

# How the Turbulence Facing US Nonprofits Might Transform the Giving Infrastructure

Benjamin Soskis

April 2026

Civil society in the US has experienced several waves of turbulence after the inauguration of the second Trump administration. Some are related to funding cuts and freezes (Tomasko et al. 2025). Others are related to a charged political climate in which some nonprofits find themselves under threat of investigation for violating the administration’s priorities or under attack from public officials.<sup>1</sup> This brief explores how those disruptions might reshape the support system for charitable and philanthropic giving, or the giving infrastructure.

In other research, Urban Institute scholars have used the term “social sector” to designate private organizations (e.g., nonprofit, for-profit, and hybrids of the two), groups, and individuals acting to advance social missions as their primary purpose, and have defined the social sector infrastructure as “the support system that helps the social sector thrive. It is an ecosystem of providers that offer services focused on sustainability, learning, relationships, and influence to social sector organizations, groups, and individuals.”<sup>2</sup> I define the giving infrastructure as that component of the social sector infrastructure that facilitates and fosters giving and volunteering.

This brief maps out the following four ways in which new policies and practices are disrupting the social sector and might reshape civil society and the giving infrastructure that serves it:

1. the emergence of systems of triage to respond to funding gaps facing nonprofits and individuals after federal funding cuts or freezes
2. the drive to recover and protect public datasets removed or altered by the Trump administration
3. the provision of security to organizations and individuals who fear being targeted for their work as a form of philanthropic currency
4. the flight of philanthropic capital out of the US

This list is by no means exhaustive. The brief does not examine, for instance, the ways in which disruptions facing civil society might lead to a wave of nonprofit closures and mergers, or the pursuit of alternative organizational models besides 501(c)(3) status that might shield organizations from government surveillance or regulation. Nor does it address how the networks of activism emerging in communities across the country—including formal organizations, informal neighborhood associations, and independent individuals roused to action to push back against the Trump administration’s crackdown on illegal immigration—might leave lasting imprints on the giving infrastructure. All these are worthy topics of additional research.

This brief centers on two main themes: the dynamic between the drive to stabilize and to transform as complementary and at times competing reactions to the disruptions; and, relatedly, the interplay between short-term reactions and longer-term changes to civil society and the giving infrastructure.

## Giving as Gap Filling and the Emergence of Triage Infrastructure

The federal government retrenchment in 2025—including the canceling or freezing of funds directly or indirectly supporting nonprofits, reducing staff at federal offices, and dismantling entire government departments and agencies—has had a profound effect on civil society. That impact can be understood, first and foremost, in terms of the direct financial disruption. According to the Urban Institute’s National Survey of Nonprofit Trends and Impacts, in the first four to six months of 2025, a third of nonprofits reported “experiencing at least one type of government funding disruption (loss of at least some government funding; a delay, pause, or freeze in government funding; and/or a stop work order)” (Tomasko et al. 2025). In a survey conducted in August and September 2025 by the Center for Effective Philanthropy, 56 percent of nonprofits reported experiencing funding losses from the federal government or expected to experience those losses in the near future (Buteau et al. 2026).

Yet the impact of funding disruptions on civil society can also be detected in the response to those disruptions. Indeed, the task of filling gaps left by government retrenchment has become one of the primary areas of focus for the current giving infrastructure, and this dynamic will likely have longer-lasting effects. The response has involved repurposing the existing giving infrastructure to address

those gaps. In March 2025, Give.org published a list of all Better Business Bureau accredited charities that receive government funding to help guide donors to charities that might experience funding disruptions.<sup>3</sup> The platform JustGive, which was founded in 1999, went even further. In November, it rebranded as Charity Bridge Fund with a purpose of responding to “sudden government defunding.”<sup>4</sup> The site offered a database of defunded nonprofits and included details on the federal funds withdrawn or lost, an itemization of updated funding needs, and impact stories on how those losses affected communities on the ground.<sup>5</sup> Such offerings, though made in response to this particular moment, can become a permanent fixture of the giving infrastructure and be adapted to other occasions of widespread nonprofit funding losses.

## Philanthropy’s Response

Despite the talk of their inability to adequately fill the gaps left by government cutbacks, many philanthropic funders have stepped up to provide emergency “bridge” funding—a somewhat curious if ubiquitous term given the lack of certainty regarding any permanent resolution (i.e., bridge to where?).<sup>6</sup> According to the Center for Effective Philanthropy survey referenced above, 64 percent of foundations report providing emergency or rapid response grants, while another 15 percent report considering doing so (Buteau et al. 2026).

Funders have created new giving vehicles (or repurposed old ones) to provide such emergency support. In August 2025, for instance, a handful of funders committed nearly \$37 million “to provide immediate relief to public media stations at risk of closure following federal funding cuts to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting,” including \$26.5 million to the newly created Public Media Bridge Fund.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, in May, a group of foundations that support research on education formed a “rapid response bridge funding program to provide quick turnaround grants of up to \$25,000 for education scholars impacted by the abrupt grant cancellations by the National Science Foundation.”<sup>8</sup>

## Small Donors and the SNAP Gap

Crowdfunding campaigns proliferated in response to emergent needs as the tides of federal funding receded. One GoFundMe campaign, for instance, sought “to raise every dollar that the NEA withdrew from Oregon’s Arts Organizations, and to distribute those funds evenly across all affected groups.”<sup>9</sup> Some scientific researchers also turned to crowdfunding to support projects imperiled by government funding cuts. One cancer researcher who set up a GoFundMe campaign for their lab told the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, “It was odd to me, because I don’t really think of our research lab as a place that would need charity.”<sup>10</sup> Yet the sense of deprivation produced by federal cuts helped normalize crowdfunding for institutions and organizations not typically associated with such assistance—a standard which may very well persist even after the funding crisis subsides.

Another flurry of crowdfunding campaigns emerged in response to the government shutdown in October and November 2025, especially to assist those affected by the suspension of Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits.<sup>11</sup> Notably, this development spanned the ideological spectrum and was compatible with a range of partisan interpretations of the shutdown. Shortly before

those benefits were to be suspended, for instance, the conservative crowdfunding platform GiveSendGo featured a blog post reminding donors, “People were created to care for each other, neighbor helping neighbor, not to leave the task to a faceless institution that can be turned off with the stroke of a pen.”<sup>12</sup>

Indeed, the widespread popularity of “SNAP gap” crowdfunding points to the complex politics of gap giving in the face of government retrenchment. Charitable giving can function as a justification for rolling back government support and services, raising the question: “If communities and people can do something, why are we charging the federal government with doing it?”<sup>13</sup> It can also serve as a protest against retrenchment by highlighting the desperate needs government funding cuts engender and the limits of private resources to address them.<sup>14</sup> The public discourse over the next few years between these two ways of understanding gap giving will have a profound effect on attitudes toward governmental and philanthropic responsibility.

The giving infrastructure also responded to the “SNAP gap” through the use of the SNAP/EBT card (which might lay the ground for further experimentation).<sup>15</sup> Instacart and DoorDash, for instance, offered discounts on food deliveries to SNAP recipients.<sup>16</sup> GiveDirectly partnered with Propel, an app used by millions of SNAP households to manage their benefits, to distribute cash payments directly to those who had their benefits suspended.<sup>17</sup> (GiveDirectly had worked with Propel before to distribute cash in the wake of natural disasters, such as the Texas floods, the Los Angeles wildfires, and Hurricane Helene.<sup>18</sup>)

## Philanthropic Triage and the Dismantling of USAID

Some of the most significant adaptations of the giving infrastructure were in response to the administration’s dismantling of USAID and billions of dollars in cuts to foreign assistance programs.<sup>19</sup> One estimate put the amount raised in the first eight months by emergency funds in response to the USAID shutdown at \$125 million.<sup>20</sup> GlobalGiving, a nonprofit that helps connect charities to donors, quickly began a Community Aid Fund and has since raised \$28 million to support affected charities in 100 countries.<sup>21</sup> The Foreign Aid Bridge Fund, started in February 2025 by Unlock Aid “as a short-term emergency response to the US foreign assistance freeze,” closed its doors at the end of April after raising more than \$2 million, which was distributed to over 40 organizations.<sup>22</sup>

These and other campaigns placed an emphasis on bolstering the infrastructure’s capacity for triage—an imperative that demands a combination of urgency and discrimination. The paradigmatic triage organization, which received media attention from NPR, CNN, and the AP, among other publications, was Project Resource Optimization (PRO).<sup>23</sup> The idea for PRO was seeded when a number of philanthropic funders reached out to USAID staffers asking how they could help, given their limited resources and the scale of the need brought on by the federal government’s retrenchment in foreign aid. A crew of former USAID economists sought to provide an answer by reviewing all of the foreign aid programs that USAID had been funding, using data on the ForeignAssistance.gov.<sup>24</sup> After analyzing the data, talking with other experts, and reaching out to the affected charities, they determined which programs were the most cost-effective and could save the

most lives—ultimately compiling an “Urgent and Vetted” list of some 80 charities. By the end of 2025, PRO, now hosted by the DIV Fund and formerly by the Center for Global Development, had mobilized more than \$113 million in charitable grants to nearly 80 projects across 30 countries.<sup>25</sup>

What might be the longer-lasting impact of this reshaping of the giving infrastructure around gap filling? On the one hand, many of the responses to budget cuts and disruptions were explicitly framed as term-limited; for instance, PRO describes itself as a “time-bound effort.”<sup>26</sup> It is possible therefore that their effect on the infrastructure will be time-bound as well. But it is also the case that short-lived organizations can have longer-lasting impact through the propagation of models and norms. A time-limited triage organization that would “pop up” during a crisis and then dissolve once the crisis ended could itself have a much longer life if its model is increasingly taken up. Such a development could have significant effects on the nonprofit sector—how it is staffed, regulated, and evaluated.<sup>27</sup>

A few features of PRO and the philanthropic response to the dismantling of USAID are worth highlighting for how the ascendance of the triage imperative might reshape the giving infrastructure. First, because a background premise to such deliberations was the discrepancy between the scale of (reduced) government spending and the (relatively modest) funds at the disposal of private philanthropy, the optimization of limited resources—and thus the trimming of charitable fat—became the guiding principle for action. An official at Helen Keller Intl told the AP that, after losing nearly a third of the organization’s revenue because of the termination of USAID programs they helped implement, they provided PRO with a smaller budget: “Instead of the \$7 million annual budget for a nutrition program in Nigeria, they proposed \$1.5 million to keep it running.”<sup>28</sup> The experience of navigating federal funding disruptions could deepen the allure of using cost-effectiveness as a lodestar for giving decisions even after government funding is restored. This might, in turn, tilt the giving infrastructure toward large, US-based charities that can more easily provide measurable evidence of effectiveness—and thus even impede the drive toward “localization.” (To address this challenge, PRO is partnering with GlobalGiving to help direct the funding it has raised to local charities.<sup>29</sup>) In addition, approaches to calculations of cost-effectiveness themselves might have to be reimagined if they had been premised on the existence of health systems infrastructure that was once, but no longer, supported by US government funding.<sup>30</sup> More broadly, the pull of cost-effectiveness might encourage the emergence of organizations dedicated to producing curated, prescriptive lists of vetted charities in different realms, well beyond foreign aid and global development.

Another feature of PRO that touches on the potential longer-term impacts on the giving infrastructure is the way in which the drive toward charitable triage and emergency gap filling has at times been coupled with a seemingly contrary impulse to transform rather than just to stabilize. Many sought to leverage funding disruptions to rethink the entire system of global aid.<sup>31</sup> PRO presented itself as “a lab for more effective aid in the future.”<sup>32</sup> As one of its founders wrote in *Inside Philanthropy*, “Private philanthropy cannot replace bilateral aid, but it *can* lead the way in demonstrating what the future of development should look like: simpler, more transparent, and relentlessly focused on results.”<sup>33</sup>

Other visions of global development have emerged after the fall of USAID<sup>34</sup>—often on the heels of calls to address the short-term immediate needs of the current system or, at the very least, to pursue a gradual “phased transition” out of it.<sup>35</sup> Similarly, in the domestic realm, the Public Media Bridge Fund is working toward the longer-term sustainability of local public media organizations by assisting in the transition to funding models that rely less on government support. Such efforts to encourage the diversification of funding sources echo many nonprofits’ ultimate response to funding cuts enacted by the Reagan administration four decades previously, which led to a turn toward earned revenue and other forms of nonprofit commercialism and entrepreneurialism.<sup>36</sup>

Another triage strategy is exemplified by the DIV Fund, which had existed within USAID as Development Innovation Ventures—a division that helped to identify and invest in early-stage organizations and projects in global health and development that had the potential to be high-impact and cost-effective.<sup>37</sup> It was given new life as a stand-alone nonprofit with support from two private donors.<sup>38</sup> The fate of the DIV Fund reverses the traditional trajectory of demonstration projects—long a key strategic approach within philanthropy’s toolbox—in which private funding seeds initiatives that, if proven successful, could then be taken on and scaled by government. In this case, philanthropy secured an initiative that already proved its worth within government by establishing it as a nonprofit. In many ways, the DIV Fund is an exceptional case, with a preestablished set of potential funders—yet its model could reshape the giving infrastructure well into the future, given there is no clear terminal date for this period of precarious and volatile government support.

In these and countless other examples, the dynamic between gap giving approaches that conserve and those that plant the seeds for future transformation will be one of the main determinants of the longer-term effects of the current moment on the giving infrastructure.

## Public Data Recovery and Protection

Another gap that has opened due to the disruptions of the last year relates to public datasets that the Trump administration has discontinued, altered, or taken off-line.<sup>39</sup> Here, too, civil society has taken up the challenge of gap filling. As an official with the David and Lucile Packard Foundation noted in September 2025, philanthropy confronts “dramatic changes to the availability and reliability of public datasets and supporting systems” on which much of its work has long depended: “Experts in federal data collection agencies were let go. Budgets for data were shrunk. Advisory boards providing unbiased oversight were dissolved.”<sup>40</sup> Government-sponsored data had served as essential supports for the social sector infrastructure, yet the social sector must now face the prospect of “essential data on poverty rates, maternal and infant health markers, access to safe and affordable housing, exposure to environmental risks, and civic engagement rates” no longer existing as accessible public goods.<sup>41</sup>

In response, a host of actors have taken up the charge of promoting data resilience.<sup>42</sup> As the *Chronicle of Philanthropy* has reported, “alliances of nonprofits, universities, and civic technologists” have begun to incorporate those public datasets more firmly into the private domains of the social

sector infrastructure—“to track data loss, archive federal information, and create independent public dashboards.”<sup>43</sup>

The Data Rescue Project, for instance, was formed in February 2025 to serve “as a clearinghouse for preserving at-risk public information.”<sup>44</sup> At the time of this brief’s publication, this all-volunteer effort by several data organizations had preserved 2,932 datasets across 94 government offices. Funders like the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation have also taken the lead in seeking to preserve existing public health data, redesigning health data systems, and conceptualizing and creating alternative data sources.<sup>45</sup>

At a basic level, these efforts aim to salvage existing public data resources; they are, in other words, a form of stabilization. Doing so has required embracing litigation. A federal lawsuit was filed by a group of environmental and science organizations—including the Union of Concerned Scientists, Sierra Club, Environmental Integrity Project, and California Communities Against Toxics—to challenge the removal of public information on climate and environmental justice from federal agency websites.<sup>46</sup> There are also advocacy campaigns to mobilize users of public datasets to push Congress and the current administration to support their reinstatement or rehabilitation.<sup>47</sup> But, as with the gap giving related to funding reductions, these efforts often involved leveraging the disruption to rethink data infrastructure more generally, including encouraging states and cities to construct parallel data systems and fostering communities to create their own local health data ecosystems, such as those promoted by MADE for Health Justice.<sup>48</sup> Here, the pursuit of public data resilience intersects with the promotion of data philanthropy—the provision of data as a form of private giving, which in turn requires cultivating and strengthening the existing giving infrastructure (Bernholz and Pawliw-Fry 2022).

Such work represents a potentially enduring change to the giving infrastructure, one which might help reshape giving patterns and priorities. The longer-term effects of much of the current data rescue work are less clear, however. To the extent that much of it functions as emergency triage, and given the widely acknowledged unmatched scale of government data reach and resources, it does not necessarily signal a permanent shift toward privatization of data infrastructure. It is possible that a good part of this work will be temporary and put aside if a future administration reprioritizes public data. Yet the memory of the current moment will persist, as will the recognition of the essential vulnerability of public data to the whims of those in power. The drive to back up public data and to create alternative private and community-centered data ecosystems will very likely endure—and those impulses will have significant effects on the giving infrastructure moving forward.

## Security as Philanthropic Currency

The disruptions nonprofits are facing at the current moment have deepened a concern for staff’s well-being that had surged during the COVID-19 pandemic, and fortified it with a particular regard for *security*. This focus reflects an acknowledgment among funders and nonprofit leaders of a pervasive sense of *insecurity* within the sector, a product not merely of organizations’ precarious finances but

their fear of becoming targets of investigation from state and federal government officials and of attacks from private citizens.<sup>49</sup>

In a survey by the Center for Effective Philanthropy, conducted in August and September 2025, 35 percent of nonprofit leaders reported experiencing concerns about the well-being and safety of their staff or board, and 13 percent more expect to experience those concerns in the coming year (CEP 2026). For many groups, especially those engaging with politically charged issues or working with marginalized communities, that sense of peril has long been the norm. But in the last year, it has expanded to a broader class of nonprofits, in part because of the perception that threats to their security often had the power of the state behind them. As Devex reported in November, “The administration’s antagonistic approach to nonprofits is causing deep anxiety in the sector.”<sup>50</sup>

Many nonprofits, including smaller organizations with minimal excess capacity to spare, have seen their legal, cybersecurity, and data-safety needs skyrocket over the last year in response to the possibility of administrative, congressional, and state-level subpoenas, investigations, oversight demands, or audits, as well as hacking attempts from hostile private actors.<sup>51</sup> Given these needs, the provision of security has become an important form of charitable and philanthropic currency.

A number of philanthropic funders have recently taken on this challenge. In October 2024, the Packard Foundation began providing Nonprofit Secure—which offers a suite of services related to digital, physical, psychological, communication, and legal security—to its grantees.<sup>52</sup> One part of the Hill-Snowdon Foundation’s Protect, Block & Build Initiative, unveiled in September 2025, entailed support for the “digital and physical security, legal assistance, and other critical needs of current partners.”<sup>53</sup> In November 2025, the first philanthropic fund, Mind the Movement, was established. It is dedicated to the mental health of democracy and movement workers, providing “organizational crisis training, free and low-cost therapy, and supportive spaces and resources.”<sup>54</sup>

In some cases, foundations have approached the security needs of grantees as a distinct philanthropic imperative, supplemental to existing grantmaking priorities. This is a development that could leave a longer-lasting imprint on philanthropic norms. As the *Chronicle of Philanthropy* reported in May 2025, the Weissberg Foundation increased its payout from about 6 percent of assets to 10.3 percent, resulting in an additional \$10 million in spending, much of which “will go toward cybersecurity and physical security for grantees that fear being targeted for their work.”<sup>55</sup> According to the Center for Effective Philanthropy, 41 percent of foundations responding to its fall 2025 survey reported offering organizations “assistance with legal support” beyond grants (Buteau et al. 2026, 21).

Indeed, as *Nonprofit Quarterly* wrote in August 2025, “With traditional legal support drying up, an ecosystem of legal defense funds and nonprofit law firms is emerging that is set to become a lifeline for nonprofits under fire.”<sup>56</sup> Organizations and individuals that can provide legal defense have risen in prominence as vital elements of sector-wide infrastructure. One notable dimension to this development has been the “boom” in the provision of pro bono legal support.<sup>57</sup> In many cases, this development has entailed the incorporation of solo practitioners and small law offices into the giving

infrastructure, as larger firms with more established pro bono practices but “wary of retaliation” have pulled back.<sup>58</sup>

The demand for services to meet the security needs of nonprofits has led to growth within the broader social sector infrastructure in other ways. In August 2025, a former US Associate Attorney General launched the NGO Solidarity Network, “which supports nonprofit organizations in the face of governmental threats to ensure they can remain mission-focused and stand strong together.”<sup>59</sup> In July, the *New York Times* reported on “a secretive effort called Beacon” funded by Freedom Together and a corps of other funders, which offers assistance to those “who find themselves facing legal, online or even physical attacks and need help with security, lawyers or other forms of assistance.”<sup>60</sup> By design, many of these additions to the social sector infrastructure are not meant to be highly visible, as an institutional presence could make them vulnerable to reprisals. Because of their informality and potential provisionality, it remains an open but important question to what extent they will have a permanent presence and influence within that infrastructure.

More generally, as the above examples suggest, an important consequence of heightened demands for security has been the growth of collaboration, coordination, and solidarity among nonprofits. John Palfrey, president of the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, noted in the *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, “In 2025, we saw unprecedented unity from the charitable sector.”<sup>61</sup> Some of this collaboration was formal and public, such as the Unite in Advance campaign led by Palfrey and two other foundation presidents, which encouraged foundations to publicly defend civil society and the freedom to give; so far, 740 organizations have signed on.<sup>62</sup> Other forms of collaboration were less formal and more private. To what extent these collaborative efforts are not just temporary expedients to meet the threats of the moment but will put down more permanent, formalized roots, and to what extent they can reach across ideological and partisan divides to establish longer-lasting bonds around common interests in defending and promoting civil society, are key questions that will define the development of the giving infrastructure in the years to come.

## Philanthropic Capital Flight

It is quite possible that the turbulent political climate will lead some donors to be more concerned about their own security, boosting, for example, preferences for anonymous modes of giving. Donor apprehension regarding the threats posed to some nonprofits might also have longer-lasting effects on philanthropic flows both into and out of the US. So, too, might reports that the administration was considering banning domestic philanthropy directed overseas and longstanding but newly invigorated congressional efforts to restrict foreign philanthropy coming into the country.<sup>63</sup>

Already, in October 2025, the UK-headquartered Children’s Investment Fund Foundation (CIFF) announced that it was pausing its funding of US-based nonprofits because of the uncertainty surrounding “the US policy environment for foreign funders of US NGOs, including for international work.”<sup>64</sup> So far, no other major funders have joined CIFF in making such a public announcement. But it is possible that hesitancy from non-US organizations to fund US nonprofits will manifest through less

official and formalized policies, and that the uncertainty experienced by CIFF will function as a more general drag on cross-border philanthropy into the US. It is also possible that fewer global charities will decide to establish offices in the US. As a Canadian tax expert told Devex in October, “Many groups that might have in the past formed an international charity in the US are now hesitant to do so because of the political uncertainty.”<sup>65</sup>

If there might be a reduction of philanthropic capital coming into the US because of political uncertainty, there will likely be some increase of philanthropic capital leaving the US for similar reasons. In late October 2025, the *Financial Times* reported that “US philanthropists are moving hundreds of millions of dollars in charitable funds to UK structures as President Donald Trump’s attacks on nonprofit groups stir wealthy donors into precautionary action.”<sup>66</sup> According to the head of the American Donor Fund team at the Charities Aid Foundation, this movement of money was “quite an unprecedented occurrence and not something [they] had necessarily seen coming.”<sup>67</sup> The *Financial Times* noted that some US-based organizations were creating new structures in the UK, while others were establishing “sibling or subsidiary bodies for their existing US charities.”<sup>68</sup> They reported, “The Charity Commission, the UK regulator, said that since the start of the 2025–26 financial year, more than 200 US-based not-for-profit organisations had applied to register as charities.”<sup>69</sup> (The Charity Commission did not have data for previous years to determine what sort of increase, if any, this represented.)

Similarly, Mark Blumberg, the head of a Canadian law firm, told Devex that the firm had experienced a tenfold increase in inquiries from US-based nonprofits seeking to form overseas entities or foreign offices in Canada.<sup>70</sup> He and a colleague stated in another publication that these entities could pay for staff and programs in the US or in other countries.<sup>71</sup> They noted that the establishment of a Canadian affiliate might not just hedge against the possibility of US-based funds being frozen or expropriated by the state, but would also allow the Canada-based entity to receive foreign funding that non-US funders may not be prepared to provide to US entities.

As of the writing of this brief, the philanthropic capital flows out of the US, as well as the capital no longer flowing in, have settled at modest levels. This reflects the fact that the hazards facing nonprofits, such as the revocation of tax exemption, have often not moved beyond the realm of threat. The fear that fuels these capital flows, however, is pervasive. If it continues to intensify, and philanthropic cross-border capital flows are disrupted even further, the US giving infrastructure could experience profound transformations. It is also likely that the fear will outlive the conditions that produced it, such that even if the threats to nonprofits subside, for prudential reasons, philanthropic leaders who had authorized philanthropic capital flight out of the country will be reluctant to fully reverse the process. This will result in overseas “safe harbor” entities and overseas offices becoming permanent features of the US giving infrastructure.

## Conclusion

This brief has outlined four ways in which current disruptions to civil society might lead to short- and longer-term changes to the giving infrastructure. These changes stem from the need to fill gaps produced by funding cuts and freezes, as well as from the call to reimagine and reconstruct the infrastructure itself in light of those disruptions. Those dual aims to stabilize and transform—sometimes complementary, sometimes in tension—underscore the core missions of the giving infrastructure more generally, ones that will define the future of civil society. In some cases, the imperative to fill gaps left by government funding cuts will diminish if and when those cuts are reversed; in others, it will result in novel demarcations between public and private responsibilities, and between the roles of voluntary giving and tax-supported funding. Similarly, civil society organizations' experience of these disruptions, as well as the related insecurity sparked by perceived threats from government agents, have amplified preexisting vulnerabilities and created new ones that have led to short- and longer-term responses from the giving infrastructure. Even if current disruptions to civil society are temporary, many of the changes they have wrought on the giving infrastructure will be more enduring.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> “FAQ: Nonprofits in the New Landscape,” Building Movement Project, accessed February 23, 2026, <https://buildingmovement.org/blog/faq-nonprofits-in-the-new-landscape>; and Zolan Kanno-Youngs, Andrew Duehren, Kenneth P. Vogel, and Katie Rogers, “Trump Invokes Kirk’s Killing in Justifying Measures to Silence Opponents,” *New York Times*, September 16, 2025, <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/09/16/us/politics/trump-kirk-free-speech-hate-speech-left.html>.
- <sup>2</sup> “Exploring the Social Sector Infrastructure,” Urban Institute, accessed February 23, 2026, <https://socialsectorinfrastructure.urban.org>.
- <sup>3</sup> “Wise Giving Wednesday: Helping Charities Impacted by Government Funding Changes,” Give.org, March 12, 2025, <https://give.org/news/helping-charities-impacted-by-government-funding-changes>.
- <sup>4</sup> For information on the Charity Bridge Fund, visit <https://www.charitybridgefund.org/about-us>.
- <sup>5</sup> “Charity Bridge Fund Launches to Support Nonprofits Experiencing Loss of Federal Funding,” *NonProfit PRO*, November 3, 2025, <https://www.nonprofitpro.com/article/charity-bridge-fund-launches-to-support-nonprofits-experiencing-loss-of-federal-funding>.
- <sup>6</sup> Stephanie Beasley, “Gates CEO: Foundation Will Stay the Course as Humanitarian Aid Shrinks,” *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, February 3, 2026, <https://www.philanthropy.com/news/gates-ceo-foundation-will-stay-the-course-as-humanitarian-aid-shrinks/>; and Michael Kavate, “Can Love of Humanity Rise to This Moment? Maybe, If We Stop Talking About What It Can’t Do,” *Inside Philanthropy*, November 4, 2025, <https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/can-love-of-humanity-rise-to-this-moment-maybe-if-we-stop-talking-about-what-it-cant-do>.
- <sup>7</sup> MacArthur Foundation, “Foundations Commit \$36.5 Million to Protect Public Media in Communities,” press release, August 19, 2025, <https://www.macfound.org/press/press-releases/foundations-commit-36-million-to-protect-public-media-in-communities>. For information on the Public Media Bridge Fund, visit <https://www.publicmediabridgefund.org>.

- <sup>8</sup> “A Note from Spencer Foundation President Na’ilah Nasir and an Announcement of a New Funding Opportunity,” Spencer Foundation, May 2, 2025, <https://www.spencer.org/news/meeting-the-moment-together>.
- <sup>9</sup> “Keep the Story Alive: Oregon Arts Rising,” GoFundMe, created May 4, 2025, <https://www.gofundme.com/f/oregon-arts-rising>.
- <sup>10</sup> Megan Zahneis, “As Trump Upends Funding for Research, These Scholars Turn to GoFundMe,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, July 25, 2025, <https://www.chronicle.com/article/as-trump-upends-funding-for-research-these-scholars-turn-to-gofundme>.
- <sup>11</sup> “Government Shutdown Direct Relief Fund,” GoFundMe, created January 18, 2019, <https://www.gofundme.com/f/govshutdown>.
- <sup>12</sup> Alex Shipley, “SNAP Benefits Halted! Don’t Wait for Someone Else, Step In and Be the Hands and Feet of Jesus,” GiveSendGo (blog), October 30, 2025, <https://www.givesendgo.com/blog/stepin-snap>.
- <sup>13</sup> David Hebert, “Grassroots Safety Net: SNAP Gap Inspires Americans to Help Out,” *The Daily Economy*, November 6, 2025, <https://thedailyeconomy.org/article/grassroots-safety-net-snap-gap-inspires-americans-to-help-out>.
- <sup>14</sup> Eden Stiffman, “SNAP Crisis Exposes Limits of Philanthropy’s Safety Net,” *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, November 13, 2025, [https://www.philanthropy.com/news/snap\\_crisis\\_exposes\\_limits\\_of\\_philanthropys\\_safety\\_net](https://www.philanthropy.com/news/snap_crisis_exposes_limits_of_philanthropys_safety_net).
- <sup>15</sup> Martha Ramirez, “Philanthropy’s Response to SNAP Cuts Highlights Government’s Abdication,” *Inside Philanthropy*, November 19, 2025, <https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/philanthropys-response-to-snap-cuts-highlights-governments-abdication>.
- <sup>16</sup> Dee-Ann Durbin, “Instacart, DoorDash and Other Companies Offer Discounts to SNAP Recipients,” PBS News, October 31, 2025, <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/nation/instacart-doordash-and-other-companies-offer-discounts-to-snap-recipients>.
- <sup>17</sup> Maria Aspan, “How One Tech Startup Is Giving Cash to SNAP Recipients,” NPR, November 4, 2025, <https://www.npr.org/2025/11/04/nx-s1-5587728/snap-shutdown-propel-tech-startup-cash-donations>.
- <sup>18</sup> “SNAP Relief Payments Are Complete, but You Can Still Donate to Low-Income Families,” GiveDirectly, accessed February 23, 2026, <https://www.givedirectly.org/snapgap>.
- <sup>19</sup> “The Trump Administration’s Foreign Aid Review: Reorganization of US Global Health Programs,” KFF, October 16, 2025, <https://www.kff.org/global-health-policy/the-trump-administrations-foreign-aid-review-proposed-reorganization-of-u-s-global-health-programs>.
- <sup>20</sup> Thalia Beaty, “Private Donors Gave More than \$125M to Keep Foreign Aid Programs Going After US Cuts,” Associated Press, October 27, 2025, <https://apnews.com/article/usaid-foreign-aid-cuts-deaths-emergency-funds-7ed67cb3983b2615ebcdae7098295beb>.
- <sup>21</sup> Kristen Graberstein, Officer of Strategic Philanthropy at GlobalGiving, email message to author, February 20, 2026; and “GlobalGiving Community Aid Fund,” GlobalGiving, accessed February 24, 2026, <https://www.globalgiving.org/projects/globalgiving-community-aid-fund/faq/#menu>.
- <sup>22</sup> For information on the Foreign Aid Bridge Fund, visit <https://www.foreignaidbridgefund.org>.
- <sup>23</sup> Ari Daniel, “A Matchmaking Service with a Twist: Connecting Big Givers to Programs Cut by USAID,” NPR, May 13, 2025, <https://www.npr.org/sections/goats-and-soda/2025/05/13/nx-s1-5379905/a-matchmaking-service-with-a-twist-connecting-big-givers-to-programs-cut-by-usaid>; Lauren Kent, “These Former USAID Staff Are Working to Match Donors to Urgent, Lifesaving Aid Projects that Had Their Funding Slashed,” CNN, June 22, 2025, <https://www.cnn.com/2025/06/22/africa/former-usaid-staff-matching-donors-intl>; and Beaty, “Private Donors Gave More than \$125M.” For information on Project Resource Optimization, visit <https://proimpact.tools/>.
- <sup>24</sup> ForeignAssistance.gov Dashboard, last updated March 31, 2026, <https://foreignassistance.gov>.
- <sup>25</sup> “Dear PRO Impact Community,” Project Resource Optimization, accessed February 24, 2026, <https://proimpact.tools/campaigns/view-campaign/g->

[zl1IHWTy0yxMIA6YAjgwLA7RalZhRkeelKuiJhNPgY2XmLTLeJ8MIaUD8WqAX1G2aLQhXMegaNF9W9zli6wxDKaa08ZfCG.](https://www.philanthropy.com/news/this-years-federal-funding-freezes-offer-lessons-on-emergency-grant-making)

- 26 “Team,” Project Resource Optimization, accessed March 24, 2026, <https://proimpact.tools/team>.
- 27 Stephanie Beasley, “This Year’s Federal Funding Freezes Offer Lessons on Emergency Grant Making,” *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, December 1, 2025, <https://www.philanthropy.com/news/this-years-federal-funding-freezes-offer-lessons-on-emergency-grant-making>.
- 28 Beaty, “Private Donors Gave More than \$125M.”
- 29 “GlobalGiving and Project Resource Optimization (PRO) Help Donors Back Locally-Led Projects After USAID Cuts,” GlobalGiving, January 22, 2026, <https://www.globalgiving.org/aboutus/press-release/globalgiving-and-pro-help-donors-back-locally-led-projects-after-usaid-cuts>.
- 30 Lauren Evans, “GiveWell: How a Charity Advisor Became a Powerhouse Grantmaker,” *Inside Philanthropy*, March 25, 2026, <https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/givewell-how-a-charity-advisor-became-a-powerhouse-grantmaker>.
- 31 Mara Kardas-Nelson, “‘They Take the Money and Go’: Why Not Everyone Is Mourning the End of USAID,” *Guardian*, November 4, 2025, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2025/nov/04/they-take-the-money-and-go-why-not-everyone-is-mourning-the-end-of-usaid>.
- 32 Rob Rosenbaum, Caitlin Tulloch, and Cindy Huang, “Building the Future of Aid—Starting Now: Strategic Lessons from a Crisis,” Center for Global Development, May 20, 2025, <https://www.cgdev.org/blog/building-future-aid-starting-now-strategic-lessons-crisis>.
- 33 Rob Rosenbaum, “How Donors Can Maximize Impact Following USAID Cuts: The PRO Initiative,” *Inside Philanthropy*, May 19, 2025, <https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/how-donors-can-maximize-impact-following-usaid-cuts-the-pro-initiative>.
- 34 Rama Yade, “Trump’s Dismantling of USAID Offers a New Beginning for Africa,” Atlantic Council, February 24, 2025, <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/africasource/trumps-dismantling-of-usaid-offers-a-new-beginning-for-africa>; and Sarah Bush and Jennifer Hadden, “The End of the Age of NGOs? How Civil Society Lost Its Post-Cold War Power,” *Foreign Affairs*, July 3, 2025, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/world/end-age-ngos>.
- 35 Raj Kumar, “The Old Aid Model Is Dead. Now Comes the Fight Over What Replaces It,” Devex, January 16, 2026, <https://www.devex.com/news/the-old-aid-model-is-dead-now-comes-the-fight-over-what-replaces-it-111648>.
- 36 Sara Herschander, “For Nonprofits, Trump’s Cuts Echo Reagan Era, but with Striking Differences,” *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, March 3, 2025, <https://www.philanthropy.com/news/for-nonprofits-trumps-cuts-echo-reagan-era-but-with-striking-differences>; and Steven Rathgeb Smith, “Government and Nonprofits: Turning Points, Challenges, and Opportunities,” *Nonprofit Quarterly*, September 21, 2009, <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/government-and-nonprofits-turning-points-challenges-and-opportunities>.
- 37 For information on the DIV Fund, visit <https://www.div.fund>.
- 38 Thalia Beaty, “With \$48M in Philanthropic Backing, a Division of USAID Relaunches as a Nonprofit,” Associated Press, February 6, 2026, <https://apnews.com/article/div-fund-usaid-foreign-aid-3d4b69f8a1c53fae17a39fd9af1f4f00>.
- 39 “The Nation’s Data at Risk: Ongoing Monitoring,” American Statistical Association, accessed February 25, 2026, <https://www.amstat.org/the-nations-data-at-risk-year-two-ongoing-monitoring>.
- 40 Karuna Sridharan Chibber, “Preserving and Rebuilding Public Data Systems: A Framework for Funders,” Center for Effective Philanthropy, September 23, 2025, <https://cep.org/blog/preserving-and-rebuilding-public-data-systems-a-framework-for-funders/>.
- 41 Sridharan Chibber, “Preserving and Rebuilding Public Data Systems.”
- 42 “Data Resilience,” Urban Institute, accessed February 25, 2026, <https://www.urban.org/tags/data-resilience>.

- <sup>43</sup> Eden Stiffman, “Trump’s Data Cuts Could Leave Nonprofits ‘Flying Blind,’” *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, October 17, 2025, <https://www.philanthropy.com/news/trumps-data-cuts-could-leave-nonprofits-flying-blind>.
- <sup>44</sup> Data Rescue Project Portal, accessed April 1, 2026, <https://portal.datarescueproject.org>.
- <sup>45</sup> Alonzo L. Plough, “Philanthropy’s Crucial Role in Protecting Public Health Data,” Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, October 16, 2025, <https://www.rwjf.org/en/insights/blog/2025/10/philanthropys-crucial-role-in-protecting-public-health-data.html>.
- <sup>46</sup> “Environmental and Science Groups Sue Trump Administration Over Removal of Climate and Environmental Justice Websites and Data,” Union of Concerned Scientists, April 14, 2025, <https://www.ucs.org/about/news/nonprofits-sue-administration-over-removal-federal-data>.
- <sup>47</sup> Stiffman, “Trump’s Data Cuts Could Leave Nonprofits ‘Flying Blind.’”
- <sup>48</sup> For information on MADE for Health Justice, visit <https://debeaumont.org/made-for-health-justice>. Claire Cusella, Rekha Balu, and Kathryn L.S. Pettit, “Philanthropy Can Help Communities Fill Gaps in Today’s Uncertain Federal Data Landscape,” *Urban Wire*, Urban Institute, October 9, 2025, <https://www.urban.org/urban-wire/philanthropy-can-help-communities-fill-gaps-todays-uncertain-federal-data-landscape>.
- <sup>49</sup> Nick Robinson and Elly Page, “US Current Trend: State Attorney General Investigations Targeting Nonprofits,” International Center for Not-for-Profit Law, January 2025, <https://www.icnl.org/post/features/u-s-current-trend-state-attorney-general-investigations-targeting-nonprofits>; Beth Gazley, “Trump Administration Is Threatening Liberal Foundations and Nonprofits After Kirk’s Death—but Proving Wrongdoing by Any of Them Would Be Very Hard,” *The Conversation*, September 18, 2025, <https://doi.org/10.64628/AAI.67sr43vek>; and Kenneth P. Vogel, Nicholas Kulish, Kate Kelly, Theodore Schleifer, and David A. Fahrenthold, “Trump’s Targeting of Soros Foundations Elicits Fear and Defiance on Left,” *New York Times*, September 26, 2025, <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/09/26/us/politics/trump-soros-foundations-donors.html>.
- <sup>50</sup> Jessica Abrahams, “NGOs Say They’re Under Attack from Trump—and Are Ready to Fight Back,” *Devex*, November 17, 2025, <https://www.devex.com/news/ngos-say-they-re-under-attack-from-trump-and-are-ready-to-fight-back-111334>.
- <sup>51</sup> “FAQ: Nonprofits in the New Landscape,” Building Movement Project; Sara Herschander, “How Data Subpoenas and Online Harassment Are Silencing Many Nonprofits,” *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, March 20, 2025, <https://www.philanthropy.com/news/how-data-subpoenas-and-online-harassment-are-silencing-many-nonprofits>; Vittoria Elliott, “The Trump Administration Is Coming for Nonprofits. They’re Getting Ready,” *WIRED*, October 2, 2025, <https://www.wired.com/story/the-trump-administration-is-coming-for-nonprofits-theyre-getting-ready>; and Rasheeda Childress, “Congressional Investigations Are Coming. Is Your Nonprofit Ready?” *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, November 10, 2025, <https://www.philanthropy.com/news/news-childressinvestigations-1110>.
- <sup>52</sup> For information on Nonprofit Secure, visit <https://nonprofitsecure.org/landing.html>. In a webinar, a program officer from the Packard Foundation discusses Nonprofit Secure and mentions that they began offering it in October 2024. “The Legal Landscape and Path Ahead for Nonprofits and Philanthropy,” posted March 17, 2025, by National Council of Nonprofits, YouTube, 35:39, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r9EilodgJE>.
- <sup>53</sup> For information on Protect, Block & Build Initiative, visit <https://www.hillsnowdon.org/protect-block-build-initiative>. David Callahan, “A Few Thoughts at an Ominous Moment,” *Inside Philanthropy*, September 15, 2025, <https://www.insidephilanthropy.com/home/a-few-thoughts-at-an-ominous-moment>.
- <sup>54</sup> For information on Mind the Movement, visit <https://mindthemovement.org>.
- <sup>55</sup> Alex Daniels, “Philanthropy Opens the Vault: Payouts Are Surging in Response to Trump,” *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, May 5, 2025, <https://www.philanthropy.com/news/philanthropy-opens-the-vault-payouts-are-surging-in-response-to-trump>.
- <sup>56</sup> Lauren Girardin, “Legal Defense Funds Protect Nonprofits Under Political Attack by Trump Administration,” *Nonprofit Quarterly*, August 13, 2025, <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/legal-defense-funds-protect-nonprofits-under-political-attack-by-trump-administration>.

- <sup>57</sup> Stephanie Beasley, “Pro Bono Services Ramping Up for Nonprofits Facing Funding Cuts and Legal Threats,” *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, July 22, 2025, <https://www.philanthropy.com/news/pro-bono-services-ramping-up-for-nonprofits-facing-funding-cuts-and-legal-threats/>.
- <sup>58</sup> Mike Spector, Brad Heath, Kristina Cooke, Joseph Tanfani, and David Thomas, “How Trump’s Crackdown on Law Firms Is Undermining Legal Defenses for the Vulnerable,” Reuters, July 31, 2025, <https://www.reuters.com/investigations/trumps-war-big-law-leads-firms-retreat-pro-bono-work-underdogs-2025-07-31>; and Elizabeth Williamson, “Big Law Firms Bowed to Trump. A Corps of ‘Little Guys’ Jumped in to Fight Him,” *New York Times*, July 21, 2025, <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/07/21/us/politics/trump-big-law-firms-fight.html>.
- <sup>59</sup> “Advancing Civil Rights and Strengthening Democratic Norms—Vanita Gupta and Prof. Rodríguez ‘00,” Ludwig Speaker Series, Yale Law School, September 10, 2025, <https://law.yale.edu/yls-today/yale-law-school-events/advancing-civil-rights-and-strengthening-democratic-norms-vanita>.
- <sup>60</sup> Theodore Schleifer, “Liberal Fund-Raising Drive Seeks \$250 Million to Aid Pushback Against Trump,” *New York Times*, July 8, 2025, <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/07/08/us/politics/freedom-together-deepak-bhargava.html>.
- <sup>61</sup> “How to Fend Off Threats to the Sector in 2026: Predictions for the Year Ahead,” *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, November 12, 2025, <https://www.philanthropy.com/opinion/defending-democracy-in-2026>.
- <sup>62</sup> Tonya Allen, Deepak Bhargava, and John Palfrey, “Unite in Advance: Philanthropy Coalition Launches Solidarity Campaign,” *Nonprofit Quarterly*, April 9, 2025, <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/unite-in-advance-philanthropy-coalition-launches-solidarity-campaign>; and “A Public Statement from Philanthropy,” Council on Foundations, accessed April 1, 2026, <https://cof.org/page/public-statement-philanthropy>.
- <sup>63</sup> Paul Clolery, “Potential Executive Orders Against Nonprofits Paused,” *The NonProfit Times*, April 23, 2025, [https://thenonprofittimes.com/npt\\_articles/potential-executive-orders-against-nonprofits-paused](https://thenonprofittimes.com/npt_articles/potential-executive-orders-against-nonprofits-paused); Craig Kennedy, “Congressional Scrutiny of Foreign Donors Is a Good Thing for All Nonprofits,” *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, August 14, 2024, <https://www.philanthropy.com/opinion/congressional-scrutiny-of-foreign-donors-is-a-good-thing-for-all-nonprofits>; and “C&SN’s Year in Review: 2024,” Charity & Security Network, September 4, 2025, <https://charityandsecurity.org/news/csns-year-in-review-2024>.
- <sup>64</sup> “Update for Our Partners,” Children’s Investment Fund Foundation, October 8, 2025, <https://ciff.org/news/update-for-our-partners>.
- <sup>65</sup> Jessica Abrahams, “US Nonprofits Seek Refuge Abroad,” Devex, October 27, 2025, <https://www.devex.com/news/us-nonprofits-seek-refuge-abroad-111200>.
- <sup>66</sup> Josh Spero and Joe Miller, “US Philanthropists Move Hundreds of Millions to UK to Avoid Trump Threats,” *Financial Times*, October 31, 2025, <https://www.ft.com/content/d9929dde-d9af-4107-a5a2-aec2b49f6bf6>.
- <sup>67</sup> Spero and Miller, “US Philanthropists Move Hundreds of Millions to UK to Avoid Trump Threats.”
- <sup>68</sup> Spero and Miller, “US Philanthropists Move Hundreds of Millions to UK to Avoid Trump Threats.”
- <sup>69</sup> Spero and Miller, “US Philanthropists Move Hundreds of Millions to UK to Avoid Trump Threats.”
- <sup>70</sup> Anna Gawel, “US-Based Nonprofits Race to Escape Hostile Environment,” Devex Newswire, October 28, 2025, <https://www.devex.com/news/devex-newswire-us-based-nonprofits-race-to-escape-hostile-environment-111206>.
- <sup>71</sup> Mark Blumberg and Caitlin Lee, “Why Some US Nonprofits Dealing with Tremendous Adversity May Want to Have an Affiliate in Canada?” Blumbergs, November 13, 2025, <https://www.canadiancharitylaw.ca/blog/article-why-some-us-npos-dealing-with-tremendous-adversity-may-want-to-have-an-affiliate-in-canada>.

## References

- Bernholz, Lucy, and Brigitte Pawliw-Fry. 2022. "The Looming Fight Over How We Give Our Data." *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 20 (1): 24–31. <https://www.doi.org/10.48558/jqmw-1x33>.
- Buteau, Ellie, Elisha Smith Arrillaga, Seara Grundhoefer, and Christina Im. 2026. *A Sector in Crisis: How US Nonprofits and Foundations Are Responding to Threats*. Center for Effective Philanthropy.
- CEP (Center for Effective Philanthropy). 2026. "[Mounting Pressure: Foundations and Nonprofits on the Current Context](#)." CEP.
- Tomasko, Laura, Hannah Martin, Katie Fallon, Mirae Kim, Lewis Faulk, and Elizabeth T. Boris. 2025. *How Government Funding Disruptions Affected Nonprofits in Early 2025: Nationally Representative Findings from the Nonprofit Trends and Impacts Study*. Urban Institute.

## About the Author

**Benjamin Soskis** is a senior research associate in the Center on Nonprofits and Philanthropy at the Urban Institute and the cofounder and editor of *HistPhil*, a web publication dedicated to the history of philanthropy, nonprofits, and civil society. In 2025, he was a visiting scholar at Independent Sector. He is a frequent contributor to the *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, and his writing has appeared in the *Washington Post*, the *Atlantic*, the *Guardian*, and the *Wall Street Journal*, among other publications. He is the coeditor (with Ray Madoff) of *Giving in Time: Temporal Considerations in Philanthropy* and coauthor (with Alan Abramson) of *Standing Up for Nonprofits: Advocacy on Federal, Sector-wide Issues*. Soskis received his PhD in American history from Columbia University in 2010.

# Acknowledgments

This brief was produced with support from the Gates Foundation through a grant for research on philanthropic infrastructure. We are grateful to them and to all our funders, who make it possible for Urban to advance its mission.

The views expressed are those of the author and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Funders do not determine research findings or the insights and recommendations of Urban experts. Further information on the Urban Institute's funding principles is available at [urban.org/fundingprinciples](https://urban.org/fundingprinciples).



## ABOUT THE URBAN INSTITUTE

The Urban Institute is a nonprofit research organization founded on one simple idea: To improve lives and strengthen communities, we need practices and policies that work. For more than 50 years, that has been our charge. By equipping changemakers with evidence and solutions, together we can create a future where every person and community has the opportunity and power to thrive.

Copyright © April 2026. Urban Institute. Permission is granted for reproduction of this file, with attribution to the Urban Institute.