**Ten Nonprofit Funding Models**

One of the strongest impressions I got was that the article itself is a product. Rather than “head” or “ceo” or similarly technical, flat, terms, the piece used the term “decision maker” exclusively. The section that discusses BELL on page 4 reads like a testimonial; there’s a problem, then the product offered solves that problem. Then there’s statistical support (“70 percent of our costs”). Page 3 talks about the largest nonprofits all having “well-developed funding model[s],” so there’s an element of ladder-climbing here. To the intended audience (smaller, disorganized nonprofits), to gain social and financial capital, you have to have a clear model for how you will secure funding. Then the article tells you some of these funding models.

Ethicality isn’t discussed, either. The article explicitly mentions Susan G. Komen and talks about its funding model, but doesn’t mention at all that only 20% of their donations go to cancer research.

Market forces and hierarchies of capital clearly influence the nonprofit sector. To assume there are no organizations truly seeking to do good would be foolish, but this article shows that there’s no reason to trust that nonprofits don’t have the same extractive motivations as for-profit ventures. The establishment of a market of nonprofits competing for limited resources presents clear issues; glamorous problems are easier to sell, so more mundane needs are harder to secure funding for. The Make-a-Wish foundation is a great example of this: the article says that organizations following its model must “communicate what is compelling about [their] nonprofit in a simple and concise way.” This is merely advertising, and the mission of these organizations is a product to sell. Social welfare programs suffer while trips to disney are filmed and advertisements run on the hour.

If social welfare is a priority for our society, we should remove it from the market. Feeding the hungry shouldn’t be a billionaire’s PR stunt, nor should it be a church bake sale. Taxation and central distribution of resources is a more efficient way to ensure the welfare of members of our society. Choosing a system with market forces allows personal gain at the expense of people who need help, and it’s unethical.