday.com/ct/2001/014/6.67.html>)

Other Information

- US Hispanics represents \$477 billion of buying power for the year 2001.
<http://www.schwartzresearch.com/html/hispanicMarket.htm>. By way of comparison, the largest Hispanic nonprofits spent \$254.7 million last year to deal with housing, health, civil rights, and economic development issues.
<http://www.hispanicbusiness.com/news/newsbyid.asp?id=5328>

⁶⁹ Dávila 2001:5.

- The top 25 nonprofits—as rated by [hispanicbusiness.com](http://www.hispanicbusiness.com)—reflect a wide range of issues including education, housing, economic development, civil rights and healthcare. They are also the recipients of substantial amounts of Latino philanthropic dollars. For a more detailed description visit <http://www.hispanicbusiness.com/news/newsbyid.asp?id=5328>. A list follows.
- [The Aspira Association](#)
 - [Hispanic Scholarship Fund](#)
 - [Asociacion Nacional Pro Personas Mayores](#)
 - [National Council of La Raza](#)
 - [The Puerto Rican Family Institute](#)
 - [Chicanos Por La Causa](#)
 - [Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities](#)
 - [Casa Central Social Services](#)
 - [Latin American Civic Association](#)
 - [Congreso de Latinos Unidos](#)
 - [El Valor](#)
 - [Spanish-Speaking Unity Council of Alameda County and Subsidiaries](#)
 - [California Hispanic Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse](#)
 - [Nuevo Amanecer Latino Children Services](#)
 - [La Casa de Don Pedro](#)
 - [League of United Latin American Citizens](#)
 - [United Community Center/Centro de la Comunidad Unida](#)
 - [Amigos Del Valle](#)
 - [Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund](#)
 - [Coalition for Hispanic Family Services](#)
 - [CHARO Community Development Corp.](#)
 - [Hispanic Federation](#)
 - [Council for the Spanish-Speaking](#)
 - [Center Home for Hispanic Elderly](#)
 - [U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce](#)
- Revenues for the Nonprofit 25 lean heavily toward corporate grants (56.5 percent of the total) and government grants (28.5 percent). No other revenue stream figures significantly on the income side of the equation. On the expenditure side, these groups commit 55 percent of their money directly to service programs, 19 percent to administrative costs, and 26 percent on "other," including events and fund-raising. These numbers vary widely, however, with most human-service organizations putting 85 to 90 percent into programs. In contrast, advocacy groups spend much more on "other" to cover the costs of research, legal actions, lobbying, and political outreach.

It should be noted that there is a divergence between the areas to which Latinos give the most as presented above, and the areas in which the largest Latino organizations work. A reason can be found in that government and corporate sponsors, play a significant role in funding these large organizations. Individual philanthropy directed toward nonprofits organizations (as opposed to the church) lags.

- Housing ranks as the most popular service, offered by 13 of the 25 nonprofits on the list. Next comes youth development (12 organizations), followed by education (10 groups) and employment and civil rights advocacy (nine organizations each). Health figures in the mission of seven nonprofits, while six each focus on economic development, mental health, and community recreation. <http://www.hispanicbusiness.com/news/newsbyid.asp?id=5328>.

Bibliography

Butterworth, Douglas and John K. Chance. 1981. Latin American Urbanization. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Camarillo, Albert. 1991. "Mexican-Americans and Nonprofit Organization: An Historical Overview." In Hispanics and the Nonprofit Sector, ed. Herman E. Gallegos and Michael O'Neill. New York: The Foundation Center.

Campoamor, Diana, William A. Diaz, and Henry A.J. Ramos. 1999. Nuevos Senderos: Reflections on Hispanics and Philanthropy. Houston: Arte Publico Press.

Carragher, James. 2002. "US-Cuba Relations: Recent Developments." Seminar at The Cuba Project/Bildner Center for Western Hemisphere Studies, The Graduate Center, City University of New York, February 22, 2002.

Cervantes, Alejandra. 2003. "Hometown Associations As Catalysts For The Development of Community Foundations: The Zacatecan Case." Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society, The Graduate Center, City University of New York, May 2003.

Claudio, Edwin. 1989. "Hispanic Americans and Philanthropy." *NSFRE Journal* (Autumn).

Cortes, Michael. "Latino Philanthropy: Some Unanswered Questions." Washington, DC. Paper presented at the Researchers Roundtable Seminar by the Council on Foundations.

_____. 1995. "Three Strategic Questions About Latino Philanthropy." *New Directions for Philanthropic Fundraising* (Summer), vol. 8.

Davila, Arlene. 2001. Latinos Inc. The Marketing and Making of a People. California: University of California Press.

De la Garza, Rodolfo. Latino Subgroups and Their Attitudes Toward Philanthropy: A Comparison Among Them and With Non-Latinos. Austin: University of Texas at Austin.

Diaz, et. al. 2001. *Facts and Findings* (Fall), vol. 3, no. 3.

Duany, Jorge. 1994. Quisqueya on the Hudson: The Transnational Identity of Dominicans in Washington Heights. New York: CUNY Dominican Studies Institute.

Duran, Lisa. 2001. "Caring Communities for Each Other: Philanthropy in Communities of Color." *Grassroots Fundraising Journal*, vol. 20, no. 5.

Estrada, Leobardo. 1990. "Hispanic Evolution: As Their Giving Evolves, Many Hispanics Link Philanthropy to Personal Involvement in Civic Affairs." *Foundation News*, May/June, 34-36.

- Foner, Nancy, ed. 1987. New Immigrants in New York City. New York: Columbia University.
- Garcia, Juan. 1996. Mexicans in the Midwest, 1900-1932. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Gallegos, Herman E. and Michael O'Neill, ed. 1991. Hispanics and the Nonprofit Sector. New York: The Foundation Center.
- Georges, Eugenia. 1990. The Making of a Transnational Community. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Glazer, Nathan and Daniel Patrick Moynihan. 1963. Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Jews, Italians, and Irish of New York City. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
- Gonzalez, Manuel. 1999. Mexicanos: A History of Mexicans in the United States. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Grasmuck, Sherri and Patricia R. Pessar. 1991. Between Two Islands. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gurak, Douglas and Mary Kritz. 1982. "Dominican and Colombian Women in New York City: Household Structure and Employment Patterns." *Migration Today* 10, nos. 3-4, 14-21.
- Hendricks, Glenn T. 1974. The Dominican Diaspora: From the Dominican Republic to New York City, Villagers in Transition. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hernandez, Ramona and Silvio Torres-Saillant. 1996. "Dominicans in New York: Men, Women and Prospects." In Latinos in New York: Communities in Transition, ed. Sherrie Baver and Gabriel Haslip-Viera. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Hewlitt, Nancy, A. 1987. "Mutual Aid or Charity: Two Approaches to Philanthropy in a Latin Community." In "Women and Philanthropy: Past, Present and Future." New York: Center for the Study of Philanthropy, The Graduate Center, The City University of New York.
- Hodgkinson, Virginia A. and Michael Weitzman. 1992. "Giving and Volunteering In the United States." Findings from a national survey. Washington, D.C.: Independent Sector.
- Marquez, Benjamin. 1993. LULAC: The Evolution of a Mexican American Political Organization. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Miller, Eugene. 1999. Latinos and the Development of Community: Philanthropy, Associations, and Advocacy. New York: Center for the Study of Philanthropy, The Graduate Center, The City University of New York.

Multilateral Investment Fund, Inter-American Development Bank, *Sending Money Home: An International Comparison of Remittance Markets* (February 2003).

Murguia, Ramon. 1995. "Latino Funds in the United States of America: A Review of Models for Philanthropic Resources." Paper presented at the Hispanics in Philanthropy's First International National Conference, Oct. 1-3.

Pessar, Patricia. 1995. *A Visa for a Dream: Dominicans in the United States*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Portes, Alejandro and Robert L. Bach. 1987. *Latin Journey: Cuban and Mexican Immigrants in the United States*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Pycior, Julie Leininger. 1996. "Sociedades Mutualistas." In *The new handbook of Texas*. Austin: Texas State Historical Association.

Ramos, Henry A.J. 1999. "Latino Philanthropy: Expanding US Models of Giving and Civic Participation." In *Cultures of Caring: Philanthropy in Diverse American Communities*. Washington, DC: Council on Foundations.

_____. 1995. "Latino Nonprofit Leadership in California's Emerging Multicultural Society." Albuquerque, NM. Paper presented at the Hispanics in Philanthropy's First International National Conference.

Ramos and Kasper. 2000. "Building a Tradition of Latino Philanthropy: Hispanics as Donors, Grantees, Grantmakers, and Volunteers". Presented at "What's 'New' About Philanthropy?" Forum on Philanthropy, Public Policy and the Economy. At USC Nonprofit Studies Center, University of Southern California, January 19-20.

Ricourt, Milagros. 1998. "Patterns of Dominican Demography and Community Development in New York City." *Latino Studies Journal* 9, no. 3, Fall, 11-38.

Rivas-Vazquez, Ana Gloria. 1999. "New Pools of Latino Wealth: A Case Study of Donors and Potential Donors in US Hispanic/Latino Communities." In *Nuevos Senderos: Reflections on Hispanics and Philanthropy*, ed. Diana Campoamor, William A. Diaz, and Henry A.J. Ramos. Houston: Arte Publico Press.

Sassen-Koob, Saskia. 1979. "Formal and Informal Associations: Dominicans and Colombians in New York." *International Migration Review* 13, Summer, 314-332.

Sainz, Rudy. 1993. "Dominican Ethnic Associations: Classification and Service Delivery Roles in Washington Heights." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University.

Singer, Merrill, et al. 1991. "Puerto Rican Community Mobilizing in Response to the AIDS Crisis." *Human Organization* 50, Spring, 73-81.

Wilhelm, Ian. 2002. "Key Events in Minority Philanthropy." In "Tapping Ethnic Wealth," by Michael Anft, *The Chronicle of Philanthropy*, January 10.