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Abstract

This paper attempts to address the gap in knowledge on the contributions by philanthropic players to national development in Singapore. Using grounded research, it explores the evolution of giving by individuals, the community and the private sector in Singapore from the end of World War II in 1945 to today. It looks at how each group gives towards prevailing social needs, unexpected events and crises as well as government calls for community support across five key phases in Singapore’s journey to nationhood. To provide context to the giving, the political and socio-economic situation of each time frame and concurrent government social welfare provisions in each phase are also described.

The data collected shows evidence of complementary efforts across the people, public and private sectors over time, from the rebuilding of Singapore after the war to the formation and running of the Singapore Council of Social Service, the Community Chest, Singapore Community Foundation, ethnic self-help groups and various social movements. In the immediate post-war period (1945-1959), all three sectors worked in tandem to rebuild Singapore. In the first years of independence (1959-1975), the public sector took the lead to build basic social and economic infrastructure with the people and private sectors filling in the gaps. Once Singapore had achieved economic stability, the government corralled the community and corporates to first unite in (1975-1990) and then initiate support for the underprivileged (1990-2004). In the last decade, there has been clear evidence of civil society taking the lead in advocating for social inclusion with the government responding with strategies that ensure economic growth without compromising the social and emotional well-being of the people.

From fighting fires in the kampong to containing the SARS epidemic and from donating trishaw-riding wages to build Nanyang University to emptying one’s piggy bank to help the underprivileged, the sense of community spirit and initiative has been strong and enduring in Singapore since the end of World War II. Philanthropy has been both responsive and transformative, transcending time, age, social status and circumstance.
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Singapore has often been hailed a development miracle. Within a short 50 years, it has transformed from a small, Third World British colonial outpost to a First World, thriving economy driven by electronics manufacturing and financial services. Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita has multiplied more than 40-fold, from $1,580 in 1965 to about $71,000 in 2014 (Department of Statistics Singapore, 2015) – higher than the United States and Germany. The economy is characterised by full employment, high savings and investment rates, a strong currency, low inflation and a 90-percent home ownership rate. In 2013, the International Monetary Fund named Singapore the easiest country in the world to do business and second in competitiveness. The rate of social progress in the country has been equally impressive. In 2013, Singapore placed ninth out of 127 countries ranked in the United Nations’ Human Development Index, far surpassing its Southeast Asian neighbours and developed countries such as the United Kingdom and France. Singaporeans have high life expectancy at birth, are well educated, and have access to jobs at decent salaries. The crime rate is low and the political environment stable. A culture of hard work and self-reliance unites the people, underpinned by a government with pragmatic, socio-democratic ideals. Few other countries can claim similar simultaneous achievement of economic and social goals.

Yet at its birth in 1965, Singapore was an unlikely nation. Independence did not arise from individuals’ desire to come together, as is typically the case, but rather took the people by surprise. The country was vulnerable both economically and politically. It had no natural resources, the population was ethnically and religiously diverse, and there was no common language. For it to survive and thrive, it not only had to overcome the fiscal odds but also develop an overarching identity or sense of nationhood to accommodate the ethnic and linguistic pluralism of the population.

The story of Singapore’s transformation has frequently been told from the perspective of politics, statistics and economics. Historical records are supplemented by the insight and personal experience of leaders such as Lee Kuan Yew, Goh Keng Swee and S.R. Nathan. However, the quiet, unremunerated contributions of private citizens and other players in Singapore’s journey to nationhood have, to our knowledge, never been documented in a systematic manner over time. The spirit of kindness and philanthropy that led individuals from all walks of life to extend a helping hand beyond the family has arguably been as important as the efforts of policymakers in achieving the progress that the country has seen, particularly in defining its core values and identity.

The paper attempts to fill this gap by tracing the evolution of giving in Singapore from the end of World War II in 1945 to today. To answer the question of how philanthropy has shaped Singapore in its journey to nationhood, the paper describes individual, community and private sector giving during key phases in Singapore’s history. In each phase, the paper looks at how each group gives towards prevailing unmet social needs, unexpected events and crises as well as government calls for community support. To provide context to the giving, the socio-economic and political situation of each time frame and concurrent government endeavours to meet social needs are also described.

Given the lack of known prior research in this area, the paper draws on relevant studies on Singapore history, oral history records, print and online media, corporate and nonprofit sector reports as well as government sources to build a chronological narrative. The secondary research is supplemented with information gleaned from interviews with individuals and organisations active in different periods. As this is exploratory, grounded research, the study is not intended to be conclusive or comprehensive but rather seeks to build a preliminary narrative, setting the stage for more in-depth research in specific areas and time frames.

The evidence gathered suggests that giving is intrinsic to the Singapore identity; since the end of the war, the government, corporate sector and community have worked collaboratively and in dynamic ways to meet the social welfare needs on the ground.

Chapter 1 covers the post-war reconstruction phase (September 1945 – May 1959). Whereas before World War II, dissatisfaction with the provisions of the
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colonial government led each ethnic community to see to its own social welfare needs, these boundaries disappeared with the war’s end and social welfare became a national undertaking. Although there was continuing discontent with the colonial authority, the government and the people worked on joint initiatives to ensure that the needs of the entire community were addressed effectively. By 1958, there were so many charities and organisations working on various aspects of social welfare that an independent statutory board, the Singapore Council of Social Service, was formed to coordinate their activities. However, the people were increasingly weary of the unrest resulting from the confrontational politics between the colonial powers and the labour movement and sought a more stable, strong and pan-ethnic alternative.

Chapter 2 documents philanthropy in the transition to self-rule and independence (May 1959 – August 1975). Having chosen Lee Kuan Yew and the People’s Action Party as their representatives in the May 1959 elections, the people rallied and placed their trust in the government to establish the pillars for economic growth. The underlying narrative of survival and sacrifice – the main unifiers in this period – saw corporate entities give generously to longer-term infrastructure development such as defence and healthcare facilities while the philosophy of self-help and family and kin-group support guided community initiatives in meeting immediate social welfare needs.

In Chapter 3, we describe how philanthropy supported the development of a national identity. Having met the population’s basic needs and set Singapore on a stable path for economic growth, the period covered (August 1975 – November 1990) saw the government actively encourage the tripartite model; government, civil society and the corporate sector working together to address social and community problems. The formation of institutions such as the Community Chest exemplifies this approach. As the population became more affluent and people better able to meet their basic needs, community efforts became visible in addressing the gaps in social welfare.

November 1990 marked a key transition in nation-building in Singapore: self-renewal. As Lee Kuan Yew handed over the premiership to Goh Chok Tong, the national narrative too evolved to one of a caring and compassionate society. Chapter 4 (November 1990 – August 2004) addresses giving in the framework of the national ideology of Shared Values and its corollary, Many Helping Hands, introduced during Goh’s tenure. The Lien Foundation and Tsao Foundation were forerunners at this time. They laid the groundwork for new national policies in palliative care, preschool education and community care for the aged using entrepreneurial-like approaches that were “quick and innovative, and [that understand] creative destruction” (Acs, 2013). By reinvesting accumulated wealth to explore original, inventive solutions to community needs, these foundations paved the way for new cycles of innovation and enterprise in the social sector.

In the final chapter, we consider the most recent decade of philanthropy. During Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong’s tenure, we have seen a paradigm shift with civil society becoming increasingly vocal and active in driving change in the social sector instead of taking the government’s cue. In fact, the government has had to adapt its policies to support the dual objectives of economic growth and an inclusive society, in particular strengthening support for the social welfare needs of lower-income groups. Philanthropy continues to play a key role in mobilising grassroots resources, with corporates and community leaders from various sectors taking the initiative to address the complexity and scale of social needs.

Note: The periods covered in this paper saw different currencies in use in Singapore. Between 1939 and 1953, the currency used was the Malayan dollar. From 1953 to 1967, the Malaya and British Borneo dollars were used. The Singapore dollar only came into circulation in 1967. For ease of reading, only the $ prefix is used before all amounts raised or given through philanthropic activities during the various periods discussed, unless indicated otherwise.
Rebuilding Singapore after World War II
(September 1945 – May 1959)

The end of World War II and the Japanese Occupation had left the population in Singapore “undernourished, disease-ridden and poorly housed” (Yeo & Lau, 1991, p. 182). Health, welfare and educational facilities were inadequate. Severe food shortages throughout Malaya made even staples such as rice hard to come by (Kratoska, 1988). Access to electricity and clean water were limited due to the wartime destruction of infrastructure (Lepoer, 1989). Jobs were scarce and poor citizens were forced to settle in squatter slums which were “insanitary, congested and dangerous” (Housing and Development Board, 1967, p. 39).

The Japanese surrender on August 15, 1945, had taken the British by surprise. They were, at the time, finalising plans for the recapture of Singapore and post-war administration processes were still undecided. While they immediately established an interim military government to oversee post-war reconstruction, the British Military Administration (BMA) did not arrive in Singapore until September 5, 1945, three weeks after the end of the war (Springhall, 2001).

The Malayan Communist Party (MCP), supported by its offshoots such as the Malay People’s Anti-Japanese Army (MPAJA), took advantage of this time lag to establish its authority (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009). Re-emerging from its jungle hideouts, it set about administering its own justice on those it thought to be Japanese collaborators (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009). By the end of August, it had circulated an eight-point programme that committed to establishing a democratic government “with an electorate drawn from all races of each state and the anti-Japanese army” (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009). This meant that when the BMA arrived a week later, it was confronted with a rival power that the people saw as true heroes and defenders of Singapore and Malaya – a real and still-armed alternative to itself that it had never had to consider before (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009).

The shared experience of having survived the war together had engendered an increased sense of belonging across racial and ethnic lines. This was no longer a community of transient immigrants and people now took a greater interest in the way the country was being run. Prominent Chinese entrepreneur and philanthropist Tan Lark Sye articulated this shift well: “When I left our country twenty years ago, I wanted to make a lot of money, then triumphantly return home to the fatherland as a rich man, raise a prosperous family and enhance the fame of my ancestors. I don’t think like that anymore. Since the end of World War II, I have come to think of Malaya as my home” (Lee, 2008, p. 83).

The prevailing political situation combined with the change in the locals’ attitude meant that with the war’s end, social welfare took on national significance and importance. The return of the British coincided with the emergence of the welfare state in Britain and other parts of Europe. This development overlapped with the interests of local leaders who, as they actively lobbied for positions in the Legislative Council or the communist parties, saw the need for more government intervention in the provision of public assistance (Ho, 2014). This meant that state coordination of social services was increasingly effective and efficient. Local needs determined all welfare programmes introduced, and there was an underlying emphasis on working with the local community (Ho, 2014).

Soon after they arrived, the BMA met with over 40 representatives from organisations active in resisting the Japanese including Hokkien Huay Kuan, Nanyang Press Ltd, Sam Kong Community, and the Singapore Women’s General Association to discuss post-war relief efforts. The latter presented their plan for “9 [relief] centres ... the staff to work in those centres, a list of 5 expected groups of people requiring immediate relief, and an estimated budget of $3,000,000 for relief purposes”, and offered their organisations’ aid in carrying them out (Ho, 2012). This pressured the BMA to launch relief efforts which were led by a committee composed of two Salvation Army officers, the Lord Bishop, seven Chinese members, and a Muslim, Indian and Eurasian representative (Ho, 2012).

Charity work intersected with the BMA’s initiatives. Local ad hoc projects were tied up with government
programmes, facilitating coordinated nationwide efforts to combat malnutrition, fight fires, and stem the spread of communicable diseases like tuberculosis or malaria. The government even reached out to the people to volunteer as godmothers or uncles to those in children’s homes (The Straits Times, 1956a; The Singapore Free Press, 1954a).

While the BMA’s purpose was to help Singapore recover and reconstruct after the war, the locals soon grew disillusioned with the corrupt and exploitative tendencies of some within the ranks. Although it was the largest employer in Malaya, most of its employees were paid pre-war wages. Some officers gave favours in exchange for kickbacks from local businessmen and black-market dealers. It also re-started importing opium (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009). As Lee Kuan Yew later said, “The men now in charge – majors, colonels, brigadiers – knew that they would be in power only until they were demobilised, when their wartime commissions would vanish like Cinderella’s coach. The pumpkin of civilian life to which they would then be reduced was at the back of their minds, and many made the most of their temporary authority” (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009).

On April 1, 1946, the nine Malay states and the Straits Settlements of Penang and Malacca officially became the Malayan Union, and Singapore a separate crown colony under Governor Sir Franklin Charles Gimson. By June 1946, the Department of Social Welfare (DSW) was established, the first multi-service agency for welfare provision in Singapore (Tan, 2005). The department’s main priorities were to provide emergency relief for war victims, find homes for the homeless, provide cheap meals, and eradicate juvenile delinquency and prostitution.

To mobilise community support, the department set up the Social Welfare Council to advise on government activities and various community efforts. Representatives from the major religious bodies and voluntary welfare organisations (e.g., the Salvation Army) as well as members of the upper class were nominated or invited to join the council alongside heads of government and municipal departments concerned with welfare to share their expertise and knowledge on the needs of the people (Ho, 2014). The department’s activities were funded by the Silver Jubilee Fund, a fundraising campaign started in 1935 “to relieve poverty and distress” (The Straits Times, 1947) which had accrued $320,000 by 1947. The campaign committee underwrote the lion’s share of the department’s activities, enabling an increase in welfare payments from January 1947. The administration also provided grants to local charities, disbursing over $100,000 in 1949, approximately half of which went to orphans (The Straits Times, 1949a).

Local volunteers provided crucial manpower for the DSW’s main initiative, the People’s Restaurants and Communal Feeding Programme. These centres initially provided cheap meals for Singaporeans, but took on a life of their own as women, including the governor’s wife Lady Margaret Dorothy Gimson, focused their efforts on establishing Child Feeding Centres which totalled 24 by April 1948. These volunteers started to provide childcare and educational services through the formation of Children’s Centres Clubs (The Straits Times, 1948) which later became Children’s Social Centres. These initial community welfare programmes formed the foundation of the 1970s’ Community Centres, a bedrock of welfare and social service provision. Another long-lasting initiative that emerged from these initial months was the provision of family planning advice in an effort to combat child poverty. This was formally established as the Singapore Family Planning Association in 1949 (Ho, 2013).

The political situation in Singapore continued to be tenuous, however, with the colonial government particularly threatened by the labour movement. While the MCP continued to pose a political challenge – declaring armed insurrection in 1948 – the bulk of Singapore’s unrest stemmed from spontaneous dissatisfaction amongst workers. Already in October 1945, 7,000 harbour workers refused to load British troop ships, and post-war stoppages that ran through December affected hospitals, taxi and bus companies, offices, garages, the telephone exchange, and the post office (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009).

Such anti-government strikes continued well into the 1950s; prominent among them were the 1952 strike by postal workers, the 1954 student protest against National Service, and the 1955 Hock Lee Bus Riots. From early April until the end of December 1955, Singapore witnessed 260 labour protests. The October 1956 riots sparked by Chinese students prompted a final crackdown and imposition of curfew (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009). Alongside these
leftist protests, communal tensions grew and were brought to a boil by the 1950 Maria Hertogh court case that awarded custody to her birth parents over her Muslim foster parents. The resultant riots raged for three days – killing 18 people and injuring 173 others (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009) – calling into question whether Singapore’s ethnically diverse population could ever live together harmoniously or even share a common consciousness.

It was against this backdrop that Singapore’s first elections took place in 1959 with the Labour Front coming under strong criticism from the People’s Action Party (PAP) led by Lee Kuan Yew. People were resentful and disillusioned with the confrontational politics of the immediate post-war years (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009) and sought a brighter future – a promise offered by the PAP which strategically repositioned itself from its leftist roots to a more centrist, pan-ethnic party capable of strong governance in the face of social divisions. Its message was well-received by a generation that had lived through the Occupation, the Emergency, repeated shortages, unemployment and corruption (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009), and had in the 15 years since the end of the war borne the main burden and responsibility of (re)constructing Singaporean society.

**Corporate Initiatives**

After the war, most business owners lacked the capital to rebuild their own businesses, much less contribute towards social welfare; war relief claims for their lost goods were not available for some time with responsibility for compensation remaining under debate into 1959. However, some companies started to provide donations from the 1950s with the Singapore Turf Club giving as much as $50,000 to the Singapore Anti-Tuberculosis Association in 1952 (The Straits Times, 1952a). On a smaller scale, businesses could be counted on to donate to relief funds, such as the Singapore Flood Relief Fund which received sums of up to $500 from various firms such as Standard-Vacuum Oil, Fraser and Co, and Eastern Bank, while other companies such as Borneo Motors and Cycle and Carriage started to carry out staff collections (The Straits Times, 1954a).

In the early 1950s, the Chinese-speaking and Chinese-educated in Singapore were increasingly frustrated with the limited improvement in their prospects. Job opportunities remained poor and Chinese schools were underfunded, overcrowded and neglected. The qualifications that these schools provided were increasingly going unrecognised. The start of the Malayan Emergency in 1948 and the formation of the People’s Republic of China in 1949 made it increasingly difficult for Malayan Chinese to go to China. With no other Chinese-medium universities in the region, these high school graduates would be forced to prematurely halt their studies. The community as a whole also felt threatened by the rise of Malayan nationalism in Malaya, particularly its emphasis on Malay as the sole national language (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009).

Tan Lark Sye, then chairperson of the Singapore Hokkien Huay Kuan (SHHK), first proposed a Chinese-medium university for Southeast Asia in a clan meeting in 1953. Tan called for public donations and pledged to “complement by donating the same amount” (SHHK, 2006), giving $5 million personally while the SHHK contributed 523 acres of land as premises for the university. Other clan associations, chambers of commerce, and businessmen also contributed to the cause.

People from all walks of life pooled their resources towards the founding of Nantah. Several fundraising efforts were initiated spontaneously, both through institutions and by the public. For instance, 1,000 taxi drivers from the Taxi Transport Association contributed a day’s earnings to the fund (The Singapore Free Press, 1954b). Dance hostesses from five city dance halls held floor shows and auctions in a Charity Week, raising $19,196 (The Straits Times, 1953a). Small business owners also contributed. Yeong Noh Ching, a Singaporean restaurant owner, raised $10,000 through serving dinner at $10 a table over 10 days (The Straits Times, 1954b) while Goh Siew Ying donated six days of her beauty parlour takings (The Straits Times, 1954c). Hawkers gathered to donate to the fund (The Straits Times, 1953a). Trishaw drivers and construction workers also contributed a day’s earnings (The Straits Times, 1954d). Even a 72-year-old beggar in Kuala Lumpur gave his life savings and three days’ begging proceeds of $11.20 (The Straits Times, 1953b) while Goh Siew Ying donated six days of her beauty parlour takings (The Straits Times, 1954c). Hawkers gathered to donate to the fund (The Straits Times, 1953a). Trishaw drivers and construction workers also contributed a day’s earnings (The Straits Times, 1954d). Even a 72-year-old beggar in Kuala Lumpur gave his life savings and three days’ begging proceeds of $11.20 (The Straits Times, 1953c). Within a year, over $10 million had been raised for the Nanyang University Fund (The Singapore Free Press, 1954c). With that, planning for the construction of the campus began in 1954.

---

**Box 1: Nanyang University**

In the early 1950s, the Chinese-speaking and Chinese-educated in Singapore were increasingly frustrated with the limited improvement in their prospects. Job opportunities remained poor and Chinese schools were underfunded, overcrowded and neglected. The qualifications that these schools provided were increasingly going unrecognised. The start of the Malayan Emergency in 1948 and the formation of the People’s Republic of China in 1949 made it increasingly difficult for Malayan Chinese to go to China. With no other Chinese-medium universities in the region, these high school graduates would be forced to prematurely halt their studies. The community as a whole also felt threatened by the rise of Malayan nationalism in Malaya, particularly its emphasis on Malay as the sole national language (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009).

Tan Lark Sye, then chairperson of the Singapore Hokkien Huay Kuan (SHHK), first proposed a Chinese-medium university for Southeast Asia in a clan meeting in 1953. Tan called for public donations and pledged to “complement by donating the same amount” (SHHK, 2006), giving $5 million personally while the SHHK contributed 523 acres of land as premises for the university. Other clan associations, chambers of commerce, and businessmen also contributed to the cause.
Community Initiatives

The tradition of community philanthropy in Singapore had already been well established before the war. Wealthy businessmen and community leaders had played a prominent role, particularly in building schools that catered to the educational needs of their respective communities. The Chinese clan associations, for instance, built Chinese-medium schools like the Tao Nan School, Poi Ching School, and later on, Nanyang University. Arab families such as the Alsagoffs and Aljunieds built madrasahs to educate rural Malay children while the Ramakrishna Mission shouldered the responsibility of providing Tamil vernacular education.

Even after the war, these individuals continued to support education. Yock Eng High School, for example, was rebuilt with the $24,000 donated by small businessmen through the Kiung Chow Association (Hong, 2003). During this period, community networks were also valuable to rebuilding business relationships and expanding ties. For the Chinese, these often came through clan membership or social and business clubs such as the Ee Hoe Hean Club (Wee, 2009). Networking and knowledge sharing among members opened doors, whether for business relationships, legal advice, healthcare options, education or even funeral services.

Box 2: Chinese Clan Associations in Singapore

The first clan associations emerged in Singapore in the 19th century. These groups were formed based on lineage, such as the Nanyang Kuah Si Association, or by locality like the Teo Yeoh Huai Kuan whose members have origins in Teo Yeoh, Teochew province, though they sometimes straddled both. Clan associations could also be formed from an amalgamation of surnames – the Lau Kwan Cheong Chew Ku Seng Wui Kun is for those from one of four surnames – or geographical regions, such as Kwong Wai Siew Peck San Theng, formed by members of Cantonese and Hakka origin.

Irrespective of their membership parameters, each of these associations had the primary objective of addressing the social welfare needs of members. They acted as the first point of contact for new immigrants, supporting their integration and helping them to overcome language barriers. The temples that the associations constructed helped new immigrants to continue their cultural practices and feel connected to Singapore. Socially, they provided a platform through which migrants could gather and support each other in terms of employment, accommodation, social welfare, and funeral arrangements (Chang & Yi, 2005). Dominated by affluent businessmen and elites, they also provided access to networks, ties and resources for members seeking partnerships, financing or other support in establishing operations in Singapore (Leong, 2007, p. 671). They were also the avenue through which they could continue to support healthcare and educational initiatives as well as public works in their hometowns in China.

Over 300 Chinese clan associations are active in Singapore today. In 1986, a formal community of clan associations was established with the founding of the Singapore Federation of Chinese Clan Associations (SFCCA). This aimed to advance co-operation among clan associations and promote Chinese language and culture “so as to achieve social harmony and national cohesion” (SFCCA). The SFCCA currently boasts a membership of 207 clans (Mah, M., personal correspondence, December 29, 2014).

New clan associations such as the Tianjin Club (2008) and the Shandong Association (2013) continue to be registered annually, fuelled by the influx of Chinese expatriates, students and new immigrants in recent years. Unlike earlier Chinese clan associations, these new associations tend not to be structurally involved in philanthropy. Instead, they bear closer resemblance to interest groups in their organisation. For instance, the 300-strong Tianjin Club (Wang, B., personal correspondence, January 9, 2015) takes part in a charity event about once a year. This is not a milestone set by the association and is usually proposed by individual members. Other meetings and activities tend to be of an ad hoc nature and no fixed fund exists for philanthropic activities.

Nature of Philanthropic Activity

Clans in Singapore are well known for their philanthropy, particularly in education, health, and the arts and culture. They are able to mobilise members towards philanthropic giving by tapping on a network of kinship, and geographical and linguistic ties. The formation of professional interest groups within clan associations has enabled the SHHK to provide specialisation in welfare services (e.g., legal advice) for members (Sim, B. H., personal correspondence, February 6, 2015).

Before independence, people preferred to donate through clan associations as accumulating funds toward a larger project was possible (Mah, M., personal correspondence, December 29, 2014).
The rich pooled their money to be distributed to a cause later. With independence, such donations dropped as a national identity “[took] over.” Clan associations also have several properties under their names, donated by members or purchased with internal funds, which provide rental revenue (Kua, B. L., personal correspondence, January 15, 2015). With astute investment, some have managed to amass enormous wealth even as wealthier members continue to donate. Hence, philanthropic activity has been possible, with larger ones establishing foundations to manage their philanthropy.

Education

Clan associations have invested heavily in education since the 19th century, contributing to the construction and maintenance of a total of 43 schools past and present (Chang & Yi, 2005). In colonial Singapore where access to an English education was select, they provided Chinese vernacular education to Chinese migrants’ children (Kuah-Pearce, 2011). Post-independence, only 11 remain operational. Mark Mah (personal correspondence, December 29, 2014) notes that today most have handed over the governance of affiliated schools to the Ministry of Education (MOE) although executive members continue to sit on school councils. The Ngee Ann Polytechnic Council has a position for a representative from Ngee Ann Kongsi which set up the institution in 1963. Clan associations have also donated to non-affiliated educational institutions. In 1953, SHHK donated 523 acres of land to set up Nantah (presently the Nanyang Technological University) to provide higher education opportunities for Chinese secondary school graduates after China went under the Communist regime (SHHK, 2006). Many clan associations also organise subsidised and complimentary training classes and workshops for members and non-members. Bukit Panjang Hokkien Konghuay has organised classes on Taiji and creative writing, among others (Chang & Yi, 2005).

Health

Since the 19th century, clan associations and individual philanthropists have established Chinese medical institutions such as the Chinese Pauper Hospital in 1884 and Thong Chai Medical Institution in 1892 (Wan, 2011). In 1910, Cantonese businessmen Wong Ah Fook, Leong Man San and Yow Ngar Pan set up the Kwong Wai Shiu Free Hospital (Urban Redevelopment Authority, 2015). The Thong Chai Medical Institution and the Kwong Wai Shiu Free Hospital remain in operation today while the Chinese Pauper Hospital was the predecessor to the Tan Tock Seng Hospital. Clan associations have made significant financial contributions to hospitals and healthcare institutions. The Phor Tiong Koh Peng Association has committed donations to Ren Ci Hospital and Geylang Old Folks’ Home (Chang & Yi, 2005). Some continue to provide medical care for their members. Interestingly, the Char Yong (Dabu) Association let a private hospital, the Balestier Medical Centre, use their premises in return for special rates for needy clan members and medical care for the association’s old folks’ home (Toh, 1990).

Arts and Culture

Post-independence, clan associations have taken significant steps to promote the arts and culture. To an unprecedented extent, they came to represent key agents in the preservation of Chinese culture and heritage, organising cultural festivals and classes, and funding initiatives by other institutions and individuals. Furthermore, clan associations like the Hainan Hwee Kuan have actively supported government arts and culture campaigns, such as the Speak Mandarin Campaign. Promoting culture and heritage has become so fundamental a goal that some have re-fashioned part of their premises into cultural displays. With a $100,000 grant from the National Heritage Board, the Kong Chow Wui Koon was transformed into a living museum, the Kong Chow Cultural Centre, in 2013 (Leong, 2013). They have also funded cultural institutions. In 1997, the Ann Kway Association contributed $10,000 to the reconstruction expenses of the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Hall managed by the National Heritage Board (Ann Kway Association, n.d.). They also carry their own publications, espousing the biographies of notable individuals, history and culture.

Social Welfare

Since their founding, clan associations have looked after the general welfare of their members and people from the same locality or lineage. Some would have a mutual-aid section devoted uniquely to member welfare. This has continued today with foreign nationals and new immigrants approaching them for aid. For instance, the Chung Shan Association distributes hongbao to elderly members during the Lunar New Year (Chang & Yi, 2005). Before independence, clan associations acquired clan cemeteries for fellow kin members and ancestral worship was held collectively. For most, this function ceased with government acquisition of burial land for urban redevelopment (Chang & Yi, 2005) and the setting up of public columbaria. Nonetheless, many continue to organise ancestral worship and send condolences to families of deceased members. Chan Si Wui Kun has since 1996 presented $200 as welfare benefit to such families (Chang & Yi, 2005). Before independence, clan associations also played a significant role in disaster relief efforts. In the 1961 Bukit Ho Swee fire, the Kong Chow Wui Koon raised funds for victims (Chang & Yi, 2005). They have also been integral in supporting community organisations. The Ji Yang Cai Clan Association donated to the educational fund of the Joo Chiat Citizens’ Consultative Committee (Chang & Yi, 2005).
However, community leaders were not the only recourse to charitable funding; widespread appeals saw every individual contributing what he could, signifying a greater sense of community “Singaporean-ness” and pan-island involvement and engagement. The Salvation Army, for example, raised $68,800 from public donations in 1956, enabling it to provide two new homes for 180 children out of the 312 under their care (The Singapore Free Press, 1957a). The Rotary Club similarly contributed to relief work and later started initiatives such as Sunshine in a Box, a fund for ad hoc charity needs, and the Students’ Loan Fund (Chew & Medora, 1983).

Women also played an important role in philanthropy after the war, spearheading many prominent charitable initiatives. Women's organisations sprung up both organically and as part of existing international organisations; social functions were often integrated with charity work and events. For example, the Chinese Ladies’ Association immediately immersed itself in fundraising and charitable activities once it was revived in 1948. One of its first events, the Festival of Chinese Fashions in 1950, benefitted the Singapore Anti-Tuberculosis Association and the University of Malaya. The group continued to raise funds for charities such as the Deaf Association, the Spastic Association, Leprosy Fund, Red Cross, YMCA, St. Andrew's Mission Hospital, Malay Youth Literary Association, and the Mandai Home for the Aged. It was one of the first associations to successfully run model homes for the elderly such as the Henderson Senior Citizens’ Home.

At the end of the war, the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) set up a Business and Professional Women’s Club to provide a support network to the growing number of working women. In the late 1950s, the club worked to provide higher English education for girls as well as evening classes for 500 underprivileged children to fill the education gap for the many children who had had no opportunity to learn during the war years. The YWCA also added more women's centres for education and recreation, such as courses in cooking, painting and languages, while also sponsoring shelters for squatters and orphans. Another Christian association, the Women’s Society of Christian Service, sponsored various causes, including overseas work, children raised by the church, and campaigns against gambling and drinking (Pitt & Thevathasan, 1984).

Box 3: Prominent Post-war Female Philanthropists

Among the women who stood out for their service to the community after the war was Che Zahara who founded the Malay Women’s Welfare Association (MWWA) in 1947. She housed orphans and destitute women in her own home, close to the red light district, to help women who had been forced into prostitution due to wartime hardships. The MWWA acted as the first Muslim women’s welfare home in Singapore, independently providing food, shelter and education. In 1948, Che Zahara mobilised the women of the MWWA to donate blood at the Singapore Blood Transfusion Service. Between 1947 and the 1960s, the MWWA looked after over 300 women and children of different races and religions.

Concurrently, the Persatuan Pemudi Islam Singapura (PPIS) or Young Women’s Muslim Association was founded by Mrs Mohamed Siraj in 1952 to fill the gaps in social services for poor Muslim families. It advocated for women’s rights and education while the Muslim Women’s Council played its own part in conducting family planning education in the kampongs, including distributing free condoms (Zaki & Mohamed, 1995).

Another prominent woman at the time, Constance Goh, not only took the helm in organising the first feeding centre for children in Singapore in 1945, but also opened the first family planning clinic in 1949. This was staffed entirely by volunteers and provided free family planning advice and contraceptives. Within a year, Goh and her team were operating five undercover clinics, spreading the word through friends and community workers to avoid opposition from conservatives and traditionalists (Frost & Balasingamchow, 2009).
The kampongs themselves were a hotbed of philanthropic activity. For example, Tan Kim Wah organised his village to set up a school in Jurong after the war, seeking volunteers and donors from the community (Choo & Tan, 1983). He also established the Yio Chu Kang Villagers’ Mutual Help Association which set up a Teochew opera troupe, provided tuition for children, and collaborated with the Ministry of Health to carry out health checks. Lee Kim Tah sponsored a clinic through the association to provide affordable services for the poor as well as limit the distance that newborn babies and other sick people needed to travel to the nearest medical centre (Tan & Chiang, 1988). A health drive by students in Kampong Woodsville in 1953 (The Straits Times, 1953b) saw the construction of a dispensary serving 20,000 residents and a second Potong Pasir clinic (The Singapore Free Press, 1954), all staffed by volunteer doctors and nurses. In light of the prevalent problem of attap house fires, kampong residents often gave money towards volunteer fire fighting squads, including in Yio Chu Kang and Kampong Soopoo (The Straits Times, 1957a). At some level, even the secret societies had a role to play – they acted as an “indispensable” positive force within the kampong, helping to police the grounds and prevent fires (Loh, 2007).

In times of struggle, the altruism showed no borders. Relief centres set up after devastating fires, such as those at Kampong Bugis (1951), Kampong Koo Chye (1958), and Kampong Tiong Bahru (1959), received donations from across the country. Chinese newspapers and organisations pitched in to organise relief efforts following the Kampong Bugis fire, and on August 13, 1951, a Singapore Joint Relief Organisation was established to provide aid to those affected (Loh, 2013). Often, passers-by would just stop and join volunteers in providing relief. Schoolboy R. Sivalogan was cycling home from school when he saw the fire raging at Tiong Bahru. He threw his books aside and said, in between passing pails of water, “I don’t live here, but this is a very big fire. I came to help” (The Straits Times, 1959).

Education

The community also came together to ensure that children stayed in school. A 1952 campaign encouraged Malays to stay in school, accompanied by community fundraising of “thousands of dollars” used to sponsor six students in their studies through to the University of Malaya (The Straits Times, 1952b). The Malay Youths’ Literary Association also sponsored poor Malays’ study in English schools (The Straits Times, 1951a). Adult education was not neglected; Inche Aziz started to provide informal English evening classes in 1946, beginning with 13 students but quickly growing to over 300 pupils (The Singapore Free Press, 1949a) while the Malay Union also provided literacy classes at a more basic level (The Straits Times, 1950b). Other adult classes sought to address the urgent need to raise literacy levels, such as those offered by the Workers’ Education Association (The Straits Times, 1950c) and University of Malaya volunteers (The Straits Times, 1950d). The Catholic Church sponsored shelters such as the 1948 Catholic Boys’ Town (now Assumption Pathways/English and Boys’ Town Boarding Home) for troubled or abandoned youth led by Brother Vincent (Boys’ Town, 2009). The Canossian Daughters of Charity also took in boys and visually and hearing impaired children after the war as did the Po Leung Kuk (SCSS, 1974). Their benefactors did not fail to give back to the community; a 1952 newspaper report profiled 27 boys from the Gimson Home who volunteered to build new premises for a children’s centre (The Straits Times, 1952c).

Health

Philanthropic efforts gave poor and rural residents access to medical care. Apart from long-standing Chinese charity clinics, the Kwong Wai Shiu Hospital provided free medical services to Cantonese immigrants (Kwong Wai Shiu Hospital, 2012). The Malayan Association of Almoners, founded by Malayan social workers in 1953, advocated on behalf of those with serious medical issues. They obtained sponsorship in 1955 for a Scheme for Diet Allowance that funded gastric and post-gastrectomy cases, and also initiated programmes related to tuberculosis treatment, leprosy employment, and handicapped children (Fong, 1978). St Andrew’s Mission Hospital provided free care for those who could not afford it (Zaki & Mohamed, 1995), with support from volunteers such as the women’s committee that supplied linen for its child patients (Chew & Medora, 1983).

Even as more structured health organisations, such as the Association for the Blind, and the Deaf and Dumb Association, arose to carry on these early ad hoc efforts, they nevertheless still relied on individual donations and volunteerism at the ground level. Blood transfusion services institutionalised in the 1946
Singapore Blood Transfusion Service, for example, were run by women volunteers and based entirely on voluntary blood donations (Ang & Chia, 2008; The Straits Times, 1988). Volunteers also staffed clinics run by the Singapore Family Planning Association to educate local women and train overseas doctors. This was arguably a pioneering effort at family planning practices in Southeast Asia (Foo & McNeice, 1981).

Grassroots efforts also helped to initiate and develop a service framework for children with disabilities. Soon after her appointment as the head of the Children's Paediatric Unit in 1955, pioneering medical social worker Daisy Vaithilingam, with the support of the nurses and social workers at the Woodbridge Hospital, spearheaded a foster care scheme for the hospital's children with developmental disabilities and persuaded the MOE to integrate children into mainstream education (Chew, Lai & Vaithilingam, 1993).

Arts and Media

The earliest post-war artistic organisations were based on ethnic and linguistic divisions, such as the Malay Society of Arts, the Indian Fine Arts Society (IFAS) established in 1952 (Seng, 2007), and the All-Malaya Malay Artists' Association founded in 1949 (The Straits Times, 1949b), which aimed to unite Malay artists, promote their art, and send Malay artists abroad. Indeed, the development of a Singaporean arts scene took a major step forward that year with the founding of the Singapore Art Society. This body worked with and received the support of arts organisations across all communities from the YMCA Arts Club to IFAS. They aimed to give Singaporean artists opportunities to learn and exhibit their art, with a major Annual Exhibition of Works by Local Artists and scholarships for local artists to study abroad (Seng, 2007). These artists gave back as well, performing in charity shows such as Sepuluh Malam Bonanza (Ang & Chia, 2008), the Carmelite's Spirit of Chap-Ji-Ki (The Singapore Free Press, 1948), the Malay Society of Arts' Jiwa Seni (The Singapore Free Press, 1949b), and the Chinese YMCA concert for children's funds (The Straits Times, 1956b).

With newspapers helping to publicise needs across the country, volunteers and donations came forth more easily. English-language newspapers frequently published articles on the subject, such as the need for teachers at the Girls' Home (The Singapore Free Press, 1951) and a call for volunteers at the Singapore Flood Relief Fund (The Straits Times, 1954e). They also profiled charity cases, prompting readers to donate money and other resources that led to a widow getting a new attap house (The Straits Times, 1952d) and another widow receiving some $500 (The Straits Times, 1958a). Chinese-language newspapers helped to raise donations for various causes and featured local artists (Thum, 2010). In February 1956, the Straits Times published the winning essays in its first essay competition for young Malayans on the theme How I Can Help Our Social Services (The Straits Times, 1956c). Through the competition, teenagers reflected on the subject with responses from "giv[ing] a good bath and a meal to the poor, dirty, unclothed and unnourished children in my neighbourhood" to "a helping hand or even a few sweets". Articles like these reveal that philanthropy was increasingly an ordinary, ongoing practice outside of official organisational activities.

Box 4: The First Foundations

The first foundations to be established in Singapore after the war were the Lee Foundation (1952) and the Shaw Foundation (1957).

Lee Foundation

The Lee Foundation was set up in March 1952. Founder Lee Kong Chian was not new to philanthropy. He had already been an active contributor to several causes prior to the war, including the Singapore Chinese Girls' School in 1929, St Theresa's Convent in 1933, Kuo Chuan Girls' School in 1938, Nanyang Chinese Normal School in 1941, and the University of Malaya Endowment Fund in 1949. Lee also served as the president of the Singapore Chinese Chamber of Commerce from 1939 to 1940 and was the chairperson of Thong Chai Medical Institution – a free hospital in Singapore – from 1951 to 1952 (Rahman & Wee, 2011).

However, through his charitable activities, he had noticed that donations tended to fluctuate in line with economic conditions. He wanted to establish "... a long term solution to the problem of the needy, providing steady, continuous support to charities over the good years and the bad" (Chew, 1996, p. 26). While in the United States during World War II, he learned about (continued on next page)
the work of early American philanthropic institutions such as the Rockefeller Foundation. Upon his return to Singapore he established the Lee Foundation to provide a structure for philanthropic work and an avenue to gather input from others to enable more inclusive decision-making (Chew, 1996; Quah & Lee, 1997). The foundation was funded using shares amounting to $3.5 million (Chew, 1996; Sim, 1950; Tan, 2008) from his various businesses, including Lee Rubber. At the time, they were expected to generate a yearly income of $150,000 to $200,000 (The Straits Times, 1952e).

The Shaw Foundation

Started by brothers Tan Sri Runme Shaw and Sir Run Run Shaw in 1957, the Shaw Foundation was borne out of the belief that what was gained from society should be given back (Chew, 1996; Shaw Towers Realty Pte Ltd, 2009; Ahmad & Rahman, 2004). Tan Sri Runme Shaw said, "... we make money from the public. We want to give the money back to the public. What is the best way? So we thought of the Shaw Foundation" (Chew, 1996, p. 52).

The foundation was funded through profits from the brothers' businesses, with a target value of $10 million for charity endowments at the time of establishment (The Singapore Free Press, 1957b). Half of this came from the Shaw House whose ownership was eventually transferred to the foundation. The Shaw House was expected to provide an income of $300,000 yearly (The Straits Times, 1958b).

The foundation aimed to carry out charitable activities "to help enrich human life and social well-being" as well as contribute to the progress of education and medicine (The Straits Times, 1958c) not only in Singapore, but also Malaya, Sarawak, North Borneo, Brunei and the rest of the British Commonwealth. The funds were intended to be completely dedicated to charities with long-term impact on the community (The Singapore Free Press, 1957b, 1958b).

The foundation aimed to provide aid to the people who could not fend for themselves (e.g., the widows, the diseased, the orphans, and disaster victims) and those who need to be rehabilitated (e.g., prisoners, young delinquents, and prostitutes) (The Straits Times, 1952f). It also aimed to provide tertiary education to those who could not pay for it (Quah & Lee, 1997). The overall objective of the foundation was to support established organisations or institutions, such as charities and educational institutions, instead of individual causes (The Straits Times, 1952e).

By the mid-1950s, the foundation had made contributions to several schools, including a $10,500 donation to the Umar Pulavar Tamil School in 1957 (The Straits Times, 1957b) and a $24,000 contribution towards science laboratories and equipment at St. Margaret's School (The Straits Times, 1957c). It also gave $1,500 to help Gimson School for Boys, under the Singapore Social Welfare Department, to form a bugle band (The Singapore Free Press, 1958a).

Lee Foundation also contributed to various community organisations such as the National Library (Quah & Lee, 1997), the Ramakrishna Mission (The Straits Times, 1954a), and the Federation of Boys' Clubs which received $5,000 for leadership training (The Straits Times, 1957e). It provided funds for hospital equipment and supported those in need of surgery, (Quah & Lee, 1997). In 1954, the foundation contributed $5,000 to the St. Andrew's Mission Hospital (The Straits Times, 1954f). It also contributed $23,243 to the Singapore Anti-Tuberculosis Association in 1957 (The Straits Times, 1957d).

The foundation gave $2,500 to a relief fund for the Cecil Street fire in May 1957 (The Straits Times, 1957f). In addition, the Lee Foundation was a key supporter of the Singapore Council of Social Service (SCSS) and contributed $200,000 to the SCSS Building Fund (NCSS, 2008).
In December 1958, on the recommendation of the Department of Social Welfare, a statutory board, the Singapore Council of Social Service (SCSS), was established. Just like its predecessor, the Social Welfare Council, the SCSS was a coordinating body that brought together existing VWOs and coordinated their efforts in remedial services and disaster relief in support of the Department of Social Welfare (Tan, 2005). It was also volunteer-led, with businessman and philanthropist Lee Kong Chian serving as president of the founding executive committee. However, the formation of the SCSS was also an acknowledgement that the community’s needs for public assistance, health services and other social welfare support would not be short-lived and there was a need for more formal structures to oversee and manage the various services being provided.

In fact, just two months after its inaugural meeting, the council was called to task in coordinating the efforts of VWOs, the government and the community in response to a major fire in Kampung Tiong Bahru which destroyed the homes of 5,000 people. By March 1959, a month after the fire had broken out, SCSS managed to raise about $700,000 for the 5,000 victims who lost their homes (NCSS, 2008). Apart from disaster relief, the council also coordinated fundraising by VWOs. It managed a flag day calendar to ensure both the more prominent and lesser-known organisations had an opportunity to raise money this way. It also started an Annual Charity Bazaar at Victoria Memorial Hall – this lasted 10 years – as an avenue for VWOs to fundraise through the sale of food and other items as well as showcase their respective efforts. Lee himself was a generous donor to SCSS and through his foundation, the Lee Foundation, made several contributions, including a $200,000 donation to the SCSS Building Fund (NCSS, 2008).

**Conclusion**

At a broader level the evolution of the Social Welfare Council into the SCSS was illustrative of the evolution of philanthropy in the post-war period. Not only did the people look beyond racial and ethnic lines to give more broadly to those in need, they also established more formal structures such as VWOs and foundations to be more deliberate and effective in their giving towards visible needs. For the majority of the population struggling to get back on their feet after the war, philanthropy was not about dollars and cents, but about willing hands and hearts.

From the very beginning the people showed a willingness to work alongside the government in various ways to provide for the community despite the increasingly tenuous political environment and their disillusionment with the BMA. Efforts to combat malnutrition, fight fires, and arrest the spread of communicable diseases were coordinated, national endeavours while establishing Nanyang University, supporting the disabled, or providing opportunities for women’s education were complementary to the government’s work in providing schools and employment for the majority.
Self-Government to Independence
(May 1959 – August 1975)

In May 1959, Singapore came into self-rule with the PAP’s overwhelming success in the national elections. This marked the start of a period of political uncertainties and transitions in the country; the most significant being independence in 1965 – only two years after the country’s merger with the Federation of Malaya. The PAP’s supplanting of the incumbent Labour Front marked the beginning of more decisive policy-making that demonstrated Singapore’s readiness to take over the full powers of self-governance.

The country that the founding government inherited was teeming with people struggling to meet their basic needs. In spite of the family planning programmes introduced after the war, the population had grown at an average of 4.4 percent per year from 1946 to 1957. As a result, by 1957, the population was almost double that in 1946, with an 84.7 percent increase in size (Wong & Yeoh, 2003, p. 5). Unemployment rates were also high, reaching 8.9 percent in 1966 (Huff, 1994, p. 291). Over 90 percent of the population still lived in slums and squatter settlements in 1959 (HDB, n.d.). The unsanitary living conditions with poor ventilation, lighting and scarce electricity in the cramped settlements made them hotbeds for infectious diseases. After the baby boom in the early 1950s, these slum areas often saw multiple generations under one roof. The combined effect of overcrowding, poor sanitation and hazardous living conditions meant a restive population, social unrest and high crime rates.

The government took a pragmatic, utilitarian approach to addressing these issues with the aim of creating the greatest good for the greatest number of people. While its overriding concern was securing Singapore’s economic future (Vasoo & Lee, 2001, p. 277), it also sought to strengthen core areas of social well-being, such as education, public housing and social security, by building on the basic infrastructure left behind by the colonial powers. At the same time, it tried to instil a culture of resilience among the populace; one where hard work was rewarded and self-reliance encouraged (Maisharah, 2008, p. 18). The government hoped that a Malayan culture, composed of aspects of all the various ethnic groups, would take root over time. It recognised four languages – Malay, English, Mandarin and Tamil – as Singapore’s official languages while envisioning that Malay would become the de facto national language from widespread use (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009). It also continued to implement the 1958 Master Plan for rebuilding Singapore to create the necessary infrastructural foundation for economic development.

The need for education was not just to cope with the increasing number of children reaching school-going age each year, but also to meet the demand for an educated workforce to further the state’s economic goals. The PAP government took over “community-based education” (Gopinathan, 1991, p. 273) with “new schools built, thousands of teachers trained – all this in a hurry” (Lee, 2008, p. 274). The result was a homogenised education system that sought to reduce friction between the elite and the masses. The initiative also depoliticised schools that were hotbeds for student political riots in the 1950s.

By 1960, the old Singapore Improvement Trust (SIT) had been replaced by the Housing and Development Board (HDB) to guide the country’s public housing programme. In its first three years, the HDB built almost as many houses and shops as SIT did in its 32 years – at a rate of 40 units per minute, according to a 1963 government broadcast (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009). Five years later, 23.2 percent of the population was already living in HDB units (Lim, 1989, p. 182), and 40 percent by 1974 (Arumugam, 1974). The 1968 Public Housing Scheme proved especially crucial to making HDB ownership affordable as Singaporeans could now use their savings in the Central Provident Fund (CPF) scheme to purchase HDB flats. In the words of the founding Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew (Lee, 2000, p. 90), “My primary preoccupation was to give every citizen a stake in the country and its future. I want a home-owning society. I have seen the contrast between blocks of low-cost rental apartments, badly misused and poorly maintained, [and] those of house-proud owners, and was convinced that if every family owned its home, the country would be more stable.” Such
a stake was made achievable by the government's commitment to pricing flats affordably – with sale prices maintained at about two years' income – through to the 1990s (Yuen, 2007).

The PAP also integrated the People's Association (PA) – its grassroots arm established in 1960 – with existing networks of community centres (CCs), Citizens' Consultative Committees (CCCs) and Residents' Committees (RCs). In addition to the provision of social programmes, these centres and committees had a political agenda in promoting the government's political message, thus blurring the boundaries between the social and political spheres (Maisharah, 2008). The PA proved to be one of the government's most successful political tools because PA activists and organisers were trained in official PAP ideology and how different government ministries functioned, making them effective intermediaries between the party and the people. Between November 1962 and December 1963, the government constructed 121 community centres, adding to the 59 it inherited from the British in 1959 (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009). This network of grassroots organisations posed a challenge to the traditional clan associations and acted as the basis of future community organising.

The government also established the basic framework of social infrastructure, refining the CPF scheme left behind by the colonial government. This retirement scheme was a form of “forced saving” (Peebles & Wilson, 2002, p. 46-47) based on contributions by employers and employees. The aim was to raise the overall savings rates of those in stable employment so that workers would be able to support themselves after retirement and not have to rely on the government. The funds also served as a “pension fund managed by the government” (Lim, 1989, p. 187), with contributions helping to finance some social needs such as retirement, education and housing.

In 1963, the government created the Public Utilities Board to provide running water, electricity, gas, improved sanitation and sewage. It transformed public health by bringing primary healthcare closer to the people. It not only built public hospitals, but also school, maternal and child clinics. It also ran mass campaigns against diseases such as tuberculosis (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009). These policies served to pave the way for merger with the territories of Malaya, Sabah and Sarawak to form Malaysia. The PAP had long envisioned this as the ultimate goal for Singapore. The final obstacle in this path, the opposition from Barisan Socialis, was removed with Operation Cold Store in 1963.

Concerted efforts at social development from 1963 to 1965, the abortive period of merger with the federation of Malaysia, were largely hindered by the clash between the PAP's multi-ethnic vision of Malaysia and UMNO's desire to prioritise bumiputras in national development. Long-term planning was also disrupted by continual crises during this time – confrontation with Indonesia followed by disputes over the common market with Malaysia, mutual electoral interference by the PAP and UMNO, and the July 1964 racial riots in Singapore. By 1965, most political energy – and indeed public attention – was focused on this struggle over the foundational basis for a unified Malaysia. This resolved itself dramatically and abruptly in August 1965 with the separation of Singapore from Malaysia.

The shift in Singapore's geopolitical position created great anxiety in the island state and for its PAP government, with its location in a potentially hostile and volatile Southeast Asia and imminent British military withdrawal combining to make its survival as a country uncertain. Among Lee Kuan Yew's first priorities was the development of Singapore's defence capabilities. This led to the introduction of National Service in July 1967 to “deter any threat to Singapore's survival” (Toh Chin Chye, quoted in Quah, 1977, p. 214). Beyond its practical function of building an army, National Service became one of the government's most important nation-building instruments. As S. Rajaratnam, a founding member of the PAP, put it, “When young Chinese, Malays, Indians and Eurasians train together to defend and die for their country, then they become true blood brothers” (Frost & Balasinghamchow, 2009).

The PAP's unquestioned primacy following separation enabled it to implement its vision of multiracialism as a basis for Singapore's identity, and thereby begin to construct a sense of belonging via two main strategies. The first was the provision of a stable economic basis for an industrial class of workers. The second was the creation of national commonalities through multiracial public housing and universal education in English, with the compulsory teaching of a second language. Daily flag-raising and pledge-
taking ceremonies were also introduced in schools to promote the sense of belonging and unity. Indeed the institutionalisation of English as the primary language of instruction had a significant impact on the fledgling economy; the fact that “the leaders and people of Singapore spoke English” (Lee, 2008, p. 271) was a key attraction for multinational corporations to set up offices here.

However, persistent population growth, illiteracy and organised crime – alongside the economic damage of separation from Malaysia followed in quick succession by the British military withdrawal in 1968 – posed hindrances to both social and economic development during this period. These multiple challenges justified quasi-authoritarian actions in policies such as the 1966 Compulsory Land Acquisition Act and the 1967 Trade Unions Bill (which broke up the Amalgamated Union of Public Employees). With PAP’s sweep of the 1968 elections came the passage of the Employment Act and Industrial Relations (Amendment) Act to promote industrial peace and discipline among the workforce. Later that year, the Development Bank of Singapore commenced operations, providing loans and financial assistance for industry development while supporting projects from the Urban Renewal Programme and tourist schemes.

With the major threats to governmental legitimacy eliminated, Lee initiated a more ambitious project of developing Singapore into an industrial hub, adopting a developmental state approach to encourage infrastructure growth. Jurong Town Corporation was launched in 1968 to develop local industrial estates. The Economic Development Board, formed in 1961 to develop local industry and attract foreign investment, expanded overseas. The National Wage Council was established in 1972 to formally structure the tripartite system in the economic sphere. In 1972, Rajaratnam also articulated the PAP’s view of Singapore as being foremost a global city. That called for emphasising quality economic development to maximise productivity in view of its human resource constraints. Lee reaffirmed this in his National Day address in the same year.

Given this continued search for economic sustainability, the narrative of survival remained the main unifying force in Singapore. The PAP’s 1973 election campaign was structured around the two messages of non-communalism and survival against foreign threats. Accordingly, the government placed emphasis on self-reliance and individual effort, with capacity building in the welfare sector coming secondary to the imperatives of economic development and reform. Perhaps one of the upsides of separation was the fact that it allowed the government to “convince [the people] to make immediate sacrifices” (Peebles & Wilson, 2002, p. 32). This was important because many problems emerged in this period that had to be quickly solved through cooperative effort.

The Ministry of Culture and Social Affairs under Othman Wok continued the welfare work taken over from the British through the Singapore Council of Social Services and Social Welfare Department. It also had to handle two other mandates: legal aid and firefighting. National campaigns were the preferred method of mass mobilisation with the initiatives serving as early attempts to build a community-minded society but remaining limited in scope. More worrying than the unity of Singapore was what Lee termed a “qualitative worsening of the population” (Arumugam, 1974). His continued insecurity about Singapore’s capability to compete in the global economy led to the prioritisation of meritocratic achievement above distributive equity. The many political and economic changes during this period only deepened the PAP subscription to a social-democratic ideology which strongly emphasised self-help and family and kin group support (Peebles & Wilson, 2002, p. 27) as the main means of improving community welfare.

**Community Initiatives**

The community worked alongside the government through the transition and helped to alleviate difficult circumstances as and when they arose. Several existing and new community initiatives formalised their activities through registration as VWOs and charities. This improved the channels of collaboration between the community and the government, allowing for greater social service with government initiatives and community efforts working in tandem (Maisharah, 2008). The newspapers helped to publicise calls for donations and updated the public on funds raised. In one case, the Straits Times collected $42,500 in donations from the public who had read about the plight of eight children, orphaned after the tragic death of their mother in a road accident (The Straits Times, 1964b).
Women continued to play an important role, especially in addressing the needs of the underprivileged. The Asian Women’s Welfare Association (AWWA) was set up in 1970 by a group of volunteers to help impoverished women and later special needs children and the elderly. AWWA also emphasised community-centred social welfare in providing family-based services in education and counselling (AWWA, n.d.).

Members of the Rotary Club, which expanded greatly in this period, spearheaded a number of VWOs. To foster unity among the VWOs, especially in fundraising, the first-ever coordinated exhibition cum fundraiser was held in 1962. This event saw different VWOs come together to inform the public on their causes as well as gather funds. Run annually until 1970, it was an opportunity for VWOs in Singapore to fundraise and provided a mechanism for them to promote their cause in a coordinated fashion (NCSS, 2008, p. 15).

Greater ownership of community spaces was seen in Operation Broomstick, a cleaning-up campaign launched by the Citizens’ Consultative Committees (CCC) in their respective constituencies (Leong, 2005). The campaign was part of the larger national campaign against pollution and littering called Keep Singapore Clean that was launched in October 1968. The community played a huge part in the success of the campaign. Volunteer brigades, formed by members of the CCCs, were part of Operation Big Clean, another community-based initiative taken to keep Singaporean homes and the environment clean (The Straits Times, 1969).

Notably, the Chinese clan associations that were traditional leaders in community philanthropy found themselves reconsidering their mandates in light of the initiatives introduced by the new government. For instance, their role in providing employment was now the mandate of the Ministry of Labour. Housing and resettlement was managed by the Housing and Development Board while the provision of education was centralised under the Ministry of Education (MOE). The clan associations found themselves moving more towards kinship support such as funeral arrangements, social events and support for welfare services (Tan, 2005). They continued to receive financial and non-financial support for these activities from their members and traditional businesses.

**Box 5: Lee Ah Mooi Old Age Home**

In 1963, Madam Lee Ah Mooi set up the Lee Ah Mooi Old Age Home to provide nursing care to Samsui women who worked hard to contribute to Singapore’s development both during British colonial rule and as an independent nation. Madam Lee took it upon herself to care for them as most had taken vows not to marry and hence had no children to look after them in their old age.

After some resistance from neighbours who disliked the presence of sickness and death within close proximity of their homes, the Home moved in 1984 and settled into its present location on 1 Thomson Lane from where Madam Lee continued to provide skilled nursing care and rehabilitation services to people with illness, injuries or functional disabilities (Netherlands Charity Association, 2015).

Upon her passing in 1992, the management of the Home passed to her two sons, Then Mun Wah and Then Mun Tat. Today, the Home is run and administered by Madam Lee’s grandsons – cousins Then Kim Yuan and Aaron Then. The Home is now a private nursing facility providing quality healthcare services to 110 elderly residents from low- and middle-income families.

As shared by Then Kim Yuan, the Home’s mission is “to keep our fees at least 30 percent lower than the market and to make our services more accessible to lower income families” (The Straits Times, 2014). The cousins’ innovation and desire to run the Home efficiently are in line with their vision to provide “a more humanistic, holistic and multi-dimensional care” for the residents who are unable to care for themselves (Napier Healthcare, 2014).

The Home is supported by monetary and in-kind contributions from a number of agencies and organisations. In 2013, ParexGroup adopted the Home as its charitable project. Its staff was given time off to visit the residents, organise weekend karaoke sessions and interact with them. It also raised $30,000 which went towards upgrading the Home’s facilities and buying essentials for the residents (Parex, 2013).

On June 12, 2014, the inaugural Balestier Heritage Race, co-organised by the Ramada and Days Hotels Singapore at Zhongshan Park and Web in Travel, successfully raised $12,688 for the Home (Web in Travel, 2014).
Crisis Response

Volunteer kampong fire-fighting squads continued to be indispensable in providing early warning and response to potentially devastating fires. The 38 squads that were formed in the urban kampongs at the end of 1958 increased to 82 in 1960 (Loh, 2007, p. 29). In 1961 alone, they helped to extinguish more than 15 kampong fires (Loh, 2013, p. 104). When communal riots broke out in 1964, goodwill committees run by community leaders were set up in every constituency to calm rising tensions between the Malays and the Chinese (Han, 2014).

The people also came together to respond to public appeals for urgent blood donation, particularly between 1959 and 1970 when demand was high. Approximately 190 potential donors responded to the Blood Bank’s urgent call in 1967 (The Straits Times, 1967). A year later, the Red Cross Society’s campaign to enrol new blood donors saw an average of 110 donations a day in the first month (The Straits Times, 1968b). Rotary members also donated blood at the Blood Transfusion Service in 1971 (The Straits Times, 1971a).

Education

While the government built schools, the affordability of education for the underprivileged was a growing concern. In addition to government subsidies and grants, the community came together to sponsor bursaries and scholarships for those in need. Within four months of being opened to the public in 1973,
the People’s Scholarship Fund put forward by the Ministry of Communications raised $2 million (People’s Scholarship Fund, 1973, p. 2). Among the contributors to the fund were three bus companies and their workers who together pledged $250,000 (The Straits Times, 1973a) and 10,000 workers at the Singapore Industrial Labour Organisation who donated a day’s worth of wages (The Straits Times, 1973b). The SHHK also continued to provide bursaries to help needy students with good academic results (The Straits Times, 1973c).

Attention was also directed towards providing education and training for children with special needs. In 1960, the Singapore Children’s Society established a subcommittee to lead the effort. Members of the Rotary Club contributed $13,000 to set up a pilot day training centre in Towner Road, serving 26 children with intellectual disabilities (The Straits Times, 1963). With the government’s provision of a building in Ah Hood Road and another $18,000 donation from the Rotary Club, the training centre was formalised and expanded to enrol up to 80 children in 1962. Originally known as the Singapore Association for Retarded Children, this became the Movement for the Intellectually Disabled (MINDS) in 1985. Since then, more training centres and shelters for the intellectually disabled have been set up with money raised through flag days and other fundraising efforts (The Straits Times, 1988). In 2015, MINDS served 2,400 clients from the age of six upwards in four special schools, three employment development centres, three-day training and development centres, and one multi-service residential home (MINDS, n.d.). The Rotary Club also played a crucial role in spearheading efforts to foster the inclusion of people with physical disabilities when Rotarian Leslie Rayner and a team of volunteers initiated a workshop in 1967 to aid the physically disabled in seeking employment. Eventually, this shelter flourished into a sustainable charity – the Society for the Physically Disabled – in 1970 (Society for the Physically Disabled, n.d.).

Several voluntary healthcare initiatives were registered during this period. Dr. Khoo Oon Teik started the National Kidney Foundation (NKF) in 1969 after losing his brother to kidney disease. The cost of dialysis treatment was exorbitant and kidney transplants rare, making affordable treatment for such patients urgent. With public funds and donations, Dr. Khoo and other volunteer doctors set up the first dialysis unit to provide subsidised dialysis treatment and rehabilitative care for kidney failure patients. This subsequently developed into the present-day NKF (National Kidney Foundation Singapore, n.d.).

Volunteer efforts also addressed taboo healthcare concerns. For instance, the Singapore Leprosy Relief Foundation, set up in 1971, built upon the efforts of the Trafalgar Home. The new home catering to destitute former victims of leprosy was funded by the Lee Foundation, the Reuben Meyer Trust and the Rotary Club of Singapore (New Nation, 1971). The home provided food, shelter and healthcare to these patients (Singapore Leprosy Relief Association, n.d.).

Corporate Initiatives

With the government working to build the economic pillars of the country and the people seeking to meet immediate welfare needs, businesses were seen contributing to longer-term investments in infrastructure.

Several companies contributed to the National Defence Fund, both during and after the merger with Malaysia. Fraser and Neave gave $20,000 to the fund alone, there were 307 cases per 100,000 people (Chong, 2010). Poor housing and sanitation in post-war Singapore facilitated the rapid spread of the disease, exacerbating the situation. The Singapore Anti-Tuberculosis Association (SATA) launched a community mass X-ray campaign which included the use of mobile X-ray units to reach out and screen wider swathes of the population. With generous contributions from philanthropists like Lee Kong Chian and G. Uttamram, SATA was able to establish additional clinics and rehabilitation centres to deal with the disease more effectively (SATA CommHealth, 2012, p. 9).

Tuberculosis was an imminent epidemic in Singapore during the 1950s and 1960s with more than 5,000 new cases emerging every year. In 1960

---

7 The fund had initially been proposed by Tengku Abdul Rahman to raise necessary money to defend Malaya during Konfrontasi between 1963 and 1966, a period of confrontation with Indonesia which opposed the formation of Malaysia from the Federation of Malaya, Sabah, Sarawak and Singapore. (The Straits Times, 1964). However even after separation, both countries continued to raise funds for their respective shares.
in 1964 in addition to a personal donation of $50,000 from its Board Chairman Tan Chin Tuan (The Straits Times, 1964a). The post-1965 National Defence Fund received $8.29 million in donations by 1969 (The Straits Times, 1969), including $150,000 from Overseas United Bank, $63,325 from the Chinese Chamber of Commerce, and $25,000 from Sheng Huo Enterprise (The Straits Times, 1968). Alongside these major corporate donations were those that aggregated funds raised from employees, such as the $42,190 from the Singapore Manual and Mercantile Workers' Union (The Straits Times, 1968a) and $44,240 from a group of sundries and textiles merchant unions (The Straits Times, 1968b).

Another important national fundraising campaign was the Medical Progress Fund to construct medical facilities. Launched by the University of Singapore in 1965, it aimed to raise $4.75 million for extensions to its medical faculty, including units for open-heart surgery, kidney transplants and brain surgery (The Straits Times, 1965a). The fund was especially popular with companies as memorial donations gave them the opportunity to be honoured in hospital ward names (The Straits Times, 1965b). Major donors included the Singapore Turf Club ($100,000), Singapore Tobacco Company ($30,000), The Straits Times ($12,500), and a group of local brokerages ($12,120). The hearing aid company Oticon signalled a growing linkage of corporate and social aims by establishing a trust fund for the deaf and donating 20 hearing aids for underprivileged hearing-impaired children (The Straits Times, 1973d).

Corporates also actively contributed to sports and education development in the country. The Singapore Turf Club gave $200,000 to the National Sports Promotion Board in 1971 (The Straits Times, 1971b) while others such as the Singapore Tobacco Company gave to the Singapore Amateur Football Association (The Straits Times, 1965c). Caltex gave a “substantial donation” to the Achilles Club in 1965 that enabled the track and field club to continue to compete (The Straits Times, 1965d). Multiple companies donated scholarships and equipment to the University of Singapore. Haw Par Brothers gave $20,000 for medical students (The Straits Times, 1974). The local bus firm also pledged to participate in the scholarship fund drive in 1973 (The Straits Times, 1973a). Nanyang University also received donations of $60,000 and $10,000 from the Hokkien Economic Development Company and Hong Leong, respectively (The Straits Times, 1967). Appeals to businesses by institutions below the tertiary level tended to be for building funds. Maris Stella High School and Anglo-Chinese Junior College each received $100,000 from the Singapore Turf Club (The Straits Times, 1970) while the St Margaret's School Building Fund received $20,000 from Shell (Singapore Free Press, 1960).

Arts bodies in Singapore also benefitted. The Shaw brothers made a major donation of $250,000 to establish a National Arts Gallery in 1963 (The Straits Times, 1963a) and the Singapore Turf Club gave $100,000 to the Singapore Arts Council in 1967 (The Straits Times, 1967). The subsequent Academy of Arts building fund raised $823,000 in 1968, including $120,000 from Prima Flour Mills (The Straits Times, 1968). Between 1962 and 1971, the Singapore Turf Club gave over $5 million to sports, education and the arts in Singapore. In 1973 alone, it donated $1.4 million to 73 bodies, including $300,000 to the Singapore Sports Council, $100,000 each to the Hwa Chong building and People's Scholarship funds, and $50,000 each to Catholic Junior College, Singapore International School, the University of Singapore's medical school, and Mount Alvernia Hospital (The Straits Times, 1973e).

On a less high-profile scale, companies continued to sponsor the Department of Social Welfare's homes as well as the activities of other advocates for handicapped children. For instance, Malayan Packaging Association donated $42,850 to the Spastic Children's Association (The Straits Times, 1963b) while Oasis Theatre Restaurant, Niteclub and Cabaret Enterprises gave $15,000 in cash and books to homes under the Department of Social Welfare (The Straits Times, 1972a). The tradition of community self-help was evident even in organised labour with local unions pledging to give $30,000 to help sick and handicapped members (The Straits Times, 1972b). Such corporate donations supported the work of welfare organisations which lacked full government financing for their operations. While many willing volunteers could be found, particularly among non-working women, businesses were needed to underwrite material aid.

In 1971, the Singapore Council of Social Service launched the Yusof Ishak Welfare Fund to encourage donations from the public and businesses. The fund
Box 7: Fundraising for the National Theatre, 1959

To stimulate the growth and appreciation of the arts as well as foster a Malayan culture and identity among the people, the government initiated the construction of the National Theatre in 1959. To ensure that this was a “People’s Theatre”, the government decided to involve all segments of the population in raising funds for the theatre. It initiated several fundraising drives, including a National Loyalty Week to sell concert tickets and souvenir cards, and “a-dollar-a-brick” campaign which raised $856,000 from the public (Singapore Free Press, 1959). Together with contributions from corporates such as the Singapore Insurance Companies Employees Union, Asia Life Assurance Society, Aun Kway Association and Pak Seng Hong, the construction of the National Theatre was completed in 1963 at a cost of $2.4 million (The Straits Times, 1964c).

aimed to “make charities a systematic business” by coordinating charity organisations’ work and donations (The Straits Times, 1971e). By 1974, the fund had received some $198,000 in donations, with a notable donation of $48,000 from various companies in January 1974 (The Strait Times, 1974).

Conclusion

The first years of independence were a test of the ruling party’s ability to deliver on its promises of economic prosperity despite the odds. With the government’s immediate priority being national survival, social welfare needs took a backseat to the development of basic infrastructure such as public housing, social security, sanitation and industrial regulation to support economic growth. In the meantime, it promulgated the social-democratic ideals of self-help and family support as the means to improve community welfare. The corporate community saw a gap in long-term infrastructure development and directed its philanthropic efforts there. Together the relationship was complementary between immediate and long-term needs, and economic and social needs.
Expansion of Social Welfare and Advocacy  
(August 1975 – November 1990)

The government’s economic development strategies were so successful in the first 10 years of independence that per capita income grew at a phenomenal rate, rising from $1,580 in 1965 to $6,067 in 1979 (Lee, 2008; Department of Statistics Singapore, 2015). With a solid manufacturing base and political stability, the country surged ahead in industrial development. To position it for further growth, the government modified education policies, expanded technology and computer education, offered financial incentives to industrial enterprises, and launched a productivity campaign (Ministry of Communication and Information, 2015).

The period was characterised by “efficiency-driven” development (Goh & Gopinathan, 2006, p. 25) with a clear shift from just quantity to quality. This was in tandem with the state’s desire to progress from “a ‘third-league’ labour-intensive industrialising country to a ‘second-league’ capital-intensive economy” (Goh & Gopinathan, 2006, p. 25). Alongside this, changes were made to the education system between 1985 and 1991 that “reduced wastage, increased flexibility within the school systems, gave greater autonomy to schools and provided greater access to higher education” (Goh & Gopinathan, 2006, p. 31).

Its economic plans secured, the government started to pay more attention to developing a stronger communal identity for the nation. Standards of living had been rising. With that a growing materialism and consumer culture had emerged, particularly among the war baby and post-war baby boomer generation. These individuals were born into poverty or knew it as children, but managed to transition out of it to become civil servants and professionals. There were more privately owned cars on the road and more instances of investing in and moving to private housing. The new and young middle class emulated western ideals, a result of influence from the West and an English-medium education. They eschewed the traditional Asian family setup (where grandparents, parents and children stayed under the same roof) for nuclear family units (Lee, 2008).

Yet there remained a considerable population that was not as well-off or as well-educated. These unskilled workers often toiled under poor conditions where industrial accidents were common and jobs were more vulnerable to business volatilities (Heyzer, 1983, p. 387). Women working in these sectors were especially vulnerable as they tended to lack technical skills, giving them lower status and thus lower pay. In the 1974 recession, nearly 79 percent of retrenched employees were women. Women were also among the first to be laid off when the government started to focus on capital-intensive and high technology industry (Wong, 1981).

The presence of such underprivileged groups prompted a shift in the latter half of the 1970s away from the global city image of Singapore to a renewed emphasis on national identity. Economic development, common social experiences (education, National Service and housing) (Quah, 1977), and an ASEAN identity provided the fundamental basis of attachment to Singapore. Yet there was a need to develop civil society and defuse social conflict (Sebastian, 1997) in light of emerging inequality and dissension within the formerly quiescent political scene. The government’s messaging shifted from a singular ideology of survival to a careful management of pluralism and encouragement of diverse community stakeholders, prompting the emergence of the tripartite model of government, non-government and corporate sectors as the means to address social and community issues (Chua & Wong, 2003).

Promoting local arts and culture was one approach used to cultivate national consciousness and negating influences associated with a “yellow culture” of the “decadent West” (Kong, 2000). The Singapore Symphony Orchestra (SSO) was mooted and formed in 1978 with the aim to “enrich the local cultural scene, serving as a bridge between the musical traditions of Asia and the West, and providing artistic inspiration, entertainment and education” (Singapore Symphony Orchestra, n.d., para. 1). The orchestra had its own endowment fund from its inception, the first nonprofit arts organisation to have this in Singapore. To ensure other arts groups also had support, the Singapore Cultural Foundation (SCF) was formed the same year to serve as the fundraising arm for the arts – “a repository for tax-exempt donations from individuals...
and corporate organisations“ (Lim, 2009, para. 2). The head of the SCF’s fundraising committee was banker and philanthropist Lien Ying Chow. He and the rest of the team served as volunteers, working closely with the Ministry of Culture’s Cultural Affairs Division to introduce a system of quarterly funding cycles and devising a series of grant schemes such as scholarships and seed grants for new arts initiatives (Lim, 2009).

Following opposition leader J.B. Jeyaretnam’s victory in the 1981 Anson by-election, the government put additional effort into renewing its grassroots ties. One area of reform was the revival of ethnic self-help groups with the registration of the Malay-Muslim group Mendaki as a foundation in 1982. Mendaki sought to boost the academic and socio-economic performance of Malay-Muslims, a community the 1980 Population Census had highlighted as being underperforming (Suratman, 2005).

The government also promoted a return to Asian values (Hill & Lian, 1995). A 1979 report paved the way for national civics education to defend Singapore against the negative impacts of Westernisation and social degeneration. There was also a crackdown on drug addiction, long hair and other practices perceived as morally bankrupt. In 1989, the government implemented an Ethnic Integration Policy in the HDB estates to ensure that ethnic enclaves did not take root (HDB, 2015). It was, in the words of current Deputy Prime Minister Tharman Shanmugaratnam, “the most intrusive social policy in Singapore”, but it was crucial to ensuring inter-racial cohesion within the population (The Straits Times, 2015).

While the 1988 elections promised more good years, in a period of political transition with Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew’s imminent retirement, maintaining economic growth became a growing concern for the government. Global economic difficulties contributed to the 1985 recession and severely impacted Singapore’s niches of semiconductor production and shipbuilding. Internally, Singapore’s rapid pace of economic growth slowed sharply with savings outweighing investment and the construction boom of the 1970s waning. The Economic Committee predicted further difficulties ahead, writing that “the period of easy growth is now over” and recommending wage cuts to bring income in line with slower productivity growth (Ministry of Trade and Industry, 1986). In such times of economic uncertainty and increasing insecurity for the needy, community and corporate participation was extremely welcomed, rallied by the formation of the Community Chest in September 1983 under the auspices of the Singapore Council of Social Services (NCSS, 2015). Like its predecessor, the Yusof Ishak Fund, the Community Chest acted as a central fundraising vehicle to more efficiently process charitable donations and reduce competition for donations among charities. The Community Chest allowed these organisations – particularly the smaller, less resourced ones – to focus on service delivery instead. By providing a legitimate and accountable avenue for community giving, the Community Chest made donations more forthcoming; the perception that the Community Chest was monitoring the performance of member charities gave people the confidence to give more.

**Corporate Initiatives**

Just as corporations had channelled their support through national-scale funds (e.g., the National Theatre Fund and Medical Progress Fund) in the decade after independence, they also rallied behind the government in the early days of the Community Chest. Funding exceeded the $1 million mark by November 1983. Major donors included the Khoo Foundation ($100,000); POSB Centenary Trust and KFC ($50,000 each); Esso, DBS Recreation Club, and CK Tang ($20,000 each) (The Straits Times, 1983b). On a smaller scale, flea market owner C.K. Tseng pledged $400 or about four percent of his monthly profits while special corporate events raised $45,000, particularly from jogathons. Indeed, this method of public fundraising proved popular with a 1987 OUB Charity-Walk-A-Jog raising $115,000 (The Straits Times, 1987d) and a golf charity open that same year raising $180,000 for various charities (The Business Times, 1987). Subsequently, major donations of $100,000 each came from General Electric in 1984, SIA from 1985 to 1987 (The Straits Times, 1987e), Singapore Reinsurance in 1986 (The Straits Times, 1987f), and Asahi Electronics in 1988 (The Straits Times, 1988a).

The Community Chest was not the only avenue that corporations used to give back to the community. In fact, in this period, there was a growing trend towards more nuanced and considered philanthropy by businesses in Singapore. A Straits Times survey (Saw, 1978) found that larger companies practiced
Box 8: New Ways of Corporate Giving Inspired by the Community Chest

The scale of fundraising as well as the level of publicity that the Community Chest received inspired new forms of giving and attempts to raise funds among corporate entities. Some examples include:

**Profit Pledges**

Several companies pledged a percentage of their sales such as the repeated NTUC Star Buys Annual Charity Drive. In 1986, JAL raised $50,000 for elderly services by donating $5 from each ticket sold (The Straits Times, 1986b) while Kalm donated $20,000 from one day's proceeds in 1989 (The Straits Times, 1989b). In 1990, Tan Chong gave $400,000, its proceeds from pledging $100 per car sold (The Straits Times, 1990g). Others pledged dollar-for-dollar matching donations for their employees' donations (Tan, 1979). Hewlett-Packard had already initiated such a scheme in 1977 and gave $42,400 to the Community Chest; by 1984, its scheme had raised $300,000 (The Straits Times, 1984a). Esso and Guthrie also participated in this scheme with the launch of the Community Chest (The Straits Times, 1983a).

**Payroll Deductions**

The Community Chest's Social Help and Assistance Raised by Employees (SHARE) initiative channelled corporate giving through employee payroll deductions. Essentially, this approach allowed companies to take credit for fundraising when their workers participated in the programme (Community Chest, 2009). In 1983, 16 companies had responded to a call for $1-a-worker donations (Koh, 1983). By 1987, 94,000 people donated an average of $4 monthly through the programme. In that same year, the Singapore Medical Association (SMA) signed up to the programme and SHARE made up almost half of total donations by 1989. The SHARE executive programme encouraged companies to second their managers to Community Chest (The Straits Times, 1985b). Twelve executives gave four to 10 hours a week in 1985, aiming to raise SHARE participation to 70,000 people. The Community Chest recognised these efforts with 63 companies honoured in 1987 for high participation rate in the SHARE programme and another 40 in 1989 for general contributions to welfare work (The Straits Times, 1987a).
The arts became a popular cause for corporate giving, receiving headline donations from large multinationals as well as local businesses. In 1978, the Nanyang Press sponsored Singapore’s first drama festival as part of the National Day celebrations, providing a chance for local ethnic drama groups to perform (Tan, 2003). In 1981, SIA sponsored round-trip tickets as part of the Singapore Innovations in Art contemporary art competition which it jointly organised with the Ministry of Culture (Lim, 2010). UOB Bank gave $10,000, $3,000 and $2,000 to prizewinners of the UOB Painting of the Year Award (Lye, 1988). On a personal level, an anonymous contractor spent $300,000 in 1987 to sponsor a Beijing dance troupe’s performance in Singapore (The Straits Times, 1987b). Yeo Khee Lim, chairman of Tong Fong Company, gave $50,000 to establish a calligraphy foundation in 1988 (The Straits Times, 1988).

To encourage corporate citizens and philanthropists who supported the arts to continue to give generously, the National Arts Council introduced the Patron of the Arts Award in 1983. At the inaugural award ceremony, Mobil Oil, Singapore Turf Club, Singapore Tourist Promotion Board and Singapore Airlines were recognised for supporting and promoting cultural activities with annual donations of at least $100,000 for each of the previous three years. From 1983 to 1985, the six patrons, 11 friends and six associates recognised through the Patron of the Arts Award had contributed a staggering $11.4 million (Wong, 1987).

The sports were another sector that received headline donations. In 1981, Ovaltine-Wander Sports Service made an initial grant of $500,000 (to be disbursed over five years) to the Singapore Sports Council for constituency and national level sports. At the same time, the Singapore Turf Club donated $140,000 for constituency sports and the Pesta Sukan (The Straits Times, 1981). Reflecting the importance of sports to Singapore’s identity, Borneo Motors donated $200,000 in 1989 for a Malaysia Cup soccer campaign (The Straits Times, 1989a). Two media campaigns also called on national patriotism to raise funds. In 1990 the Straits Times launched a Spirit of Singapore appeal that saw Singapura United Tobacco give $100,000 (The Straits Times, 1990a). This followed the Times of Singapore publication, A Salute to Singapore, which raised $220,000 for charity in 1985 (The Straits Times, 1985a).

Foundations

An earlier generation of socially conscious Asian corporate leaders began to shift their giving towards more institutionalised forms in this period, preferring to give via foundations and trusts. For instance, POSB established a scholarship fund in 1977 (The Straits Times, 1982b) and Jack Chia another one under MPH in 1978 (The Business Times, 1978). In 1980, the Hong Leong Group of companies established the Hong Leong Foundation to further its charitable interests (Hong Leong Foundation, 2014). It has given red packets to public assistance recipients on a yearly basis during the Lunar New Year. In 2007, the foundation’s contribution was greater than $400,000 and impacted the lives of over 3,000 people in need, most of whom were under the government’s Public Assistance or Silver Jubilee Fund Special Grant schemes. The foundation has given long-term support to its beneficiaries and has consistently contributed approximately $650,000 annually (NCSS, 2008).

Hotelier Khoo Teck Puat contributed $20 million to launch the Khoo Foundation in 1981 (The Straits Times, 1981a). An introverted businessman, Khoo also believed in quiet philanthropy. According to his daughter Jacqueline Khoo, “Father always said, never blow your own trumpet. You don’t need to tell the world that you’re helping people. So long as you know and the recipient knows, that’s enough” (NCSS, 2008, p. 53). When he passed away in 2004, Khoo left 30 percent of his US$5 billion ($6.92 billion)2 estate to the foundation. Since his death, the foundation has contributed some of the largest private donations to causes in healthcare and education (NCSS, 2008). To expand on the biomedical research initiatives at Duke-National University of Singapore Graduate Medical School, it announced an $80 million donation in 2007. This sum was increased to $160 million with a dollar-for-dollar matching grant from the government (Duke-NUS, 2015). Also in 2007, it contributed a greater sum of $125 million towards the construction and funding of a new 550-bed hospital in Yishun, named the Khoo Teck Puat Hospital in his honour (Khoo Teck Puat Hospital, 2015).

Box 9: Lien Foundation

Founded in 1980 by Lien Ying Chow, the Lien Foundation’s principle of “radical philanthropy” and its impact-based approach have propelled it to the forefront of strategic philanthropy in Singapore today. Begun with the intention to contribute to education and needy charities (Lien & Kraar, 1992), the foundation today supports causes in three key areas – eldercare, educational opportunities, and environmental sustainability in water and sanitation (Lien Foundation, 2007a).

The Lien Foundation’s pioneering initiatives related to death and palliative care have had a visible impact on national policy. A key part of its strategy involved encouraging the public to talk about the subject of dying with initiatives such as the 2006 Life Before Death campaign. Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong encouraged their work, stating in 2009 that “[w]e need more public education and more discussions about death among patients, their families and their doctors” (Teh, 2009, para. 4).

In collaboration with the Singapore Hospice Council, the foundation launched a toll-free Hospice Helpline for public education and the first Palliative Care Fellowships and Scholarships (Chen, 2006; Lien Foundation, 2006). The Ministry of Health subsequently set up a $45.6 million fund in 2009 together with the Tote Board to expand such palliative care sector projects (Khalik, 2013). It also announced in 2012 that it would work to include “palliative care training in relevant undergraduate and diploma courses” (The Business Times, 2012, para. 3). In 2014 it announced further efforts to increase home palliative care services (Gan, 2014).

In 2008, the foundation established the Lien Centre for Palliative Care with the Duke-NUS Medical School to conduct research into palliative care (Jaganathan, 2008). This was scaled up to the Lien Collaborative for Palliative Care with the Asia Pacific Hospice Palliative Care Network in 2014. It commissioned the first empirical study – What Doctors Say About Care of the Dying – of ethical, legal and social issues (Lien Foundation, 2011) surrounding end-of-life care (Teh, 2011). It also initiated an online casebook to guide healthcare professionals in thinking about and discussing the ethical issues in healthcare and end-of-life care (Lai, 2014a).

Its other initiatives in healthcare include the development of a mobile recording system for medical professionals, which has been adopted by the Home Nursing Foundation and HCA Hospice Care (Lien Foundation, 2006c), and an integrated healthcare enterprise resource planning (ERP) system (IngoT) (Lien Foundation, 2007c). It initiated Singapore’s first residential facility for dementia patients in 2006 (The Straits Times, 2006; Lien Foundation, 2006b) and the Integrated Care in Place (ICP) Programme to prevent early onset of dementia and encourage “ageing in place” (Lien Foundation, n.d.).

More recently, the foundation has begun to invest in early childhood education. In 2012, it published a report on preschool education that ranked Singapore 29th out of 45 developed economies (Toh & Chia, 2015). This finding prompted the foundation to commission Lekker Architects to develop 10 innovative preschool designs that push the limits of learning environments. These designs were made available to the public to encourage preschool operators to think beyond conventional designs (Davie, 2014). The designs influenced centres such as My First Skool @ Braddell Heights which incorporates flexible learning spaces, technology and exploration studios (Lien Foundation and NTUC First Campus, 2013). The foundation also piloted Mission: I'mPossible (MIP) in 2009 with KK Women’s and Children’s Hospital. MIP placed a specialist team in preschools and trained teachers to identify students with mild learning difficulties (New Mission: I'mPossible Programme, 2010). It has created a powerful ripple effect with the government funding a nationwide scale-up of the project (KK Hospital, n.d.).

Chairman of the Lien Foundation Laurence Lien suggests that philanthropy could even transform the focus of the Singapore education system. By experimenting with more holistic and child-centric education, genuine alternatives to the current focus on academic performance can be found. A prototype school, driven by community volunteers and funded by philanthropic organisations, can help to set the trend for new approaches in education such as student-initiated learning and peer learning (Lien, 2013).
Community Initiatives

As the population grew more affluent, it became more feasible for people to meet their basic needs for food, shelter, education and health. With this change, community philanthropic efforts shifted to less mainstream areas, becoming more active in identifying gaps in the system and providing the resources needed to effect positive reforms.

Education for Those with Multiple Disabilities

One pioneering initiative was in developing educational facilities for children with multiple disabilities. A task force comprising Dr. Kenneth Lyen (Chairman), Professor Lee Eng Hin, Dr. Ee Peng Liang, Saras Sivagnanarathnam, Dr. Pamela Sharpe and Anna Liu came together to form the Margaret Drive Special School in 1987. This marked the birth of a centre-based early intervention programme for children with developmental delay, intellectual disability, physical disability and multiple disabilities up to four years of age, and a special school for children with multiple disabilities up to 18 years of age (NCSS, 2008). In 1989, the school started a programme called Structured Teaching for Exceptional Pupils for children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) between the ages of two and 12 years. As the first programme in Singapore to cater to children with such needs, ongoing referrals received by the school resulted in a long wait list (Rainbow Centre, n.d.).

Supporting the Elderly

Another initiative was in supporting the elderly. The population was starting to age due to a sharp decline in birth rate as well as improved life expectancy. The old-age support ratio was falling and the pressure on families to support parents and grandparents was increasing (Choo et al, 1990). Specialised medical services such as geriatric medicine and psychogeriatrics had not yet been established and those with chronic or extremely frail conditions were likely to “depend on the health and social services” (Choo et al, 1990).

In 1977, committee members of the Jogging Association of Singapore came together to establish the Singapore Action Group of Elders (SAGE) (Lim, n.d.) to “promote the continued growth and development of the elderly” (Global Hand, n.d., para. 1). They organised campaigns such as the Love, Understanding and Respect for Our Elders campaign in 1980 to impress upon the public that the seniors are still contributing individuals of society (The Straits Times, 1980a). In 1989, after 10 years of fundraising effort, SAGE opened a day care centre, Village for Elders, where senior citizens could have access to medical and social services while their families were at work (Fernando, 1984).

Koh Lai Heng started the Bukit Merah Old Folks Club in 1977 on his own to offer companionship and public assistance to aged poor in the neighbourhood. Most who joined the club were Samsui women residing alone in single-room apartments. Koh led the programme but it was later placed under the care of the Bukit Timah Citizens’ Consultative Committee in 1979 (NCSS, 2008).

There were also initiatives by the community during Senior Citizens’ Week, itself initiated by the Community Service Volunteers of SCSS and supported by the People’s Association and Social Welfare Department (NCSS, 2008). In 1979, the Apex Club of Singapore held a free screening of a Mandarin movie, The Last Woman of Shang, for the elderly (The Straits Times, 1979a). In 1983, about 1,000 elderly were entertained by a song and dance show at Chung Cheng High School (The Straits Times, 1983c). The elderly themselves also participated actively during Senior Citizens’ Week. In 1981, more than 1,000 senior citizens from 101 clubs planned the first fashion show by elderly in Singapore (Tan, 1981).

Addressing the Needs of Dysfunctional Families

1. Support for Troubled Teens and Their Parents

Several initiatives also sprouted up in the area of counselling and social support services for troubled teenagers, latchkey children and their parents. In June 1981, a group of youth volunteers founded Singapore’s first crisis centre to provide temporary shelters for people experiencing difficulties in their personal lives (e.g., conflicts at home and at work) (Yap, 1981). The centre took on cases referred by the Care and Counselling Centre (CCS) and the Samaritans of Singapore (SOS) (Yang, 1981), providing social and emotional support to complement the services of existing social agencies (Yap, 1981).
Other outreach and counselling initiatives specifically targeted teenagers. In 1982, SOS conducted a six-week drive in schools and youth clubs to create awareness among youths of the problems they might encounter in adolescence (e.g., peer pressure, boy-girl relationships, coping with school work) and the services available to them (e.g., Youth Groups at Community Centres and recreational programmes by organisations) (Hedwig, 1982). Social worker Yeng Beng Choo herself initiated an independent counselling programme in 1982 for four troubled teenage girls from low-income single parent families (New Nation, 1982).

Helplines were also instituted to reach out to troubled children and parents. In 1984, the Singapore Children’s Society piloted Tinker Friend, a toll-free helpline for latchkey primary school children in Toa Payoh which was later extended nationwide (Lee, 1986). This project served the increasing number of school children returning to an empty home. As mothers began participating in the labour force (Danker, 1984), the risk of juvenile delinquency if exposed to negative peer pressure increased (Singapore Monitor, 1984). The volunteer-manned helpline provided companionship, advice and information, among other things (The Straits Times, 1985c; 1987c). In July 1986, the hotline Dial-A-Teen was set up for 10 weeks by the Singapore Youth for Christ to reach out to troubled teenagers (The Straits Times, 1986d). In January 1988, the Paya Lebar Methodist Church launched Parentline, a well received helpline for parents experiencing problems with disobedient preschool children as well as troubled teenage children (Kaur, 1988).

2. Support for Single Parents and Divorcees

With the liberalisation of divorce laws in the Women’s Charter in 1980, the number of divorces per annum increased rapidly, from 730 in 1975 to 2,313 cases in 1984 (The Straits Times, 1986a). This brought with it a rising number of single-parent families. In 1980, the Singapore Association of Social Workers (SASW) proposed the formation of support groups for single parents (The Straits Times, 1980b). These support groups did not replicate the services of social agencies (e.g., counselling, financial needs, and child care) but rather aimed to help parents in the more practical aspects of single parenthood (e.g., gaining independence) (New Nation, 1980).

The Canossaville Children’s Home also initiated the Single Parent Encounter (SPE) (Canossaville Children’s Home, 2012). In 1986, after a year in operation for 140 English-speaking single parents, it planned to expand its network to include more single parents from the Mandarin-speaking group as well as those in Malaysia. Some members were also trained to provide aid to other single parents (The Straits Times, 1986c).

Other centres also provided practical aid to single parents. The Canossian Daughters of Charity launched the Helping Every Lone Parent (HELP) Family Service Centre in 1985 in response to a call by SCSS for community initiatives to help single parents (Danker 1985a; Canossaville Children’s Home, 2012). It received funding of $90,000 yearly from the Community Chest (Danker, 1985a) to provide day care to school going children while their single parents were at work. It also helped single parents look for nurseries for preschoolers and subsidised or waived day care fees for those who could not afford them (Danker, 1985b).

Religious groups could also be seen reaching out to help single parents of the same religious faith. In 1987, several Muslim organisations came together to provide support to single Muslim parents. The Young Women’s Muslim Association (PPIS) provided counselling to parents under its family service department. In addition, the Islamic Theological Association (Pertapis) established a community service fund for this cause while a distress unit by the Islamic Fellowship Association extended its services to include troubled single parents. A charity dinner at the Singapore Hilton in 1987 further raised approximately $65,000 for Muslim single parents (Osman, 1987).

Support for Migrant Workers

By the 1980s, Singapore had one of the highest proportions of foreign workers in the labour force (Piper, 2005). The demand for low-skilled foreign labour was necessitated by rapid industrialisation and construction needs at the time. However, these individuals did not qualify for government welfare such as housing, healthcare, legal aid and other subsidies. There was also limited representation of migrant labour in worker trade unions. This led to a spurt in grassroots activism and voluntary provision of services to address the needs of the community.
One of the first welfare centres for migrant workers was the Geylang Catholic Centre, set up in 1980. It ran successful operations in providing support and social services to foreign workers (The Straits Times, 1985d). In 1988, the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary set up FILODEP, a training centre for foreign domestic workers that aims to provide pastoral care and steer Filipino women to use their leisure time constructively for spiritual and personal development (Franciscan Missionaries of Mary, n.d.). A wing within the religious institute, the Sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary, offers courses and counselling to domestic workers.

Box 10: 25th Anniversary Charity Fund

Singapore's 25th year of independence was commemorated not merely through celebrations, but also through the nationwide act of giving. The 25th Anniversary Charity Fund, launched at the beginning of 1990, aimed to raise $25 million to help the less fortunate in Singapore (Yeo, 1990). Overwhelming community enthusiasm helped raise a sum of $95 million that reached $190 million with dollar-for-dollar matching by the government. Although initiated on Deputy Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong's suggestion, its success lay in the generous efforts of individuals, organisations and the community (Lee, 1991).

Many wealthy individuals contributed generously to the fundraising effort. Khoo Teck Puat made a contribution of $10 million to the fund (Tan, 2004). Another notable individual, Chinese calligrapher Reverend Song Nian, donated the proceeds (amounting to over $300,000) from the sale of 99 pieces of his calligraphy (Wong, 1990). Companies and organisations also made generous contributions. NTUC Income pledged $200,000 to the fund while Philips Singapore pledged $6,000 worth of greeting cards to Wishing Singapore Well, a computerised wishing well launched on April 29, 1990. The Comfort Group contributed $100,000, $24,000 of which came from its cab drivers. On February 18, 1990, the Automobile Association of Singapore sponsored Wheels Aid 1990 to raise money for the Handicaps Welfare Association. The car-based treasure hunt, involving both able-bodied and handicapped team members, raised $100,000 for the fund (The Straits Times, 1989c).

Perhaps most inspiring were community-initiated projects, particularly schools' enthusiastic participation in raising funds from parents, pupils and teachers. Students also organised community events to raise money, including $22,000 during the Clean Up the Neighbourhood Day at Manjusri Secondary School. Residents of various constituencies also banded together to give back. Bukit Gombak residents organised the Leaders in Art Exhibition, selling works from 35 local artists (The Straits Times, 1990b) while the residents of Kampong Glam Selegie collected old newspapers and clothes. The 25th Anniversary Carnival at the World Trade Centre (now HarbourFront Centre) raised $2 million in June 1990. During the carnival, 80 food stalls were set up by hawkers and chefs who generously volunteered their time for the event (The Straits Times, 1990c). People from all sectors of society chose to contribute their own share towards the fund. They included six-year-old Daniel Teo who raided his piggy bank to donate $10 (The Straits Times, 1990d). The enthusiasm shown through these projects strengthened Singapore's sense of community, developed its culture of giving, and demonstrated a common generosity towards those in need.

Of the total raised, $152 million was distributed among 191 charities in Singapore (The Straits Times, 1991a). For many of these charities, the money helped to alleviate the burden of fundraising and allowed them to provide greater care and support to the less fortunate through funding new programmes and upgrading their facilities. Community Chest used its $50 million for new public education programmes to increase community awareness of the underprivileged as well as support the needs of 100,000 people – 8,000 more than the previous year (The Straits Times, 1991b). Mendaki channelled $1 million of the $1.4 million it received into an endowment fund to help improve the educational standards of the Malay-Muslim community (The Straits Times, 1990f). The Singapore Indian Development Association (SINDA) also set up a SINDA Family Service Centre to provide lower income families with counselling and education. Other charities, such as the Singapore Children's Society and the Salvation Army, also used the funds to widen their base of support for those who need it (The Straits Times, 1990e).

Most significantly, the 25th Anniversary Charity Fund was a huge step towards cultivating greater support for the less fortunate in Singapore. With the remaining $38 million channelled into the 25th Anniversary Endowment Fund, the money raised could be used to provide a source of support for the destitute and poor through schemes and programmes for the longer term (The Straits Times, 1991a). One such scheme, the Rent and Utilities Assistance Scheme, helped 68 families receive financial assistance in less than a year (The Straits Times, 1991c). Aside from the money raised, the charity fund also demonstrated the power of nationwide community giving and set the tone for future fundraising initiatives in Singapore.
Conclusion

Having established a stable economy and political environment with long-term growth strategies, the government turned its eye to addressing the increasing inequalities across ethnicities and income groups. This period was characterised by the goal of creating a communal and inclusive national identity. The government promulgated the tripartite approach to addressing social needs such as the Community Chest. Such initiatives garnered strong support, particularly from corporates. In fact, some corporates took things one step further, embarking on corporate social responsibility and other more nuanced approaches. In line with the growing affluence of the community and the government provision of basic needs, community philanthropy shifted to the next level of concerns, i.e., welfare and infrastructure development for the elderly, people with disabilities, single parents and migrant workers.
Building a Caring and Compassionate Society
(November 1990 – August 2004)

On November 27, 1990, Goh Chok Tong was sworn in as Prime Minister of Singapore in the first leadership change the country had seen since independence. He had already served in several roles in his 14 years in government – the most recent being First Deputy Prime Minister – so he was a familiar face. Nonetheless, there was some uncertainty and anxiety as to how the PAP’s role would evolve under his leadership. While his premiership did not mark a substantive shift in the style of political governance, what emerged during his tenure was a more sophisticated and complex mediation of the relationship between government and civil society (Rodan, 2005).

Goh’s main challenge was to balance economic change and continued competitiveness with the need for new forms of national identity. With the increasing privatisation of housing and medical care, the effectiveness of the earlier-held principle of economic prosperity as the key to national identity was waning. Civil society thus became an ever more important tool to facilitate state-society cohesion, but it was one that required some management. The government placed stronger emphasis on consultation and consensus-building, giving the educated and affluent population “more choices, more space for expression, and more influence in the way the country and their lives were being run” (Lee, 2008, p. 489).

One key thrust of this approach was a national ideology of Shared Values. First introduced in 1988 and adopted by Parliament in January 1991, these were broadly based on the Asian values discourse. It emphasised familial and communal units as the basic building blocks of society and discouraged individualism so as to build a civic-conscious and gracious society. The government also sought to promote civil society by moving away from quantitative indicators of well-being to improving quality of life through enhancing the physical and cultural environment. Building on the success of Mendaki, the government cautiously reintroduced self-help groups for the other main ethnic groups. At the same time, it allocated greater responsibilities to CDCs, Family Service Centres (FSCs) and other para-political structures like the PA. Social policies such as Edusave grants for students, Medifund to help the less well-off with medical expenses, and housing grants for the resale market were introduced during this period – evidence of the increased attention the government was giving to developing society as a whole. Goh was eager to have Singaporeans form “a hard core of citizens, cohesive and totally committed to the country” (Philemon, 2011). This would enable the government to pursue the more urgent priority of economic reform to ensure Singapore’s economic competitiveness.
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The renewed focus on Asian values and ethnic roots in the early 1990s prompted the government to formalise the ethnic self-help group (SHG) structure that the formation of Mendaki had re-established. Unlike voluntary welfare organisations which serve specific social needs, SHGs serve both philanthropic and community-building purposes. Their ethnic-based membership allows them to better target community-specific needs while also drawing on internal networks and assets. The pre-war Chinese clan associations are an early example of community SHGs, as is the 1951 Tamil Representative Council, formed to unite Tamils of different ethnicities.

By 1994, SHGs were established for all major ethnic groups in Singapore. Funding for the SHGs comes from both government grants as well as all working members (Singaporeans and permanent residents) of each community from whom a monthly deduction is made from CPF based on their income levels. Corporations and individuals also give donations from time to time.

Mendaki

At its founding, Mendaki aimed to raise the educational standards of the Malay-Muslim community through remedial classes, mass awareness, religious education, and discussions. It set up 13 tuition centres serving 3,000 students and awarded 80 scholarships and other bursaries. In 1988, it expanded to include a child and family development wing. This was rebranded in 1989 with a remit to address wider problems of the community – low education levels, drug abuse, high divorce rates, and low-skilled jobs. It now runs four Family Service Centres, including one in collaboration with 4PM, and continues to work with the wider network of Malay-Muslim organisations on four areas of focus: family, employability, education and youth (Mendaki, 2014).

Singapore Indian Development Association (SINDA)

Formed by the Indian community with government backing in 1991, SINDA’s work started with a nationwide tuition programme for students with borderline scores who were preparing for major examinations in 1992. It set up both an educational wing and a welfare wing to provide educational and career counselling, and talks for parents. Programmes for at-risk youths were added in 1996. It currently articulates four strategic thrusts: family, youth, education and community (SINDA, 2014).

Chinese Development Assistance Council (CDAC)

The CDAC was founded in 1992 with a $10 million grant from the government. It focuses on social mobility and aims to help the bottom 20 percent of its community achieve self-reliance while helping those with the potential to raise their social status. It serves three key demographics – students, workers and families – through its Education Programme, Workers’ Upgrading Programme, and Family Workfare and Support Programme (CDAC, 2014).

Eurasian Association (EA)

The EA formally obtained self-help group status in 1994 although it had been founded in 1919 and boasts the longest continuous history of supporting the community. It awarded the Hochstadt Scholarship from 1947 as well as the Industrial Scholarship and Voluntary Industrial Scholarship for trade apprentices. It further initiated a 1971 drive to start a $100,000 scholarship fund. It continues to disburse a range of scholarships and book awards today, including the Merit Bursary Award and the EA University Scholarship. It currently focuses on education and welfare through the family support services wing that helps underprivileged Singapore Eurasians with monthly food rations and basic necessities as well as provides counselling, case mentorship, befriending, and job seeking assistance (EA, 2015).

The 1991 Strategic Economic Plan formed the core of policy in this regard, emphasising the need to reorient local enterprises towards internationalisation and maintain Singapore’s wage competitiveness while providing value-added labour. The crisis narrative of Singapore’s early decades was re-introduced, but repositioned as economic rather than geopolitical vulnerability. It was also put forth that the solution (somewhat paradoxically) was to be found in a more open economy and light-touch regulatory regime.

However, this openness also increased the visibility of cracks in Singapore’s social structure. Divorce rates were continuing to rise, leading to more broken or single-parent families. There were persistent gaps in academic and professional achievement across different ethnic groups. Economic inequality was growing, cementing class divides. Finally, rising emigration rates were threatening national unity and identity.

---

2 The Hochstadt Scholarship gave $300 per annum to students in various fields at its establishment. The Merit Bursary provides up to $3,500 for ITE students and $5,500 for polytechnic students per year. The University Scholarship provides up to $10,000.
In 1992, the Singapore Council of Social Service was restructured to become the National Council of Social Service (NCSS). The same year, the National Volunteer and Philanthropy Centre (NVPC) was established to promote volunteerism as well as encourage the community to develop initiatives to help those in need. These two organisations were envisioned as capacity builders to ensure that the right services are delivered to needy public effectively and efficiently. The government also set up various committees to study the different social issues affecting Singapore, such as rapid demographic ageing and growing income disparity, and to recommend possible initiatives to be taken to meet these needs.

Still, the government recognised that without active citizenship, it would be difficult to achieve a strong national identity and attachment. In 1995, the government formally mooted the idea of Many Helping Hands as a new paradigm for social development (Tarmugi, 1995). This idea, still the basis of government social welfare policy today, called for cooperation across all sectors of society in leading social change rather than merely taking the government’s cue. The family, community and a network of grassroots service providers were tasked to act as pillars of support to fill the gaps in social needs. In this way, the social development ideology evolved from being state-owned to being state-managed and now one of shared responsibilities (Smith, 2015). To ensure that the spirit of giving was also nurtured in youths, the Community Involvement Programme (CIP) was launched in 1997 by the MOE, requiring every student to fulfil a minimum of six hours of community service a year, starting in 1998 (HistorySG, 2014).

In his June 1997 parliamentary address, Goh outlined his vision for Singapore in the 21st century as one in which society placed people, and not material progress, at its core (NLB, 1997). Two years later, after consultations with about 6,000 Singaporeans from all walks of life, the Singapore 21 committee published a report titled Singapore 21: Together, We Make the Difference. The report identified five ideals that formed the new national vision: every Singaporean matters; strong families; opportunities for all; the Singapore heartbeat; and active citizenship.

Unfortunately, with the 1997 Asian Financial Crisis and the global dot-com crash soon after in 2001 hitting Singaporean livelihoods hard, the people found it a challenge to commit to the re-defined social compact Goh had mooted. In 2001, the government formed the Economic Review Committee and Remaking Singapore committee to rethink the national integration and economic renewal policies proposed in the Singapore 21 report (Koh & Ooi, 2002). The former identified more specific economic niches and called on Singaporeans to close an “entrepreneurship gap” (Institutional Investor, 2002) while the Remaking Singapore report largely built on the Singapore 21 report and made recommendations for greater pluralism and active encouragement of civic society.

While Goh described the report as being “about embracing diversity,” he warned against exceeding the “parameter that the government decides.” The concrete impact was both these reports avoided more sensitive issues and policies (Noh, 2008). More thorough and transformative change would have to await the transition to Lee Hsien Loong’s leadership. The result was community philanthropic efforts in this period played a largely complementary role to that of the government.

**Corporate Giving**

Various regulatory changes in the 1990s and early 2000s encouraged corporations to give more generously. In 1994, donations to the Preservation of Monuments Board for monument restoration received tax exemption, as did donated shares in 2001. By 2002, donations to IPCs received a 200 percent tax deduction. Amendments to the Charities Act in 1995 – leading to tighter regulatory controls, especially for fundraising, and administrative guidelines for charities – gave companies more confidence in the efficacy of their donations. In 2003, ComChest – always a major recipient of corporate donations – took a major step forward in this regard by publishing a full list of its beneficiaries.

Businesses continued to develop the practice of strategic giving. This in part dovetailed with the need to economise on giving during the downturn; art sponsors sought to see “more out of our investments” (The Straits Times, 1998). The Asian Financial Crisis...
caused sharp reductions in corporate donations. The Spastic Children's Association reported that public donations declined 80 percent within a year (The Straits Times, 1998). Consequently, such charities had to go to a wider range of small-scale donors. 2003 saw another dip in corporate giving (The Straits Times, 2003a) with Charity Gift Box among the causes struggling to fulfil its targets that year (The Straits Times, 2003b). The founding of the Association of Fundraisers in 2003 (comprising NCSS, NVPC and other VWOs) and MeesPierson's charity-donor matching advisory in 2004 also helped companies give more strategically and efficiently (Today, 2004). Another form of strategic giving – that to social entrepreneurship – began to gain ground. Citibank pioneered this type of giving in 2002 with the Citi-YMCA Youth For Causes initiative. The initiative provides youth between 15 and 25 years of age with seed funding, training and volunteer mentorship to execute projects in support of a VWO of their choice. The 2002/2003 pilot programme saw 25 youth teams raise $170,000 for VWOs over two months, spurring the decision to make this an annual event (Today, 2003; Citibank, 2004). In 2003, the then Ministry of Community Development, Youth and Sports (MCYS) picked up on this trend with the introduction of a Social Enterprise Fund.5

The launch of the University Endowment Fund in 1991 provided many naming opportunities for corporate sponsors. A group of business leaders set up a committee that raised $10 million by 1992 while a charity gala later that year by Cottex pulled in $300,000. OUB gave $2 million for the Lien Ying Chow professorship in medicine at NUS in 1995 (The Straits Times, 1995). Canon contributed $1 million to establish the NTU Canon Visiting Professorship Programme (The Straits Times, 1997) while Motorola gave 10 workstations with Sun Spare 2 engineering software to NTU in 1994 (The Straits Times, 1994). The same year saw another fund, the Lee Kuan Yew Exchange Fellowship, draw 55 corporate contributors including Keppel Corporation, Natsteel and the Sembawang group (The Straits Times, 1991).

Local arts institutions also received substantial corporate sponsorship. In 1993, SIA gave $15 million to LASALLE College of the Arts to construct a consolidated campus7 (The Straits Times, 1992). This was followed by a $50,000 donation from Rolls Royce, $30,000 in scholarships from Ericsson (Munroe, 1996), and $140,000 donation from Boeing (Leong, 1996) – all in 1996. GAPL Pte Ltd8 donated $1.1 million to the newly founded Substation in 1991 (The Straits Times, 1991) while the Ngee Ann Kongsi established

---

5 Now known as Comcare Enterprise Fund.
6 Transferred to NAC in 2003.
7 Subsequently named for SIA.
8 A joint venture by Guinness Overseas and Asia Pacific Breweries.
Box 12: Corporate Funds

A few local companies have taken the initiative to establish sustainable funding sources for their chosen causes, with the funds established by the Straits Times and Singtel among the best known and earliest examples of their kind.

The Straits Times School Pocket Money Fund

Started in 2000 as a community project to help children from low-income families with school-related expenses, the Straits Times School Pocket Money Fund (SPMF) today supports over 10,000 children and youth a year. It has disbursed close to $42 million to help 128,000 children and youth since its inception. Both corporates and the public have given generously to the fund. In 2014, for example, the Ron Sim Foundation was the top donor with its gift of $1 million (School Pocket Money Fund, 2014).

Singtel Touching Lives Fund

The Singtel Touching Lives Fund (STLF) focusing on children and youth with special needs had a high-profile launch in 2002. By 2015, it had raised $24 million, benefitting 24 charities including the Association for People with Special Needs (APSN) Tanglin and Chaoyang Schools, Autism Resource Centre, Fei Yue Community Services’ eGen e-counselling, Singapore Children’s Society (SCS), Singapore Cancer Society, and MINDS Lee Kong Chian Gardens School. Singtel has used a range of means to raise funds for its charities, from charity golf tournaments and runs to a Fold a Heart campaign through which it donates $1 to the Fund for every origami heart folded and posted by the public, either online or in a local post box (Singtel, n.d.; Toh, 2003).
Towards the end of this period, the government started to encourage companies to engage in corporate social responsibility (CSR) as a means of ensuring continued competitiveness in the global marketplace. The 2002 Temasek Charter articulated a shift in its companies’ aims away from alignment with purely governmental objectives. This paved the way for the formal articulation of social responsibility as part of its charter in 2009. It also decided in 2003 to put aside a share of its profits each year for community purposes, a precursor to the founding of the Temasek Trust in 2007 (Temasek, 2015). The Ministry of Manpower (MOM), the National Trades Union Congress (NTUC), the Singapore National Employers Federation (SNEF), and the Singapore Business Federation (SBF) formed the National Tripartite Initiative on CSR (NTI on CSR) in 2004. It acts through the Singapore Compact for CSR, established in 2005 as a coordinated national initiative to help Singapore businesses align with the UN Global Compact’s 10 principles of corporate social responsibility (Thomas, 2007). These encompass direct service to the community as well as the broader adoption of business practices that mitigate negative social impact such as environmental and labour standards and sustainability.

In addition, NVPC’s early initiatives pushed firms to do more for charity than simply donating money. City Development Limited (CDL) was a pioneer with its City Sunshine Club volunteer programme introduced in 1999 (CDL, n.d.). In 2000, Ngee Ann Polytechnic undertook a Memorandum of Understanding with NVPC\(^9\) to give time off to 1,600 staff members for community service (The Straits Times, 2000). That year, 100 corporations signed up to the NVPC scheme to encourage active corporate volunteerism and strategic cooperation with charities (The Straits Times, 2001). While few organisations gave paid leave for community work, SPH was an exception with its Adopt-A-Charity programme that provided one day of leave per year for volunteer work (Shin, 2000).

NVPC formalised and expanded these efforts with its corporate philanthropy programme in 2003 and also recognised outstanding corporate philanthropy with the National Volunteerism and Philanthropy Awards. Its first corporate volunteer award in 2002 honoured Keppel, CDL and HSBC, helping to burnish their public image and extending philanthropic recognition beyond the existing Community Chest accolades (The Business Times, 2002).

## Community Initiatives

### Elderly

As Singapore aged, the proportion of elderly in Singapore was quickly rising. In addition, a 1986 Survey of the Aged Living Community sponsored by the government had revealed that poverty levels among the elderly were disproportionately high (Ramesh, 1992). One-third of men and 74.5 percent of women over 55 did not have a personal income; more than 55 percent of that age group did not have a financial reserve (Ramesh, 1992). In 1999, 25 percent of the elderly had no CPF account while 31 percent had less than $5,000 in their bank accounts (Chan, 1999). The number of only-elderly households was also rapidly rising, from 10,400 in 1990 to 25,700 in 2000 (MCYS, 2006).

To compound that, the elderly were more vulnerable to diseases and likely to face difficulties in securing a livelihood. Meanwhile, the share of public expenditure recovered from healthcare provisions had risen from three percent in 1980 to 60 percent in 2005, indicating a greater individual financial burden, particularly with the rising complexity of elder needs (Phua, n.d.).

Exacerbating these issues, the effective old age dependency ratio\(^11\) rose from 10.6 in 1995 to 14.4 in 2005, reflecting a decreasing number of economically active and independent elderly (MSF, 2009).

---

9 At the time still known as the National Volunteer Centre.
10 As reported by the Committee of Ageing Issues under the ministry’s aegis.
11 The ratio measures elderly dependency based on workforce participation, giving a more accurate estimate of the workforce dependency ratio.
Among the many initiatives launched to address the needs of the community were those aimed at befriending lonely seniors, supporting their health needs, and giving them opportunities to continue to contribute. In 1995, the Lions Befrienders Service Association (Singapore) (LBSA) established an island-wide befriending service to reach lonely seniors. Trained volunteers visited the elderly on a weekly basis to provide social and psycho-emotional support. The programme, pilot ed by the government in the 1980s, had only been handed over to three Lions Clubs a year before (LBSA, 2014). NCSS provided some funding support while the Lions Club raised the rest from events such as the Befriending Walk, Charity Golf Tournament and Flag Day (LBSA, 2014).

The Care for the Elderly Foundation is an example of a purely voluntary initiative started in 1992 to provide transport and escort services for the elderly and immobile traveling to specialist outpatient clinics. It soon expanded, starting the Code 4 Medical Service in 1995 to provide home healthcare support for frail and disabled older adults at home (CEF, n.d.).

In 1998, NCSS prompted the founding of the Organisation of Senior Volunteers (RSVP) to give opportunities to seniors to serve the community with their talent and experience (RSVP, 2010). Though initiated by the government, the board comprised committed volunteers from society such as ex-businessmen and retired school principals. It was the first voluntary organisation in Singapore to solely focus on promoting senior volunteerism (NVPC, 2007). The Indus Moral Centre of Activity for Retired and Elderly (Indus Moral CARE) opened in 2000 to serve the poor and needy in Kreta Ayer. Half of its funding came from

Box 13: Tsao Foundation

Madam Tsao Ng Yu Shun established the Tsao Foundation in 1993, motivated by the desire to enhance the quality of life of older people by empowering them with informed choice, self-care and autonomy. “I know what it is like to grow old, and I deeply feel the desperation of those who face old age alone, who cannot get to a doctor when sick, and whose families cannot – for whatever reason – adequately care for them. The pain of poor health is so much worse when you are frail and old,” she said (Tsao, 2013).

At the time, ideas such as ageing in place and community-based care for elders were almost unheard of. Old people received medical care at hospitals and long-term care in nursing homes. Families were expected to take on the full filial burden of taking care of the elderly – with limited skills and almost non-existent community support. There were instances where single elderly without family died at home, unknown to others until days later. Mobility and transportation were also growing issues.

This environment gave the Tsao Foundation a wide playing field. The team worked tirelessly to spot imminent trends, identify issues, research and test effective ways to address these issues, and – if they proved successful – advocate for their mainstreaming. In fact, several of its programmes, such as the Hua Mei Mobile Clinic and Hua Mei Seniors Clinic, were the first of their kind in Singapore. By taking these risks, the foundation was able to develop first-hand knowledge of the issues on the ground as well as gather important data to support their pitch to policymakers. Today, more than 20 years on, the ideas that it was championing have come into the limelight and gained professional recognition.

In 2015, the Tsao Foundation launched the Community for Successful Ageing (ComSA) initiative in Whampoa in 2015. This is a community-wide approach to establish an integrated system of programmes and services to enable ageing in place as well as promote health and well-being among the elderly. ComSA@Whampoa was born when the foundation was invited by the Ministry of Health’s City For All Ages initiative in Whampoa to participate in their vision of catalysing community action to create an elder-friendly neighbourhood. This paved the way for a series of activities, including developing and validating frameworks and concepts, pilot-testing various services, and obtaining feedback from the community.

Led and financed by the Tsao Foundation with support from the Tote Board, ComSA@Whampoa is run in partnership with grassroots organisations, volunteers, residents and businesses as well as local service providers and government agencies, healthcare institutions, and housing and city planners (Tsao Foundation, 2015). This multi-party approach creates a structure within the community that facilitates ageing in place even as the elderly face increasing problems. Services include a screening tool to identify seniors at risk (in the process of development) and trained para-care volunteers and professionals who provide continued support to seniors following their treatment at mobile clinics (Today, 2015). This initiative is once again the first of its kind in Singapore. It is a test bed for nationwide integrated and comprehensive support systems implemented with the combined effort of relevant community partners and grassroots organisations (The Straits Times, 2015).
the Ministry of Social and Family Development (MSF) and the rest from the Thye Hua Kwan (THK) Moral Society. The community also contributed to maintain the services; elderly volunteers helped out with daily operations while others gave monetary donations (THK, 2015).

**Special Needs**

People with disabilities – whether physical or intellectual – are a largely invisible community in Singapore with no clear statistics as to their number or the reach of services. MCYS reports that 1,400 children are diagnosed annually with learning disabilities and related conditions while the United Nations estimates that three percent of the population, or 131,000 Singaporeans, have disabilities (Smith, 2015).

There was a distinct growth in the number of schools for children with special needs in the 1990s (Poon, Musti-Ra & Wettasinghe, 2013). In 1991, AWWA pioneered the Therapy and Education Assistance for Children in Mainstream Education (TEACH ME) to provide support services for students so that their education would not be impeded by their physical disabilities (AWWA, 2015).

In 1992, the Rainbow Centre was established as an umbrella body to run Margaret Drive Special School and its initiatives. It remains a key service provider with two special schools and early intervention centres, a training and consultancy unit for local and regional professionals, and a family support group providing training and emotional support (Rainbow Centre, n.d.).

In 1993, Very Special Arts Singapore (VSA) was launched as a charity to provide people with disabilities opportunities to access the arts for rehabilitation and social integration (VSA, 2000). At the time, arts for people with disabilities were sporadic and catered to either a specific art form or disability group. VSA helped to make arts accessible to all (VSA, 2000).

**Crisis Response**

The two financial crises that hit Singapore in this period – the 1997 Asian Financial Crisis and the 2001 dot-com bust (AsiaOne, 2009) – not only affected Singaporeans’ income but also the morale of recession victims and their families (Goh, 2009). Although financial assistance and regaining families’ economic capacities were the primary need, these families also needed emotional and psychological support.

The LoveSingapore Fund set up by the Faith Community Baptist Church (FCBC) in 1998 acted as the coordinating body for churches in Singapore to give financial aid to individuals or families suffering hardship due to these crises (FCBC, 2015). Ethnic self-help groups also gave educational subsidies. During the 2001 crisis, Mendaki absorbed approximately $100,000 of tuition fees for its students from low-income families whose breadwinners had been retrenched (Osman, 2001). SINDA waived needy students’ tuition fees (The Straits Times, 2002). MUIS established a financial assistance package that covered allowances and children’s education fees for poor families (Osman, 2001). Help was also given to retrenched working adults for skills upgrading and job search during both crises.

12 In particular, Denise Phua, Jean Koh and Jacqueline Ang with key ARC staff Sylvia Yap, Anita Russell and Dr Lam Chee Meng.
In 1997, migrants who were adversely affected by the recession received aid in the form of free food from an old man. He did this in secret at migrant worker residences as well as their gathering places all over Singapore at night. When he passed away in 1998, his daughter took over his unfinished work (Rahman, 2004).

Box 14: Crisis Response – Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS)

The response to the SARS epidemic that hit Singapore between March and May 2003 was a testimony to the philanthropic spirit of the local community. Despite widespread fear of contracting the virus, Singaporeans from all walks of life – state officials, medical professionals, businessmen, volunteers and ordinary Singaporeans – rallied together. Doctors and nurses from Singapore General (SGH), Alexandra and National University (NUH) hospitals came forward to work alongside the primary team at Tan Tock Seng Hospital (TTSH). Staff nurse Katherine Javier, who had contracted SARS from the first patient, volunteered to join the team believing that she might have greater immunity from the disease after recovering from it. With the hospital closed to non-SARS patients, the doctors and nurses also acted as companions for the affected patients. Five healthcare workers succumbed to the virus while carrying out their duties (Gan, 2013).

The Courage Fund, set up on April 11, 2003, by the National Healthcare Group, Singapore Health Services, Singapore Medical Association, Singapore Nurses’ Association and SPH, served as the main fundraising vehicle. The fund served to provide relief to SARS victims and their dependents, educate and protect healthcare professionals, and support efforts in the wider Singapore community in the event of widespread infection. The fund rapidly amassed $1 million within a span of four days. Through e-banking portals, customers of OCBC bank raised $100,000 while DBS and POSB gave $145,000. 20 blind masseurs donated $1,500 from selling tins of cookies home-baked over two nights (Chua, 2004). In a time of low morale for healthcare workers, several key groups came forward to boost the spirits of those in the frontline. Businesswoman Rosemary Chng kickstarted a cookie chain initiative, rallying public support to bake 6,000 jars of cookies for SGH staff in conjunction with Mother’s Day. Over 100 groups pitched in, including volunteers from the Singapore Management University (SMU), the Salvation Army, and the Central Singapore Community Development Council (CDC). They baked 60,000 cookies over three months, decorated with handwritten thank-you notes. The staff of TTSH also received 6,000 rice dumplings – the result of a five-day dumpling-making event involving the Singapore Buddhist Lodge, Jamiyah, the Hindu Endowments Board, the Tanglin-Cairnhill Citizen’s Consultative Committee (CCC), and the Henderson Community Centre (CC). TTSH also received an anonymous donation of 60 crates of Fuji apples and a woman’s gift of 1,000 stalks of gerberas (Chua, 2004).

Chairman of the Singapore Red Cross Lieutenant General Winston Choo (Retd) started a Peach Ribbon Campaign encouraging members of the public to wear peach satin ribbons in appreciation of those in the medical profession. The campaign, which ran between April 18 and May 31, involved 8,000 volunteers who raised $322,121 for the Courage Fund by making and distributing 500,000 ribbons. Other contributors came in the form of the Singapore Pools charity lottery draw, the sale of 100,000 I Feel Good buttons by SPH, and a Singapore Symphony Orchestra gala night held in August 2003. The government’s dollar-for-dollar contribution raised the sum to $28.5 million and the public was advised against further donations. The Red Cross organised a special song tribute to healthcare workers aptly titled Through Your Eyes (Heroes and Angels). The CD featured over 30 ministers, members of parliament, local celebrities and healthcare professionals. All proceeds from the sale of the CD went to the Courage Fund (Chua, 2004).

In a time of low morale for healthcare workers, several key groups came forward to boost the spirits of those in the frontline. Businesswoman Rosemary Chng kickstarted a cookie chain initiative, rallying public support to bake 6,000 jars of cookies for SGH staff in conjunction with Mother’s Day. Over 100 groups pitched in, including volunteers from the Singapore Management University (SMU), the Salvation Army, and the Central Singapore Community Development Council (CDC). They baked 60,000 cookies over three months, decorated with handwritten thank-you notes. The staff of TTSH also received 6,000 rice dumplings – the result of a five-day dumpling-making event involving the Singapore Buddhist Lodge, Jamiyah, the Hindu Endowments Board, the Tanglin-Cairnhill Citizen’s Consultative Committee (CCC), and the Henderson Community Centre (CC). TTSH also received an anonymous donation of 60 crates of Fuji apples and a woman’s gift of 1,000 stalks of gerberas (Chua, 2004).

The Moon Crescent prison inmates of the Singapore Corporation of Rehabilitative Enterprises (SCORE) Linen Services Unit also committed to ensure a sufficient supply of clean linen for hospitals at a time of increased use due to hygiene concerns. The 500 inmates worked longer hours, through meal times and even on Sundays, to achieve a turnover of six to 12 hours. In a remarkable effort of determination, none of the inmates requested a transfer or reported sick during the period, earning SCORE the President’s Certificate for Overcoming SARS (Chua, 2004; SCORE, n.d.). At a time when information on SARS remained scarce, Denis and Anita Menezes initiated a website providing advice and the latest updates. Though not Singapore-born, the pair sought to “give something back” to the country they now called home, spending $700 on the website and scouring the Internet from 6 to 2 a.m. to post updates (Chua, 2004).
Conclusion

In spite of an overall open and strong Singapore economy, structural social and income inequalities persisted which made state-society cohesion in social welfare a priority. The *Shared Values* agenda introduced by the government and the adoption of the *Many Helping Hands* approach to social welfare built on the existing institutional infrastructure for social and community involvement at the individual level by promoting active donations and volunteerism. This period also saw the increasing involvement of the grassroots movements in addressing social needs through the re-emergence of ethnic self-help groups for all major race groups. The formation of the National Tripartite Initiative on Corporate Social Responsibility encouraged companies to not just give money but also share skills and talents. These efforts continued despite the global financial crises and SARS epidemic that affected the lives of all Singaporeans at this time.
The Last Decade
(August 2004 – Today)

In his August 2004 swearing-in speech, Singapore’s third Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong set out his vision of Singapore as an inclusive society. “Our people should feel free to express diverse views, pursue unconventional ideas, or simply be different. We should have the confidence to engage in robust debate so as to understand our problems, conceive fresh solutions, and open up new spaces. We should recognise many paths of success, and many ways to be Singaporean. We must give people a second chance, for those who have tasted failure may be the wiser and stronger ones among us. Ours must be an open and inclusive Singapore,” he said (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2004).

Indeed, a welcome paradigm shift has occurred in the last decade. Singaporeans have generally become more cognisant of social problems and increasingly acted upon their recognition of the importance of social welfare and developing the needs of individuals beyond mere economic and primary ones. These include “dignity [and] social and emotional well-being” (Basu, 2011, p. D2). The 2008 global economic crisis brought the vulnerability of Singapore’s underprivileged into sharper focus alongside broader public anxieties about financial and social security within a changing nation, particularly as government policies increasingly “shifted risks from the state to citizens … reinforc[ing] the emphasis on individual (and family) responsibility” (Bhaskaran et al., 2012). While economic success continues to be important, income inequality has become an increasingly pressing issue, with recent figures showing the top one percent of Singapore’s income earners holding more than 25 percent of the country’s wealth in 2014 (Chan, 2014).

The people’s discontent with the government’s management of the widening wage gap and unrelenting pressures on public housing, transport infrastructure and public utilities resulted in the PAP recording the lowest vote share in its history at the 2011 elections. This occurred despite the largest ever voter turnout (Chong, 2012). Civil society was demanding that greater priority be given to the welfare of Singaporeans and arguing that a more compassionate society has a similarly compassionate government.

The government has since made a concerted effort to adapt its systems and policies to address the negative implications of Singapore’s economic trajectory, with a major push to invest in intermediate- and long-term healthcare, halt housing inflation, and reduce income inequality. Government budgets since 2012 have emphasised the dual and equally pressing needs of quality growth and an inclusive society. Its policies have also been more synergised with nonprofit sector developments such as programmes developed by the Lien and Tsao foundations (see boxes 9 and 13). With 2015’s Pioneer Generation Package, policy continues to move in the direction of re-strengthening governmental support for welfare provision and assuring basic needs for lower-income citizens.

Nevertheless, philanthropy continues to play a key role in mobilising grassroots resources and ideas to drive change in the social sector, with community actors increasingly taking the lead rather than complementing government programmes. Such multi-sectoral innovation remains important in addressing the continuing complexity and scale of social needs.
The government continues to espouse the Many Helping Hands approach to social welfare provision (Rozario & Rosetti, 2012). In addition to providing direct assistance through grants and subsidies to various segments of the population, it offers dollar-for-dollar donation matching grants for funds raised from individuals, foundations and corporate establishments. Examples include the 2011 $1 billion Community Silver Trust under the Ministry of Health to help VWOs enhance their quality of care and provide affordable step-down care, and the 2012 $200 million Cultural Matching Fund under the Ministry of Culture, Community and Youth (MCCY) to foster the spirit of giving towards arts and heritage charities.

To encourage private philanthropy, the government continues to provide tax incentives for all cash donations to charities that have Institution of Public Character (IPC) status. While these incentives have been in place since at least 1998, donors received double tax deductions from 2002. That increased to 2.5 times from 2009. In 2015, the government announced a three-times tax deduction for all qualifying donations during the year in celebration of the nation’s 50th year of independence. The rate will revert to 2.5 times from 2016 to 2018 (IRAS, 2015).

The largest government-linked funding vehicles are the ComChest, discussed in previous chapters, and the Tote Board. While the ComChest is an aggregator of funds received for charitable purposes, the Tote Board – a statutory board established in 1988 – is a redistributor redirecting the gambling revenues of the Singapore Pools and Singapore Turf Club to support community needs. In 2012, the Tote Board further enhanced its social impact through the establishment of three funds: (i) the Social Innovation Research Fund for pioneering charity projects; (ii) the Outcome Fund to promote impact measurement for nonprofits; and (iii) the Social Enterprise Fund to give seed funding to social enterprises. It has also expanded beyond its traditional funding for core charitable activities (children, education and sports) to support social
Table 1: Types of Government Assistance (MSF, 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Assistance</th>
<th>Incentives</th>
<th>Grants</th>
<th>Sector-specific Grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Medifund, ComCare, Workfare Income Supplement</td>
<td>• Tax deductions and matching grants</td>
<td>• ComCare Endowment Fund¹⁴</td>
<td>• Youth Development Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education Financial Assistance, subsidies, bursaries¹³</td>
<td>• Governance standards and information provision</td>
<td>• Community Integration Fund</td>
<td>• Community Heritage Grant Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• CPF Housing Grant</td>
<td>• Mechanisms to facilitate giving (SG Cares, SG Gives)</td>
<td>• Recurrent and capital funds from MSF</td>
<td>• Approved Museum Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community Health Assistance Scheme</td>
<td>• Corporate social responsibility support</td>
<td>• VWOs-Charities Capability Fund (VCF) (2002)</td>
<td>• Public Art Tax Incentive Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Programmes for persons with disabilities (PWDs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• New Initiative Grant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Childcare and intermediate- to long-term care (ILTC) subsidies</td>
<td></td>
<td>• ComCare Enterprise Funding for Social Enterprises (2003)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Generalised subsidies, GST vouchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

enterprises with its Microcredit Business Scheme and the Caring Fleet which provides transportation for people with limited mobility. Notwithstanding these new initiatives, its core social service fund (which had a $244 million endowment in 2013) provided $77.1 million for “critical social services and increased capacity of VWOs” in 2013 (NCSS, 2013).

Facilitators

Both the NCSS and NVPC are active capacity builders, supporting charities to establish best practices and connecting them with funders, advocating for increased giving, and providing research and training to improve organisations’ efficacy.

Using the Internet as a vehicle, NVPC started SG Cares in 2009 and SG Gives in 2010¹⁵ to formalise informed giving and engagement between donors and registered charities in Singapore.¹⁶ SG Gives raised $46 million between 2010 and 2014, serving 330 charities (NVPC, 2014a). Meanwhile, SG Cares serves as a portal to match volunteers and causes, with 36,000 people in its database and 361 organisations (NVPC, 2014a). It further expands on NVPC’s capacity-building mission through vDirect, an “alternative platform for volunteers to seek out different types of regular volunteering opportunities” (NVPC, 2012), and Volunteer Coordinator Connect (VC Connect) which helps VWO staff engage better with volunteers.

NVPC has also initiated several programmes to facilitate and encourage corporate philanthropy. Its 2007 Board Match programme aimed to find suitable corporate executives to serve as charity advisors and directors while the ComCare Connection scheme built partnerships between companies and VWOs to leverage on businesses’ skills and resources. Participants included StarHub which worked with Gracehaven in 2007 to hold a charity carnival for 150 children and donated $150,000 from the StarHub Sparks Fund to set up a kitchen to be used to start a social enterprise for the home’s residents (StarHub, 2007).

¹² Includes ComCare kindergarten/student care subsidies, MOE Financial Assistance Scheme, CDC/CCC Bursary for Post-secondary Students, and MOE Bursary for Post-secondary Students.
¹³ The fund supports the ComCare Grow, Enable, and Self-Reliance grants, which are administered through CDCs with the help of grassroots organisations and VWOs.
¹⁴ SG Gives replaced the NCSS’s Online Donation Portal which was launched in 2002.
¹⁵ The government also launched Give2Arts in 2010 for individuals and corporations to contribute to the arts and heritage. This platform serves 93 charities as well as the general Arts and Culture Development Fund (Give2Arts, 2012), drawing $197,000 in donations by 2013 (Huang, 2013).
Several government bodies give out awards to recognise outstanding contributions from individuals and corporations, and to motivate others to give. The President’s Volunteerism and Philanthropy Awards (and its predecessors) date back to 2001 and are organised by the NVPC with support from NCSS and MCCY. In 2007, the Patron of Heritage Awards was launched as an annual award to recognise contributions towards preserving the history and heritage of Singapore. This is an addition to The Patron of the Arts Award which began in 1983 to recognise those who give cash and in-kind donations towards arts and culture in Singapore.

Corporate Entities

Corporate donations to charities and IPCs doubled from $325 million in 2004 to $644 million in 2013 (Charities Unit, 2014). In 2004 alone, NVPC found that the top five donors combined gave $9.9 million in direct donations, with SPH constituting the largest donor, followed by NTUC and Singtel (NVPC, 2005). This shows the dominance of sector leaders and national companies in corporate philanthropy, but their relatively small share as a total of donations also suggests a broad layer of small corporate donors. In recent years, monetary donations have come to represent only the first layer of corporate giving with many leading organisations having developed sustainable and engaged programmes to facilitate more effective and meaningful giving; several of these are addressed below.

Approaches

1. Foundations and Direct Giving

In line with the maturation of local businesses and an increasing sense of social responsibility, there has been a rise in the number of organisations establishing independent foundations to manage their philanthropic activity.

These include:

- APB Foundation founded by Asia Pacific Breweries in 1994 with a seed capital of $10 million.
- Asia Medical Foundation, set up in 2006 by the Raffles Medical Group, to which its executive chair donated 10 million shares (worth about $8.9 million) (Tor, 2006).
- Temasek Foundation founded in 2007 in partnership with the Temasek Trust, and the 2010 Temasek International Foundation and Temasek Education Foundation (see Appendix 2).
- Keppel Care Foundation, established in 2012, which receives up to one percent of the Keppel group’s annual profits in addition to its direct donations (which amounted to over $9 million in 2012) (NVPC, 2013).
- DBS Foundation launched in February 2014 with $50 million to fund social enterprises.

The Community Foundation and SBF Foundation also manage trusts for corporations with a view to eventually developing their sustainability and capacity to build their own independent grant-making structures. At its founding in 2013, the SBF Foundation had $18 million (Grosse, 2013).

However, corporate foundations are not the only means of sustained giving. Several companies without these arms continue to give a percentage of their profits to charity yearly or pledge repeated contributions to their chosen charities. Standard Chartered has invested 0.75 percent of operating profit in community programmes since 2006 (Standard Chartered, 2009). In 2005, NTUC donated one cent to the Care and Share Charity Fund for every house brand item sold, raising $1.063 million. This effort continued its tradition of raising money for charity through sales with its longer-standing Star Buys Annual Charity Drive (Quek, 2005). Sembcorp pledged to sponsor Assisi Hospice from 2009 to 2011, donating $60,000 in 2009. This is in addition to $250,000 set aside for needy students (Loh, 2009).
Corporates and individuals actively support charity runs, either as sponsors or as participants raising funds for a particular cause.

**Yellow Ribbon Prison Run**

In 2009, the Yellow Ribbon Prison Run was started as part of a wider Yellow Ribbon Prison Project launched in 2004 by former President S.R. Nathan to inspire Singaporeans to accept ex-offenders back into society. On its sixth Road to Acceptance run in 2014, Yellow Ribbon saw more than 9,000 participants, raising $130,000 for the cause supporting ex-offenders (Cheong, 2014).

**Runninghour**

Also in 2009, special needs educator John See Toh formed Runninghour to engage graduating students of Delta Senior School and members of the Association for People with Special Needs in sports. Their initiative, Runninghour 2015: Run So Others Can, is the first and only race in Singapore in which individuals with special needs run alongside the able-bodied. The inaugural race attracted more than 1,400 participants by January, with 600 opting for the blind run where participants run blindfolded in solidarity with the visually impaired. Proceeds from the nationwide run will be channelled towards sustaining the cooperative (Kok, 2015).

**Singapore Exchange Bull Charge Run**

Singapore Exchange has held the Bull Charge Run annually for 11 years, raising almost $24 million for over 50 charities. It raised $2.6 million in 2014 for underprivileged children, youth, the elderly and families, splitting the funds among four charities: AWWA, Autism Association of Singapore, Fei Yue Community Services, and Shared Services for Charities. The run drew over 120 sponsors, with HCL, NASDAQ, Noble, Thai Beverages, and UOB each contributing at least $100,000 to become diamond sponsors (SGX, 2014).

**Bloomberg Square Mile Relay**

The Bloomberg Square Mile Relay, a unique corporate race that donates the $10,000 cash prize to a charity of choice, was first held in Singapore in 2013. The Singapore Relay has been successively won by Macquarie Bank which has pledged its winnings to Hope House Foundation, an organisation for people with disabilities. In the spirit of the race, Macquarie pledged an additional $10,000 to match Bloomberg's 2014 donation. Bloomberg's official charity partner, SportCares Foundation (the philanthropic arm of Sport Singapore), uses sports to empower the socially disadvantaged and bridge communities. The funds raised from the Square Mile Relay go towards a training and mentorship running programme that seeks to discover and inspire a new generation of sporting talent (Bloomberg Square Mile Relay, 2014). The partnership has also helped SportCares expand programmes such as CareRunners and impact over 5,000 children and young adults.

**NTUC Income Run 350**

The NTUC Income Run 350, organised by Young NTUC in support of the global environmental movement, was inaugurated in 2010 with 1,000 runners. The run aims to raise awareness of the rising levels of carbon dioxide globally and the need to lower levels to 350 parts per million, the sustainable level determined by scientists. Held yearly, it is the main feature of a wider event advocating public education and action against climate change. The event also features panel discussions and green movie screenings as fringe activities. Part of the race proceeds is channelled to Garden City Fund's Plant-A-Tree Programme, pledging one tree for every 100 runners who sign up. As of 2013, 629 trees have already been planted and the number is rising as support for the run grows. The race itself incorporates a number of green measures to demonstrate the feasibility of green living. These include paperless registration and race entry pack collection, provision of bicycle racks on the race day to encourage green transportation, and the practice of waste sorting in a bid to inculcate a habit of recycling among participants.

In 2014, there were as many as 12,000 people running in support of the environmental cause. Ms Tan Wee Yin, who has participated since 2012, runs in a show of solidarity with the global environmental movement. In her words, “the event is not merely your usual run as they place a strong emphasis on spreading the message to save the environment. Covering the entire 21 kilometres and knowing that my run is going to help plant more trees in Singapore, that really motivated me to keep going even when I'm tired. I really want to do my part to conserve the environment, and taking part in Run 350 was my first step in helping spread the green message to my friends” (International Labour Organisation, 2013).
2. Corporate Volunteerism

Several companies have instituted a policy of paid volunteerism leave to encourage employee participation in their community initiatives. These include Singtel (one day per year), StarHub, JTC, and DBS (two days), and Capitaland (three days and additional no-pay leave of up to six weeks). Others organise regular employee community activities in the form of formal or informal programmes. Notable examples include Singtel's VolunTeaming programme which clocked 12,000 hours of volunteerism from 2,700 employees in 2014. The telco also organised overseas expeditions from 2011; the four trips to date include typhoon rebuilding in 2012-2013 (Singtel, n.d.). SMRT has also received recognition from NCSS for its Corporate Volunteer Programme which adopts three charities yearly from 2004 to provide assistance and develop new programmes in dialogue with the organisations. It helped to build a sheltered link way and Day Activity Centre extension as well as refurbish toilets for the Geylang East Home for the Aged in 2007 (NCSS, 2010).

DBS's People of Purpose programme encourages employee volunteerism with strong involvement from the management. A series of outreach programmes in July and August 2014 clocked 3,500 volunteer hours from 1,000 employees. Volunteers participated in a three-day series of events to reach out to 500 senior citizens, delivering necessities and organising an outing to the SEA Aquarium (DBS, 2014).

While PropNex does not have a formal volunteerism programme for its staff, its salespersons - known as PropNex Ambassadors - have engaged in multiple philanthropic projects since 2009. It raised $70,000 that year to fund a school-building project in Cambodia, with a repeat mission in 2010 to Trayong Pong. In 2012, they raised $60,000 through the Building a LovingSG charity project in support of the School Pocket Money Fund. The project was a part of the PropNex Ambassadors' Care project in aid of underprivileged children. The following year, salespersons pledged a portion of their commission to SHARE, raising $100,000 in six months. They matched this amount during the ComChest Charity Show 2014 for special needs schools, with the company's dollar-for-dollar policy bringing their total funds raised to $200,000. The PropNex Ambassadors programme continues to engage in a range of community-oriented projects on an ad hoc but consistent basis (Propnex, 2014).

3. Partnerships

In line with the Many Helping Hands model, businesses have developed partnerships with CDCs across the island. In 2013 Central CDC had corporate partnerships with 45 firms. Together, they underwrote 58 programmes and raised $1.3 million. One long-standing partner, Maybank, has supported the CDC since 2010. That year, it raised over $530,000 for the Maybank Family Fund established in partnership with the CDC. Contributing to the fund was the NightWalk that attracted over 11,000 participants and raised over $330,000. Other initiatives included sponsorship of induction cookers for underprivileged elderly. Over 200 staff and volunteers also assisted with CDC activities, engaging 400 senior citizens in active lifestyle events and helping to plan other events. Maybank currently funds the Family Protection programme which provides free personal accident insurance to 700 beneficiaries. It also runs a Cashup programme to educate residents about financial literacy; in 2014 it conducted over 100 sessions (People’s Association, 2011).

Far East Organisation has focused on community health initiatives with a 2011 gift of $125 million towards the establishment of the Ng Teng Fong General Hospital, a new hospital in Jurong East, in commemoration of its founder. It also gave $52 million towards the Ng Teng Fong Healthcare Innovation Programme at Tan Tock Seng Hospital in 2014 to improve patient care delivery (Far East Organisation, 2015).

4. Sharing Expertise

DBS began working with social enterprises in 2008, introducing a special banking package that includes loans at 50 percent of market rate. From 2012 to 2014, it provided $2.4 million in grants to 80 Asian social enterprises, including $340,000 to four Singaporean ventures. Its efforts have now been formalised in the DBS Foundation (DBS, 2014). It also used its banking infrastructure to aid fundraising during regional disasters, allowing customers to donate through ATMs, AXS machines, and iBanking. It raised over $1 million for the 2011 Japan disaster fund, and in 2013
raised $800,000 for Typhoon Haiyan relief efforts. It also matched all staff donations dollar-for-dollar to raise $280,000 internally. Its subsidiary POSB has partnered with the Council for Third Age since 2009 and runs the Active Neighbours programme which helps elderly access banking services (DBS, 2011).

Citibank continues to run Youth for Causes with YMCA using an entrepreneurial approach to encourage innovative fundraising through a competition format. In 2013, its participants raised $756,000 and roped in almost 9,000 volunteers for their various causes (Youth for Causes, 2015). Companies have also reached out to charities to help them improve their marketing. Procter & Gamble staff worked with social enterprise Empact while Deloitte provided media relations support for the Singapore Disability Sports Council during the Asian Para Games as well as seconded a manager in the Clients and Markets Department to the organising committee (Wong, 2015).

Salesforce Foundation, an arm of the cloud computing firm Salesforce.com, has developed its own approach – the 1-1-1 model which involves the use of one percent of its production, capital and employee time for community projects connected to its Salesforce for Nonprofits software package. A signature initiative in Singapore with the TOUCH Seniors’ Activity Centre used Salesforce software and volunteers to create a data management system for the centre. This is in addition to a $100,000 donation and sustained volunteering (Salesforce, 2014). Earlier in 2010, the foundation supported the Lien Foundation's preschool development project with a donation of US$1 million ($1.38 million) in licenses of its system (Lien, 2010). Similarly, Google customises its own suite of products with Google for Nonprofits which recently launched in Singapore. This programme includes free advertising, Google Apps and YouTube capacity (Google, 2015).

**Community Giving**

There has also been a surfeit of public giving by individuals across cause, demographic and means of giving, be it through funding, volunteering or sharing skills and networks. The 2014 Individual Giving Survey by the NVPC suggests individual donations are rising, with an estimated $1.25 billion donated to nonprofit organisations that year. This is 14 percent more than the $1.1 billion estimated in 2012. However, there is some evidence to suggest that larger charities benefit more from such giving. In 2012, charities with annual receipts of above $10 million accounted for 85 percent of total receipts (Commissioner of Charities, 2014). Small charities with annual receipts of less than $250,000 accounted for less than one percent of total receipts (Commissioner of Charities, 2014).

The 2014 Individual Giving Survey report also showed a preference for giving money over time, with 83 percent of those surveyed having made a donation versus only 17.8 percent having volunteered in the past 12 months. It also noted that informal volunteerism was a growing and underexplored area of local philanthropy (NVPC, 2014b). Given that these surveys only cover contributions to registered local charities, these figures likely understate the true extent of giving across the country.

**Approaches**

1. **Direct Giving**

Giving on an individual level to worthy causes remains the primary form of philanthropic activity for most Singaporeans – be it through direct channels such as charity fundraisers, centralised channels such as SG Gives, or through newer platforms such as online crowdfunding or giving circles.

Newspaper stories, long a way to publicise and draw public support for individual cases of need, have greatly multiplied their impact since crowdfunding started gaining ground in 2012. This practice of raising relatively small amounts from a large number of people has attracted a mix of Singaporeans from passionate youths to established organisations such as the Singapore Children's Society. A recent case of spontaneously organised crowdfunding involved Tan Soy Kiang, an elderly victim who was conned of $53,000 over 15 years. His plight, published in the newspaper, galvanised an Indiegogo project that raised over US$48,000 ($68,435) within a month (Tan, 2015; Chen, 2015). In a similar vein, in 2013, two daughters of a single mother suffering from end-stage cancer successfully raised US$32,161 ($44,513) to cover medical bills and funeral costs (Emmanuel, 2013).
Indeed, Singapore is among the top 10 countries in Kickstarter pledges, having amassed $6,710,961 since 2011 (Yap, 2014). This is in addition to other online giving such as SG Gives, Give2Arts and another prominent crowdfunding portal, GIVEasia, that allows Singaporeans to initiate community projects without unnecessary transaction costs (SG Gives, 2014). It has raised over $6 million to date (GiveAsia, 2015).

Giving circles are also becoming more well-known in Singapore. This is an informal network of investment that brings together multiple donors who commit to recurrent giving to common causes. Giving circles facilitate not just investment but also skill-sharing and advocacy. Members often prefer to keep their activities private. However, two examples are prominent. Focus India Forum started in 2002 when 16 Indian expatriates in Singapore decided to donate US$16 (S$22) per month to charities in India. It now has 180 regular donors and collected US$32,000 (S$44,290) in 2013, helping its members to magnify their impact by pooling funds and giving strategically (John, 2014). A more recent initiative is the Singapore chapter of 100 Women Who Care, an international organisation whose members donate $100 each quarter to commonly selected charities. At their first meeting in March, they chose TWC2 as their recipient while their May donation supported Ronald McDonald House's Tubs of Love (100 Women Who Care, 2015).

Box 16: The Heart of Giving

Giving is not always about money. Here are a few of the innumerable examples of individuals who have offered their time and skills to help people in need.

Gerard Ee Hock Kim

From a young age, Gerard Ee has given his time to help others and serve the community. As the son of Ee Peng Liang, Singapore’s “father of charity” (Ramlan, 2010), he accompanied his father on visits to welfare organisations. Growing up in a neighbourhood where gang fights occurred rather frequently, he noticed that although the people looked fierce on the surface, they also often demonstrated kindness. He often recalls an incident that occurred when he was 11 years old. As he carried a six-year-old disabled boy up a flight of stairs towards the Van Cleef Aquarium, the younger boy asked him if he would ever recover from his disability and be able to walk once again. This disorientated Ee, leaving him at a loss of how to respond (Ee, 2004). These childhood experiences committed him to serving others for social good.

Now 66 years old, Ee has served on several committees in the social sector, including areas pertaining to the rehabilitation of young offenders, persons with disabilities, health and education. He also served as the president of the NCSS and chairperson of the Council for Third Age (MCCY, 2015). After the NKF financial scandal, then-Health Minister Khaw Boon Wan appointed Ee as board chairman to restore public confidence in the organisation (Foo, 2013). In 2015, he began a two-year term as the Charity Council’s chairperson (Today, 2015a).

Lau Hock Soon

“It's nice that you guys come and see us. People like me in this old folks home are just waiting to die,” an elderly lady remarked calmly in Cantonese to a young man. This encounter shocked and struck a deep chord in young Lau Hock Soon. He knew that a difference could be made to the lives of these people. Lau grew up in poverty, coming from a single-parent family where his mother had to raise two children alone. However, this has made him stronger and appreciative of the simple things in life. His mother, who gave food to their poorer neighbours even though the family was poor, was his inspiration (Lau, 2004).

Lau was involved in the Red Cross since primary school. In 1977, at age 17, he joined the Open Unit under Red Cross after graduating from secondary school and contributed his time towards first aid duties, training and welfare home visitations, among other youth services. Seven years later in 1984, he was entrusted with the management of the Open Unit (Singapore Red Cross Society, 2014). Lau rose through the ranks, becoming director of Red Cross Youth from 2001 to 2008 (Singapore Red Cross Society, 2014). He feels that serving on the Red Cross has shaped him into a better person – from an impatient individual who is less than far sighted to a person able to work with different people to develop programmes towards one goal. The way he views the world and its values have been positively altered by his involvement in the Red Cross. All these have motivated him to contribute even more (Lau, 2004).

(continued on next page)
There has also been an increase in youth-for-youth initiatives. The National Youth Survey 2014 by the National Youth Council (NYC) revealed that youth today are often members of multiple communities, giving them more opportunities to be involved, be it through the Internet, in their own groups, or through national programmes such as the Youth Corps Singapore and Values-in-Action (NYC, 2014, p. 15). Audible Hearts was conceptualised in 2006 by a group of youths who wanted to make a difference among their peers. It aimed to strengthen the support base for youths (HPB, 2012). Targeted at youth facing problems and pressure from many aspects of their lives (e.g., family, friends and schools), it gave them an avenue to seek support anonymously and conveniently online. Audible Hearts is fully supported and funded by the HPB but is run entirely by a team of youth volunteers. Since its inception, it has handled over 1,200 unique cases, organised several youth events, and recruited and trained over 70 volunteers (HPB, 2012).

In 2008, a group of students from Hwa Chong Institution, called Team Salad Days, collaborated with Rockstar kids and Big Ear Music to produce Listen to the Salad Days. The initiative was a part of *SCAPE's monthly Confessions gig series that celebrated experimental music. It featured student bands from secondary schools, junior colleges, polytechnics and ITEs to encourage the development of musical ideas in youth (Salad Days, 2008). In 2011, BEgIN 2012 @ *SCAPE was organised by students from ITE Central, Nanyang Polytechnic and Republic Polytechnic. The aim is to provide bigger platforms for aspiring youth performers to showcase their musical talents, the event reached more than 1,100 youth (*SCAPE, 2012, p. 7).

In 2011, a group of SMU students started Project iConserve. On the surface, Project iConserve was an environmental awareness initiative that raised funds for Thye Hua Kwan Moral Charities. However, it also aimed to make a lasting impact on those it reached by encouraging youth volunteerism. Initiatives included an exhibition at JCube in 2012 which displayed products made from recycled materials and a camp called NO IMPACT for SMU freshmen in 2013 which was designed to minimise the impact they had on the environment (Project iConserve, 2013).

2. Individual and Family Foundations

Foundations and trusts remain major sources of philanthropic funding, with long-standing foundations such as the Lee and Shaw foundations making major yearly disbursements.

With the transition of family-held firms to the younger generations, more family foundations have joined the ranks, e.g., the Chew Hua Seng and D.S. Lee foundations. These focus on education and welfare for the underprivileged in line with traditional avenues of giving. However, some foundations such as the Tsao and Lien foundations have used their platforms to take a more active role in capacity building as earlier chapters have illustrated. Appendix 1 provides details of the 127 corporate, private and other foundations registered on the Charity Portal.
Facilitators

1. Knowledge Brokers

Academic institutions such as the Asia Centre for Social Entrepreneurship and Philanthropy conduct research and education to build awareness of different models of philanthropy for audiences across the landscape - from the layman to the sophisticated philanthropists. Asia Venture Philanthropy Network (AVPN) has also recently launched a Knowledge Centre to facilitate learning through webinars, regular speaker events, and publications. Its publications include the development of a capacity building framework for members and another on the legal profile for venture philanthropy in Singapore, published in partnership with Drew and Napier (AVPN, 2015). These institutions build on the research by organisations such as NVPC to provide critical and forward-thinking perspectives on developing philanthropy in Singapore.

2. Capacity Builders

Other independent entities provide advisory services through consulting projects and strategic collaborations. Conjunct Consulting, established in 2011, works primarily with nonprofit partners, and has carried out 84 pro bono projects with 61 organisations as of May 2015. The social enterprise Empact provides a wide range of services to VWOs, corporate entities and grantmakers. In addition to advisory and capacity building services for charities, it draws on a pool of skilled volunteers to provide backend support while conducting due diligence and programme evaluation for grantmakers. Its clients range from smaller organisations like Oogachaga to national-level associations such as the Society for Physically Disabled (SPD) and the Singapore Association of Social Workers (Empact, 2014). Engineers without Borders Asia provides more specific assistance in the area of engineering support. Locally, it has worked with VWOs such as AWWA and SPD to provide assistive technology. It also supports long-term placements with Proximity Designs, a social enterprise in Myanmar, and Cambodian Rural Development Team in Cambodia. These attachments allow volunteers to lend their expertise to enhance charities’ technical capabilities and develop technological solutions for the community (Engineers without Borders Asia, 2015).

3. Advisory Services

Major banks in Singapore, recognising the overlap between the banking activities and philanthropic interests of their corporate and family clients, have established advisories for such major institutional donors. Standard Chartered, Credit Suisse, UBS and HSBC, among others, help to advise and administer family trusts and connect them with recipients as well as in-house philanthropy services. Credit Suisse’s SymAsia Foundation is a registered IPC through which donors can make tax-deductible donations while UBS similarly connects philanthropy advisory clients with its Optimus Foundation.18 HSBC administers many private family trusts with an internal charities committee that “actively looks for worthy causes that can be tracked for financial returns” (Prestige Singapore, 2013). The Community Foundation of Singapore also provides advisory services for individual clients looking to support the needs of the community more effectively.

4. Networks

Networking platforms such as AVPN have been valuable in promoting venture philanthropy and social investment across sectors, from government and academia to private banks, businesses and other institutions. It connects Singaporean members with other venture philanthropists in the region, allowing for knowledge sharing and partnership-building (AVPN, 2015). In addition, it holds a yearly conference to enable philanthropists to network, share best practices, and envision future challenges and opportunities. The Singapore Compact for CSR, founded in 2004, continues to promote CSR as a best practice for businesses. The Compact has recognised various companies for their CSR efforts. These include CapitaLand, Cerebos Pacific, Senoko and SMRT (Wong, 2012).

---

18 Established in 1999, the Optimus Foundation focuses on innovative and impactful projects targeted at children. In addition, UBS has published a Philanthropy Compass guidebook (2014) and runs the 20/20 Social Impact Leaderships Group that aims to develop philanthropic leaders in Asia (UBS, 2014).
The Last Decade (August 2004 – Today)

The 2008 global financial crisis left many Singaporeans in distress. The government extended a $20.5 billion Resilience Package in January 2009 (Thum, 2010); SHGs, religious institutions and several individuals came forward to help Singaporeans tide over the crisis. SHGs mainly targeted two areas: keeping children in school and skills-upgrading for working adults. The Community Tuition Fee Subsidy Scheme, supported by the CDCs, provided $500,000 a year to subsidise tuition for students from low-income families (Chia, 2009). SINDA also amended the qualifying income criteria for its tuition programme to waive fees for more students and provided 2,000 bursaries to students from low-income families (Leong, 2009). Mendaki relaxed criteria for several programmes, e.g., allowing upper secondary students to apply for subsidies under the Education Trust Fund, previously meant for students up to lower secondary (Yong, 2009). In July 2009, the four SHGs and the Association of Muslim Professionals jointly organised a job fair, offering over 700 placement opportunities.

Religious institutions served more free meals during the crisis. The Singapore Buddhist Lodge, which has been serving free meals for over 20 years, served 500 more people during the week and 2,000 more during the weekend. Volunteers at the Lodge's kitchen were usually housewives and retirees but Ng Kea Hee, a 25-year-old assistant engineer holding a 12-hour night shift at a shipyard, also sacrificed his sleep and unfailingly committed almost seven hours daily at the kitchen (Ng, 2009). Individual members of the community also came forward to donate money, eventually leading South East CDC to establish a fund targeted at families that did not meet the criteria to receive national ComCare assistance (Lin, 2009).

The Role of Philanthropy in Addressing Social Needs

While the predominant social needs in Singapore continue to be those that emerged in the 1990s, the issues are increasingly complex. Several new initiatives have emerged in the last decade to address the challenges at hand, particularly in education, supporting the underprivileged, arts and culture, and environmental preservation.

Education

Philanthropists continue to support education generously. Contributions to education constituted $7.5 billion or 60 percent of total charity receipts (including government grants, donations and fees and charges) in 2012 (Commissioner of Charities, 2014). While many philanthropic organisations focus on providing financial assistance for primary and secondary education, others also provide scholarships and bursaries for tertiary students in universities and polytechnics. In recent years, philanthropists have also started to promote less mainstream courses of education and address social issues which impede education. They seek to create social change by identifying the gaps in the current system and then providing the resources needed to effect change. They often tap on the expertise of their philanthropic organisation and introduce new educational practices involving technology or innovative classroom design.

1. Scholarships, Bursaries and Funds

The Leong Khay Huay Kuan launched a $10 million bursary fund to meet the needs of its members’ children pursuing tertiary education in 2013 (The Straits Times, 2015). Islamic organisations have also provided financial aid to Muslim students. Most notable among these is the Muslimin Trust Fund Association (MTFA) which gives bursary awards to Muslim students from lower-income families. In 2014, MTFA gave out six scholarships and 127 bursaries (Ariff, 1991). The Char Yong (Dabu) Association gave an endowment to the SMU in 2014 to set up a study award for students of any race (SMU, 2014). Ngee Ann Polytechnic has received 25 percent of the Ngee Ann Kongsi’s annual revenue since 2006, amounting to $7.97 million in 2014 (Tjoa, 2014). The Kongsi remains a strong supporter of education and continues to fund upgrading of facilities at the various Ngee Ann schools.

Financial aid from private foundations – in the form of university scholarships and bursaries – supports...
students in many different educational institutions. NUS has been one of the biggest recipients of the Shaw Foundation’s philanthropic outreach with some 240 scholarships (NUS, 2013). These include the $5 million granted in 2007 to students pursuing the Doctor of Medicine degree at the Duke-NUS Graduate Medical School (Duke-NUS, 2007). Half of the Lee Foundation’s landmark $150 million donation towards NTU’s Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine went to an endowment fund for scholarships and financial aid (The Business Times, 2011). Institutes of Technical Education also offer scholarships and bursaries from private foundations. An example is the Toh Kian Chui Foundation’s Special Bursary which disburses $300,000 to financially disadvantaged students (Ng, 2010).

Private foundations have begun to direct financial aid towards less conventional educational pursuits. The Tan Kah Kee Foundation’s Tan Ean Kiam Postgraduate Scholarship in the Humanities in 2011 funds Master’s and PhD degrees for up to $10,000 for overseas study or $7,000 for local study (Tan Kah Kee Foundation, 2015). In 2010, Peter Lim pledged $10 million to the Singapore Olympic Foundation to provide sports scholarships for students from poor families (The Straits Times, 2011). Founded in 2011, the E.W. Barker Institute of Sports acts as a hub for sports-related scholarship, teaching and practice. The E.W. Barker Scholarship is also awarded to undergraduates pursuing the BSc (Hons) in Sports Science and Management under NTU. The NTU Scholarship offers its awardees a grant of $8,000 per annum to support local advancements in sports (NTU, 2014b).

More individual and family donors have been setting up bursaries and scholarships. They account for more than 20 of NTU’s 114 donated bursaries and 27 out of the 72 bursaries offered by NUS (NTU, 2014a; NUS, 2015a). The Daniel and Joanna Chew Scholarship, set up in 2012 at NTU, originated from the donor’s gratitude towards the financial aid he received (Chew, 2013). Others are in tribute to a family member, such as the Gan Eng Teck and Maria Tan Ah Ho Bursary established in 2008 (NUS, 2011a). The NUS Campus Couples Bursary Fund was initiated in 2015 by Yeow Keng Joon and Kong Yuet Peng who met as NUS students. The fund stands at $325,000, with 12 couples having pledged $25,000 each (NUS, 2015b).

NUS, NTU and SMU have each set up alumni offices to focus such efforts as alumni form a growing source of donations. Between 2009 and 2011, NUS collected $94 million from 8,000 donors and NTU collected $26 million from 10,000 donors. (Yojana, 2011). Significant portions of each sum came from the respective alumni communities. NTU stands at the forefront of such initiatives, winning the President’s Award for Philanthropy in 2012 for fostering the culture of giving and strong relationships with its donors. Its Graduation Giving Campaigns has seen increasing participation rates, reaching 82 percent with the class of 2012 (NTU, 2012).

2. Improving School Infrastructure and Developing Programmes

Educational philanthropists have also helped to pioneer alternative approaches to teaching and education. Ngee Ann Secondary School, recipient of $15 million from Ngee Ann Kongsi since 1965, was encouraged by the association to integrate technology such as social networking into learning. The school is today one of 33 Microsoft World Tour Schools and has been part of the FutureSchools@Singapore programme since 2011 (Yip, 2015).

In 2005, the Lee Foundation donated $30 million to establish the Alice Lee Centre for Nursing Studies and the first full-time undergraduate degree programme in nursing (Ministry of Health, 2006). In 2011, philanthropist and professor Saw Swee Hock donated $30 million to launch the Saw Swee Hock School of Public Health, a school dedicated to researching cost effective ways of improving public health that are relevant to Asia (NUS, 2011b). In fact, NTU’s Lee Kong Chian School of Medicine, Singapore’s second undergraduate medical school, was built with a record donation of $400 million in 2011; $150 million of which was donated by the Lee Foundation (Tan, 2011). Singapore Polytechnic has made use of philanthropic support to extend its reach overseas. Temasek Foundation donated $500,000 to fund an engineering programme with two Malaysian universities and made a further grant of $400,000 in 2013 to expand it to Yogyakarta (Singapore Polytechnic, 2012).

Philanthropic organisations have also sought to introduce improvements to existing education...
that can be adapted into the national curriculum by providing the necessary expertise. Temasek Foundation seeks to improve the quality of education in Asia by supporting the training of leaders, educators and specialists with expertise institutions. During 2013-2014, 43.5 percent of its funds ($58.5 million) went towards the development of education programmes. In 2009, it launched an English language curriculum for university faculty, developing teaching materials to improve English education. The curriculum has been adopted by the NUS Centre for English Language Communication. In 2007, it launched its Leadership Enrichment and Regional Networking Programme which now benefits over 1,200 scholars in a regional student exchange programme involving leading universities (Temasek Foundation, 2014).

The $100 million in donations raised by NUS to mark the 90th birthday of Lee Kuan Yew in 2013 is being used to enhance academic programmes at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy, University Town, Yong Loo Lin School of Medicine and the Yale-NUS College (NUS, 2013). The university has also developed its research capabilities with the generosity of giving. The Yong Loo Lin 2013 grant of $25 million to the National Cancer Institute is helping to develop new models of cancer care through research and education (NUS, 2013b).

3. Non-monetary Contributions

Volunteers play a vital role in philanthropy in education. One encouraging trend is the growing number of options given to students from low-income families who are in need of private tuition (Teng, 2015). Many volunteer tutors give free or subsidised tuition to needy students through CCs, SHGs and religious organisations. Volunteers at the Stag Match Tuition Centre have been giving free tuition since the programme's inception in 2009. The centre now benefits more than 400 needy students in 14 branches. Other volunteers help those within their neighbourhood, such as the volunteers at the Loving Heart Multi-Service Centre in Jurong which targets primary and lower secondary children (Davie, 2014).

Another student initiative, Bringing Love to Every Single Soul (BLESS), was started by Ms Francesca Wah in 2013 to provide gifts for 120 underprivileged children on Children’s Day. With her network of friends, she exceeded her goal by three times, raising enough to buy gifts for 360 children within two days. BLESS has evolved into a nonprofit managed by NUS alumni and undergraduates on a pro bono basis. It runs five programmes that provide 884 children with basic school necessities, support 120 elderly living alone, and teach 20 underprivileged children how to read (NUS, 2014).

Volunteers are often fundraisers and advocates, raising public awareness of the problems faced by less privileged students. In 2011, 400 participants of the Japanese Association's bazaar helped raise $20,000 for the Straits Times School Pocket Money Fund, Charity Gift Box, and the Grace Orchard School, a school that caters to children with mild intellectual disabilities (Chan, 2012). In another initiative, residents of North West CDC rented racks of soil to grow their own vegetables. Forty percent of the rent they pay goes to the Student Support Fund. The company that started the project is Pocket Greens which aims to cultivate greater community interest in nature and farming while supporting 2,500 students from low-income families each year (Goy, 2014).

Supporting the Underprivileged

While Singapore's network of Family Service Centres and other social welfare support services ensures that the underprivileged in Singapore have their basic needs met, philanthropic activity continues to be important in serving the invisible poor and other vulnerable communities, such as the elderly with complex care needs.

Among these are several initiatives aimed to ensure everyone in Singapore has access to healthy meals. In 2007, YWCA launched Meals-on-Wheels for Children, a pioneering effort to provide free healthy dinners to children between the ages of five and 12 years from low-income families. This was subsequently extended to needy students from partnering primary schools (YWCA, 2015). The Soup Kitchen (Singapore) is a volunteer-run initiative by Food #03, a vegetarian eatery cum art project social enterprise begun in February 2009. It uses its kitchen to carry out the Soup Kitchen Project every Monday. Despite having stopped the café's meal operations in 2011, the project continues to feed 220 lower-income persons, especially one-room flat residents, cardboard and can collectors, and the homeless in Jalan Besar and Lavender Street every week (Post Museum, 2012).
individual small-scale donations of many individuals have collectively helped to sustain the Soup Kitchen although some corporates have quietly sponsored the project. Foodservices launched The Food Bank Singapore in 2012 as a central depository for unused and unwanted food that is still safe to eat but which has lost commercial value. It works with 130 member beneficiaries across the island to redistribute this food to the needy (Foodservices, 2012). Recently, the Sri Senpaga Vinayagar Temple completed its new $500,000 kitchen which houses six new pieces of equipment to allow more food to be prepared. The kitchen can now serve free vegetarian meals to over 1,200 needy people (Zaccheus, 2015).

When the haze brought the Pollutant Standards Index to a record high of 371 in June 2013, several Singaporeans took it upon themselves to aid the vulnerable. Jeremy Chua, then a university undergraduate, started a Facebook page with some friends called SG Haze Rescue. It called for donations of masks for distribution to the needy and offers of homes as temporary shelter from the haze (Teng, 2013). Within a day of the page’s creation, it received 200 masks and eventually recruited 500 volunteers to distribute masks to the elderly and children (Liu, 2013). Project Awareness, set up by local artiste Elson Soh, distributed masks and herbal tea drinks to over 50 families (Teng, 2013). Give-A-Mask Movement also gave out masks to the elderly and outdoor labourers while raising awareness about haze-related health issues (Lin, 2012).

1. Elderly

Singapore has one of the fastest ageing populations in the world, with the 65 years and above segment projected to increase to about 19 percent by 2030 (MSF, 2006). The government, alongside nonprofits such as the Lien and Tsao foundations, has sought to address infrastructural needs for intermediate- and long-term care for the needy aged. However, community initiatives remain important to address what the 1999 Inter-Ministerial Committee termed the software and heartware of eldercare to ensure seniors do not suffer social exclusion, emotional and physical abuse, or neglect (NVPC, 2010).

SMRT set up the Silver Tribute Fund in 2006 to benefit charities aiding the elderly. The fund – the largest-ever charity effort by a public transport provider – raised over $3 million in an inaugural charity show in 2011 that is helping more than 10,000 needy elderly and their caregivers (SMRT, 2012). Similarly, the Singapore Power Heartware Fund has raised over $5 million since its launch in 2005. The fund is helping to provide long-term support for the underprivileged elderly through the ComChest’s Home Help Services Programme (Singapore Power, 2007). As part of the Stay Prepared campaign by Temasek Cares, Singapore Power and SingPost to educate Singaporeans about emergency preparedness, the elderly staying alone were educated on the potential hazards involved in using gas stoves and other such appliances.

Among the many grassroots initiatives to support the elderly, two recent projects stand out. In 2011, THK piloted a project called Tele-Home Care which aimed to provide more effective care for the elderly by equipping the home with a computer that was controlled by his case manager (THK, 2011). This allowed the elderly to receive more immediate, effective and convenient care, reducing the need for travel. MCYS (now MSF) gave $14,000 towards the project (Ong, 2011).

However, it does not take an organisation to bring people together to support the elderly. Several initiatives have been started by groups of individuals on their own accord. In 2006, the Elderly Sector Networking group (ESN) was officially inaugurated by a small group of volunteers from the eldercare sector who hoped to help other volunteers and beneficiaries. ESN consolidates different agencies’ training and event-organising efforts to ensure that beneficiaries in old age homes and senior citizen programmes in Singapore get the most out of these activities (Elderly Sector Network, n.d.).

Similarly, in 2008, students from SMU started a Community Service Project called Project Inspirar to give other SMU students a platform to actively engage and befriend the elderly (SMU, 2012). In 2012, they worked with the Singapore Action Group of Elders to conduct sit exercise programmes for the elderly.

---

20 Including Philip Morgan, Gardenia and the Body Shop who were their main sponsor in 2010.
(Project Inspirar, 2008). In the same year, the team worked with pharmaceutical giant Pfizer to give 300 underprivileged elderly free wellness screening and a pneumococcal disease vaccination. These programmes aimed to instil the importance of health and active ageing in senior citizens (AsiaOne, 2012). Started by 17-year-old National Junior College student Hedyla Yap with eight friends in 2013, Project Bakewell Tart worked with Joy Centre Neighbourhood Link to organise birthday celebrations and other activities for the elderly (Lee, 2013). The project is supported by funding from North West CDC.

2. Youth

Corporate support for disabled youth and youth-in-need continues to be generous. In 2014, the OCBC-Today Children’s Fund was launched to support 10 programmes in five centres under the care of the SCS to provide counselling and therapy intervention for children from at-risk families. It raised $1.15 million within a year of its launch; $500,000 of which came from OCBC. The bank commits $1 for every $2 raised, with a cap of $1.5 million so as not to crowd out other charities (OCBC-Today, 2015a). The fund also incorporates Project Intan which has raised $200,000 since 2008 to help refurbish a day care/children centre for Assisi and create a multi-sensory room for the ARC children’s centre (OCBC-Today, 2015b).

Singtel continues to run the STLF which raised a record sum of $3 million in 2015 and reached a total of $30 million raised over 13 years. Another long-standing programme, the SPMF, achieved a record disbursement of $6.3 million in 2013 benefitting 13,557 children. Part of its funding comes from a yearly youth concert, ChildAid, which also sponsors the Budding Artists’ Fund. It has grown from four corporate sponsors giving $120,000 in 2005 to raising $1 million by 2009. From 2010 to 2013, Mohamed Abdul Jaleel, a prominent businessman who grew up in an impoverished family, donated $900,000 to the fund (Lim, 2013). Since 2008, NatSteel Holdings (NSH) has donated over $400,000 to its own NSH-Society for Physically Disabled (SPD) Bursary Award which benefits children with physical disabilities. With its employees’ union, it has disbursed $600,000 of bursaries and merit awards over 20 years (Natsteel Holdings, 2013). Great Eastern holds an annual charity shield which raised $122,000 towards the SPMF in 2014. The year before, its long-standing ChildrenCare charity initiative raised $100,000 towards sports and wellness activities (Great Eastern, 2015).

3. Migrant Workers

Migrant workers in need have seen increasing levels of support in Singapore. The Migrant Workers’ Assistance Fund, set up by the government in 2012 to provide emergency humanitarian assistance to troubled foreign workers and their families, has received increasing donations (NTUC, 2014). The public has also generously supported workers who face sudden adversity. Egan Karuppaiah, a foreign worker from India was crippled during the Kallang slashings. Singaporeans banded together to raise over $90,000 in donations to help him rebuild his home and provide for his family at a time when he could not work (Bakar, 2015). More recently, there have been individual philanthropic efforts such as Minister for Manpower Tan Chuan Jin’s donation of $320,000 to the fund from the sale of his travel photobook (Channel News Asia, 2015).

A unique volunteer effort to raise awareness of the migrant worker community is the volunteer-run arts group Migrant Voices that was started in 2006. The arts-based charity relies on donations and volunteer efforts to run its programmes which aim to improve the understanding between migrant workers and their host countries through photographs taken by the former. There have also been ad hoc student-led efforts such as the Migrant Awareness Week in 2014 at NUS as well as regular pro bono efforts by law students to provide free legal clinics to migrant workers.

Foreign workers themselves run some organisations. The Bayanihan Centre promotes skills upgrading among Filipino workers through courses such as computer training, nursing, business counselling, cooking and martial arts. The volunteers include both Filipinos and Singaporeans (Piper, 2005, p. 11). A more informal effort, initiated by an individual Indonesian domestic worker Nurifah Rasidi, is the Indonesia Family Network which provides a helpline for troubled domestic workers. The network is run entirely on a volunteer basis through donations by both domestic workers and Singaporeans. More recently, it has organised visits to the homes of the...
disabled and elderly and has branched out into recreational lessons in dance, drama, photography and art (Winarti, 2011).

**Arts**

Government funding for arts and culture has grown from $444.8 million in 2008 to $677.3 million in 2013 (MCCY, 2014). Accompanied by progressive improvements in Singapore's arts education system such as the establishment of the School of the Arts – the first pre-tertiary arts school – in 2008 (NAC, 2008), the government has actively encouraged the growth of the arts sector which has further fuelled philanthropy in this area. Organisations and individuals recognised through the NAC's Patron of the Arts Award have on average contributed about $32 million per year to the arts sector between 2005 and 2013 (NAC, correspondence). In 2013, the NAC recognised over 300 corporations, including 21 Patrons of the Arts, 45 Friends of the Arts, 50 Associates of the Arts, and 221 Arts Supporters. The NAC also conferred the Distinguished Patrons of the Arts Award on BMW, CDL, Conrad Centennial, Far East, HSBC, Keppel, M1, Marina Bay Sands, NTUC, OCBC, Radio1003, Samuel Seow Law Corporation, SPH, and UOB for giving over $1.5 million each (NAC, 2013).

These awards reflect sustained corporate giving to a range of artistic causes. The Business Times has supported the Budding Artists' Fund since 2005, raising $500,000 in that fiscal year to benefit more than 500 underprivileged children. In 2008, the funds established a training institution for its beneficiaries, Little Arts Academy (LAA). It uses various forms of fundraising strategies to attract private donors. Besides holding performances and selling tickets, the fund has three flagship annual fundraising events – Children for Children, Ocean Art Charity Campaign and ChildAid. In 2012 J.P. Morgan provided a grant of US$110,000 (S$152,249) to establish the Youth Division of LAA and another US$200,000 (S$276,816) in 2013 while BNP Paribas donated $160,000 over two years to cover costs in training, books and materials for students at LAA (superEco, 2012; LAA, 2015).

Poh Tiong Choon established a million-dollar arts fund on its 60th anniversary in 2010 to benefit 10 local arts organisations. It also supports the Lianhe Zaobao Arts Showcase with SPH with the aim of promoting Chinese arts and culture (Lim, 2011). The newly established Public Art Trust also received $750,000 from Marina Bay Sands while the National Gallery received $37 million from Keppel ($12 million went towards the Keppel Centre for Art Education) and $25 million from DBS. More established arts institutions have also continued to receive corporate support; J.P. Morgan made a donation to the Asian Civilisations Museum for each entry in its corporate challenge between 2004 and 2009 (J.P. Morgan, 2014). Credit Suisse also has a long-standing relationship with the Singapore Arts Museum. It signed a three-year partnership in 2007 to sponsor the Innovation in Art series (Artinfo, 2007), staging contemporary artists including Affandi, Alberto Giacometti and, with its extension into 2012, Jia Aili (Lee, 2012).

M1 has taken a more active role in staging local events over the last two decades. It continues to sponsor 50 percent of the cost of the Singapore Fringe Festival in collaboration with the Necessary Stage (Oon, 2013), having worked together on the M1 Youth Connection Festival from 1998 to 2004 (Takiguchi, 2013). M1 also took up sponsorship of the Chinese Theatre Festival, run by Theatre Practice in 2014, with the intention to work with the company in the long term (Tan, 2014). Testifying to the importance of such philanthropy in establishing corporate citizenship and identity, M1 cites its CSR and corporate values of innovation and relevance as key reasons for continuing its sponsorship of the festivals (Oon, 2013). Another initiative launched in 2014 was Prudential's Eye Awards to “broaden the audience who experience and appreciate Asian art” (Prudential, 2013). Run in collaboration with the Global Eye Programme, a nonprofit organisation dedicated to promoting Asian artists, and Saatchi Gallery, it awards US$20,000 ($S$27,681) to six Asian artists.

The proliferation of opportunities to recognise artists has in turn inspired ground-up arts initiatives that nurture and publicise emerging talents. In 2011, The Artist Village (TAV) started the Pulau Ubin Artists-In-Residency Programme with $80,000 in funding from the NAC (Sim, 2011). TAV called for artists and non-artists to stay in Pulau Ubin for up to three months to research a project related to Pulau Ubin. This programme sought to use Pulau Ubin to inspire art and let participants see nature in a different light. At the end of their stay, artists presented their work at an exhibition (TAV, 2015).
Traditional art forms continue to flourish as well. In 2010, a group of Indian art enthusiasts came together to form the Mudra Cultural Society which aims to promote the appreciation of Indian traditional art forms. Since its inception, the society has organised numerous workshops and performances for the general public such as its Kathakali Dance workshop held at several CCs across Singapore. LASALLE College of the Arts organised Artwalk Little India in 2015, a free public exhibition featuring Indian inspired murals in Little India. The event also featured screening of films related to Indian culture and performances put up by the Singapore Indian Fine Arts Society (LASALLE, 2015).

Environmental Protection

Environmental conservation continues to be a pressing concern for Singaporeans. While the government has regularly revised the Singapore Green Plan to ensure that economic development does not compromise environmental management (Chew, 2010), environmental conservation has increasingly gone beyond the purview of National Parks Board (NParks) initiatives. Instead, caring for the environment is increasingly positioned as a part of Singaporeans’ everyday life through awareness-raising and community-based projects.

1. Awareness-building

In 2008, a group of NUS students founded Energy Carta to educate youths about the opportunities within the sustainable development industry (Energy Carta, 2013). With more than $170,000 in corporate sponsorship (from companies such as Chevron and SIA), Energy Carta has been able to organise events like the Asian Youth Energy Summit in 2008 and the Chevron Case Challenge in 2009 (The Straits Times, 2013). These helped to raise awareness of clean technology and sustainable development among students by connecting them with the respective industries (National Climate Change Secretariat, 2014). Similarly, Youth for Ecology (ecoYOUth) was formed in 2013 by a group of pre-university students to spur their peers to be more involved in the development of Singapore’s environment (Wee, 2013). Focus groups were conducted to provoke participants to be more involved in protecting the natural environment (ecoYOUth, n.d.). The key sentiments from these discussions were then used to guide their research paper that was published in November 2013 titled Seedlings: A gathering of opinions from youth in Singapore on the environment (ecoYOUth, 2013).

Mitsubishi Corporation donated $55,000 to NParks in 2010 to launch the Nature Keeper programme, the first of its kind for primary school students in Singapore. Through a series of theoretical and field workshops over two years, the students learned about various issues including the importance of forests in regulating climate and the impact of the release of animals in nature reserves (Garden City Fund, 2013). HSBC also has a long-standing commitment with its Care for Nature programme which in 2004 adopted Chek Jawa (150 volunteers helped with conservation and guided tours) and organised the Pulau Semakau cleanup in 2007. It further donated $300,000 to the HSBC-GCF (Garden City Fund) TreeTop Walk Fund to support activities for conservation, education and outreach (NVPC, n.d.).

In 2013, CDL sponsored two green projects in celebration of their 50th anniversary. They worked with NLB to create My Tree House, branded the world’s first green library for children, in the basement of the Central Library. With 45,000 children’s books in its collection, it helps to promote environmental consciousness alongside literacy. CDL also developed a solar-powered Green Gallery with NParks for the new Singapore Botanic Gardens' Heritage Museum (CDL, 2014).

2. Community Participation

The Singapore Glove Project (formerly known as the Yellow Glove Project) was started in 2012 by Ken Jin Tan, an avid marathon runner. He combined healthy living and community service, and encouraged people to walk or jog with gloves on to pick up litter along their paths. Tan says that “the aim of the movement is to encourage Singaporeans to stay active by exploring the many corners of our beautiful country, while at the same time helping to beautify it” (Public Hygiene Council, 2014; Heng, 2015). Runs and meet-ups are organised almost fortnightly and sometimes on an ad hoc basis when volunteers or members embark on their own cleanup sessions. A group of Japanese expats have been quietly cleaning up Singapore’s parks and streets. These foreigners belong to a group called Greenbird Singapore, a division of a Japanese nonprofit organisation. Two popular hotspots which
they target are Little India and East Coast Park, organising monthly cleanups open to both foreigners and Singaporeans that have drawn an average of 10-15 participants (AsiaOne, 2013).

The Green Volunteers Singapore was started in 2009 by Dr. Grant Pereira for him to carry out environmental initiatives with the help of schools, NGOs and like-minded people. Besides the monthly mangrove cleanups at Sungei Api-Api, Green Volunteers engages with different communities to help rebuild eco-gardens. One such activity was in November 2014 when the Navayagum Spiritual Group helped Green Volunteers at Tampines Eco Garden to plant species of flora that contribute to a healthier ecosystem. NUS students, Temasek Polytechnic Community Service Club, and corporates such as Deutsche Bank have participated in the same activity in previous years as well (Pereira, 2013). The group also organises nature walks around Pulau Ubin and has planted more than 250,000 trees in the ASEAN region as of 2011 (Green Drinks Singapore, 2011).

3. Natural Conservation and Research

Nature Society Singapore (NSS) has been conducting Horseshoe Crab (HSC) Rescue and Research since 2007. It was started to understand local mangrove habitat and conservation in relation to the HSC. The programme is part of a larger Asian motion adopted at the World Conservation Congress. NSS has been funded by Caterpillar Foundation and IKEA Singapore. Their activities include monthly three-hour long trips to Mandai mudflats to search for HSC and release those trapped in fishing nets. They also carry out public education and outreach to create awareness about the biology and ecology (Nature Society, 2015).

TeamSeagrass is a volunteer-managed team that started in 2007 to regularly monitor the seagrass on Singapore’s shores. The team is part of the larger International Seagrass-Watch effort to conserve and monitor seagrass in collaboration with the National Biodiversity Centre of NParks. TeamSeagrass volunteers can participate in other outreach efforts such as public exhibitions, talks as well as online outreach through their website and Facebook page (Team SeaGrass, n.d.).

The Comprehensive Marine Biodiversity Survey, which has been ongoing since 2010, has received substantial corporate support in various areas. APB gave $250,000 to finance the seabed survey and a roving marine biodiversity exhibition while Shell provided $300,000 to bring in overseas researchers. HSBC’s Care for Nature Trust Fund also pitched in with $250,000 for survey equipment. The project aimed to “build local capacity in the field of marine biology, spread awareness and increase the appreciation of our marine natural heritage” (Garden City Fund, 2013). A related project, the Coral Nursery, received $250,000 from the Keppel Group for research; the group’s employees also volunteered their time on dives to maintain the nursery.

Lastly, the Garden City Fund, established as an independent charity by NParks in 2002, is a frequent recipient of corporate contributions, particularly towards the Singapore Garden Festival. In 2007, the Jacob Ballas Trust Fund in partnership with Garden City Fund donated over $3 million to create Asia’s first children’s garden in the Botanic Gardens named after Jacob Ballas. It has been designed to “provide unique discovery and learning experiences in an organic garden setting” and through that, cultivate appreciation for the environment from a young age (Garden City Fund, 2013).

The Yishun Park, another Garden City Fund initiative to create Singapore’s first Dipterocarp Arboretum, received $160,000 from Banyan Tree while ST Microelectronics gave $150,000 towards the Singing Forest at Southern Ridges. In 2010, Sembcorp Industries pledged $1 million over five years towards a forest of rare giant trees – the Sembcorp Forest of Giants. The company is also funding green education at the Southern Ridges. It further underwrote this support for the environment in 2015 when it announced a donation of $10 million to rejuvenate the Cool House, a temperature-controlled glasshouse at the National Orchid Garden (Garden City Fund, 2013).
Other notable corporate partnerships include the Banyan Tree Green Imperative Fund which asks each resort guest to contribute US$1 (S$1.38) per room per night, with the company matching guests’ contribution dollar for dollar (Banyan Tree, 2015). The Singapore Power Energy Efficiency Centre conducts roadshows and develops applications to enable households to do their own energy audits and set targets to reduce their consumption. In 2012, SMRT launched two projects with CDCs – The South West-SMRT Eco Fund and Go Green Seed Fund @ South East with South West CDC and South East CDC respectively – to support green projects initiated by the community (SMRT, 2012).

Box 18: Care & Share @ SG50 Movement

To mark Singapore’s 50th birthday, ComChest announced in October 2013 the organisation of the Care & Share @ SG50 national fundraising and volunteerism movement. This focused specifically on four areas: helping children with special needs reach their potential; supporting the integration of adults with disabilities; helping families in difficult circumstances stay strong; and assisting the elderly to age-in-place gracefully (Comchest, 2013).

The movement received strong support from the community with 209 VWOs joining hands to organise over 2,000 fundraising and volunteerism projects in 2014 (Comchest, 2014a). Together, these activities raised over $300 million and engaged more than 110,000 volunteers. Given this tremendous achievement, the government and the Tote Board doubled their initial matching grant from $250 million to $500 million in January 2015. This will run until March 2016 (Comchest, 2015).

Another notable fundraising event, the ComChest Care & Share Charity Show 2014, brought together local and overseas celebrities, ComChest beneficiaries, corporations and the community to complete a special art installation that raised over $6.2 million (Comchest, 2014c). VWOs also held charity dinners such as the inaugural gala by Women’s Initiative For Ageing Successfully (Wings) in November 2014 (Zaccheus, 2014). The gala raised over $300,000 to help seniors with healthcare expenses. At the dinner, Wings also introduced a programme for vulnerable women aged above 40 and their families.

Corporations have also stepped up to join the movement. Swensen’s came onboard as the first food and beverage chain to pledge its support for more than 200 VWOs, including the Association for Persons with Special Needs with which Swensen’s has been a close partner (Comchest, 2014b). It dedicated part of the sales from its local flavoured desserts towards the movement. In 2014, the Great Singapore Sale (GSS) made shoppers’ buys more meaningful through GSS Gives Back. The Singapore Retailers Association (SRA) pledged up to $10,000 to ComChest, donating $1 for every eligible entry received for the GSS 2014 Rewards Promotion.

The movement also saw SG Enable working to provide services to meet community needs. For instance, the community space at 141 Redhill Road has been transformed into the Enabling Innovation Centre (EIC), an avenue for social and recreational activities and job support services to promote social integration of persons with disabilities (PWDs) (Comchest, 2014a). SG Enable also partnered with Singtel to establish and operate the EIC. Singtel donated $1.1 million and provided expertise and volunteer resources to support training programmes at the Contact Centre. Its venture capital arm, Singtel Innov8, also advised SG Enable on encouraging the development of innovative technologies for PWDs. EIC was later renamed Singtel Enabling Innovation Centre (Singtel, 2014).

Through the innovative use of technology, public contributions have been made even more convenient. By simply tapping their EZ-Link cards on advertisement billboards at five designated SMRT stations, they donate $1 to the cause (Comchest, 2013). ComChest’s #careandshare moments social media campaign, which encouraged participants to share pictures of their caring acts and pledges with their social media friends, saw Marina Bay Sands match a dollar for every post with the hashtag. Together with support from individuals and other organisations, the campaign raised $1.5 million (Ho, 2014).

One year after the launch, 130 charities had already received funds from the movement to build their capacities and capabilities, either for existing initiatives or new ones. Breakthrough Missions, a Christian drug-rehabilitation halfway house, aims to use the $138,000 it received to expand its café at People’s Park Centre. Specifically, it is exploring the option of having a central kitchen and running more training for its staff. 365 Cancer Prevention Society, on the other hand, is looking into launching a new day activity centre for cancer patients and caregivers. In this way, this movement has allowed various VWOs and charities to explore more alternatives and opportunities to further their causes.
Conclusion

The trend from 2004 to date is that of community-driven social change with an increasing recognition of social problems arising from rampant economic growth and otherwise. This has led to greater individual empowerment to take ownership of community-based solutions to address these issues through sustainable institutions such as charities and social enterprises and long-term grassroots projects. The government can be seen responding to the voices of active and concerned citizens through policy change and greater support for community initiatives, thus aligning itself with the needs of an inclusive, compassionate society. There has been an increase in philanthropy in the social enterprise sector which corroborates with the innovative nature of charity and social welfare responses emerging in Singapore. Corporate philanthropy has substantially grown beyond traditional financial donations to create sustainable employee volunteering systems, long-term partnerships and sharing of expertise with charities and nonprofit groups. An increase in the support for causes like the arts and the environment have come with continued support for improving access to education, youth development, eldercare and migrant worker welfare.
Conclusion

This paper aimed to document the evolution of philanthropy in Singapore from the end of World War II. Through the description of various initiatives undertaken by the government, community and private entities independently or together, it shows that (i) the spirit of philanthropy in Singapore has endured over time; (ii) philanthropy has been responsive to changes in the social, political and economic environment; (iii) with each new phase, there have been new philanthropists who brought novel ideas and approaches – some entrepreneurial – paving the way for innovation in social welfare provision; and (iv) changes in the regulatory environment or government incentives have influenced the willingness to give. Indeed, instead of crowding out private giving, the Many Helping Hands approach promulgated by the government has formalised an intrinsic generosity and desire to support those in need. Alongside government grants and tax incentives, it has encouraged people to give more. There is no financial or capability barrier to giving in Singapore; people at all income levels, from all walks of life, are equally openhanded.

The data collected shows evidence of complementary efforts across the people, public and private sectors over time, from the rebuilding of Singapore after the war to the formation and running of the Singapore Council of Social Service, the Community Chest, Singapore Community Foundation, ethnic self-help groups and various social movements. In the immediate post-war period, all three worked in tandem to rebuild Singapore. In the first years of independence, the public sector took the lead to build basic social and economic infrastructure, with the people and private sectors filling in the gaps. Once Singapore had achieved economic stability, the government corralled the community and corporates to first unite and then initiate support for the underprivileged. Whereas at first economic needs took priority over social policy, the government focus shifted towards the latter more decisively from the 1990s. Today, there is clear evidence of civil society taking the lead in advocating for social inclusion alongside the government’s dual-pronged strategies that ensure economic growth without compromising the social and emotional well-being of the people.

The paper is limited in that information on giving, particularly in the early years, has never been systematically documented, leaving us to extract the information from available news records and history books. Therefore, there likely are untold stories which these pages have not captured. It is also due to such data limitations that representative statistics on the scale and scope of giving cannot be accurately computed.

In spite of this, the paper clearly demonstrates the value and impact of philanthropy in supporting social welfare needs in Singapore over the last 70 years. Philanthropy is inherently a voluntary action, motivated purely by the giver’s values, beliefs and experiences. Unlike a business, it does not have in-built feedback mechanisms, performance measures nor enforcement tactics that can motivate more effective or more strategic giving. Through highlighting philanthropy’s significance in building Singapore, it is hoped that individuals and corporates alike will not only be encouraged to continue to give, but also consider different approaches to giving. While local philanthropic activity has often been a series of independent, self-contained efforts and experiments, the potential returns from additive, collaborative philanthropy are tremendous, as the Tsao Foundation’s leadership of ComSA@Whampoa has shown. As we look forward, future research will explore the tools and platforms available to community leaders to exploit similar avenues of leverage and partnership for scalability and sustainability within the larger social welfare ecosystem in Singapore.
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Appendix 1: Grantmakers in Singapore

Grantmakers in Singapore must meet several criteria for financial governance and funds disbursement, channelling all donations to a designated fund. They can receive grantmaker status via the Charities Act (as a registered charity) or the nonprofit organisation tax incentive scheme under the Singapore Economic Development Board.

Registered grantmakers in Singapore as of August 2015 are:

1. AT Capital Charitable Foundation
2. CapitaLand Hope Foundation
3. Chew Hua Seng Foundation
4. DBS Foundation Limited
5. Ho Bee Foundation
6. Holywell Foundation Limited
7. Keppel Care Foundation Ltd
8. NTUC Fairprice Foundation Limited
9. Ong Foundation Ltd
10. Patrick D. Harrigan Foundation Ltd.
11. Rose Marie Khoo Foundation
12. S.C. Wong Foundation Trust
13. Temasek Foundation CLG Limited
14. Temasek Trust
15. The Anglo-Chinese Schools Foundation Limited
16. The GZ Charitable Trust
17. The Silent Foundation Ltd
18. Wing Tai Foundation

Foundations are defined as organisations funded by an endowment, individual, family or for-profit corporation for charitable purposes. The Charity Portal currently lists 127 such foundations. Of these, 81 are individual or community foundations and 31 are corporate.

Table 1: List of foundations on the Charity Portal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Founded</th>
<th>Sector/Classification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adam Scott Foundation (Asia) Limited</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Supports youth through scholarships and other projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ang Chin Moh Foundation</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Provides bereavement assistance to the poor; educates the public on death and bereavement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Cornea Foundation</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Health – Others</td>
<td>Works to alleviate corneal blindness through research, medical services and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia Pacific Breweries Foundation</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Supports various initiatives including arts funding, human capital development and partnerships to build the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Medical Foundation Ltd</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Health – Others</td>
<td>Helps the poor access medical services and supports medical activities by other nonprofit organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT Capital Charitable Foundation</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist Compassion Relief Tzu-Chi Foundation (Singapore)</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Provides financial assistance, befriending, free clinics for the underprivileged, and cultural education for the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CapitaLand Hope Foundation</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Supports programmes for underprivileged children in terms of shelter, healthcare and education to enable future social mobility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Based on a search of the Charity Portal's listing of locally registered charities; this excludes some operant in Singapore but registered elsewhere, such as the Lim Hoon Foundation. Descriptions taken from their submissions to the Charity Portal or from their websites, insofar as such information was available.

2 Based on the Unique Entity Number (UEN).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Founded2</th>
<th>Sector/Classification</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Care For The Elderly Foundation (Singapore)</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Eldercare</td>
<td>Provides community care services such as home help and nursing services, day activity centres, and family service centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Foundation Limited</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Religious – Christianity</td>
<td>Supports the capacity building needs of the Catholic Church in Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Char Yong (Dabu) Foundation Limited</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Education – Foundations and Trusts</td>
<td>Awards bursaries and scholarships to Singaporean students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chew How Teck Foundation</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Others – Think Tanks</td>
<td>Disburses funds to a range of charitable causes in Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chew Hua Seng Foundation Limited</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Helps the underprivileged through providing opportunities for education in Singapore, China and the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Cancer Foundation</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Health – Diseases/ Illnesses Support Group</td>
<td>Provides services for children with cancer through an integrated community service model and supports training, awareness, and research efforts on childhood cancer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chou Sing Chu Foundation</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Promotes Chinese education, culture, and language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chua Foundation Limited</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Works with strategic partners to alleviate poverty among underprivileged Singaporeans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Como Foundation</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Supports organisations that provide development, education and healthcare for women and girls through education, social enterprise, and protection for at-risk women and girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.S. Lee Foundation</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Health – Others</td>
<td>Supports education and welfare for nurses; funds arts groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Colvin Scott Foundation</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Aids the underprivileged in Singapore, in particular the youth and elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation for the Arts and Social Enterprise</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Arts and Heritage – Literary Arts, Music and Orchestras, Training and Education, Visual Arts</td>
<td>Promotes arts and social enterprise initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation of Rotary Clubs (Singapore) Ltd</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Supports individuals, families and groups with different concerns, especially those in need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Indian Foundation</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Education – Local Educational Institutions/Funds</td>
<td>Promotes education and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goh Foundation</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Supports poverty alleviation through community-based initiatives in education, medicine and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goh Keng Swee Foundation</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Provides financial assistance to disadvantaged Singaporeans and patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halogen Foundation (Singapore)</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Others – Children/ Youth</td>
<td>Conducts workshops and developmental activities for schools, youth and teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Singapore Foundation</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Education – Foundations and Trusts</td>
<td>Supports education about management and governance of NGOs in Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Bee Foundation</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Supports education, arts and culture, sports, welfare and community projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holywell Foundation</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Founded</td>
<td>Sector/Classification</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Nursing Foundation</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Health – Home Care</td>
<td>Provides integrated home care services to patients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Leong Foundation</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Supports community initiatives and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey Oei Foundation Limited</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Supports medical, healthcare and education-related causes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isetan Foundation</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Provides various scholarships; supports other causes including Dover Park Hospice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCCI Singapore Foundation</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Provides awards and donations in the area of arts, culture, sports and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jet Li One Foundation Singapore</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Builds NGO leadership and social enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampung Senang Charity and Education Foundation</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Runs programmes including Wheels of Hope; support for people affected by cancer; eldercare and student care; special needs education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Founded</td>
<td>Sector/Classification</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make-A-Wish Foundation (Singapore)</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Children/Youth</td>
<td>Grants wishes to children (3-18 years) with life threatening illnesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Parade Leadership Foundation</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Others – Children/Youth</td>
<td>Awards students with strong commitment to community service; funds development programmes for young people and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist Schools' Foundation</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Education – Foundations and Trusts</td>
<td>Supports Methodist schools in Singapore through fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanyang Fine Arts Foundation Limited</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Arts and Heritage – Training and Education</td>
<td>Supports activities under Nanyang Academy of Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Arthritis Foundation</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Health – Diseases/ Illnesses Support Group</td>
<td>Raises funds for medical subsidy funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Foundation for Digestive Diseases</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Health – Diseases/ Illnesses Support Group</td>
<td>Raises awareness among the public and general practitioners about digestive system illnesses; patient support and research; treatment assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Century Foundation</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ng Chwee Cheng Foundation</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Provides bursary awards to needy students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTUC Fairprice Foundation</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Provides social services for persons with disabilities and financial assistance to the needy, aged and disabled; promotes community building and sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ong Foundation</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP Community Foundation</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Others – Children/ Youth, General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Supports 235 kindergartens, 123 childcare centres and senior activity centres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP Community Foundation - Charity Division</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Children/Youth, Community, Disability (Children)</td>
<td>Disburses Polytechnic Study Awards; Headstart Fund; PCF Alumni Book Prize; and PCF ASSIST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick D. Harrigan Foundation Ltd</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Others – Animal Welfare, Children/Youth</td>
<td>Supports IPCs for youth or the welfare of domestic animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pei Hwa Foundation Limited</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Provides bursaries to students in Ang Mo Kio GRC, supports various schools and community centres, and provides donations to the elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rahmatan Lil Alamin Foundation</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Religious – Islam</td>
<td>Strengthens inter-faith understanding and race relations through humanitarian and community development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Swastika Charity Foundation</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Marie Khoo Foundation</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Supports charities that provide medical and rehabilitative support for ill, underprivileged and orphaned children; or promotes education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. C. Wong Foundation Trust</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. M. Jaleel Foundation</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Disburses funds to various charities and applicants referred by self-help groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sajjad Foundation Limited</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Disburses funds to social welfare charities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Founded</td>
<td>Sector/Classification</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS Foundation Limited</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Education – Foreign Educational  Institutions/Funds</td>
<td>Funds educational programmes and capital initiatives at Singapore American School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Buddhist Lodge Education Foundation</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Distributes annual bursaries to primary, secondary and tertiary students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Buddhist Lodge Welfare Foundation</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Supports the Aged People Fund; free clinics; subsidies for the needy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Business Federation Foundation</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Promotes corporate philanthropy and corporate social responsibility to build a more inclusive society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Chinese Chamber of Commerce Foundation</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Provides scholarships for business or Chinese courses; funds Singapore Chamber of Commerce &amp; Industry (SCCCI) research and SME grants; promotes Chinese language and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Christian Foundation</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Religious – Christianity</td>
<td>Aids the underprivileged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Clan Foundation</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Arts and Heritage – Historical and Cultural Conservation, Training and Education</td>
<td>Provides scholarships for postgraduate Chinese studies; supports Chinese cultural activities and Singapore Federation of Chinese Clan Associations (SFCCA) activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Dental Health Foundation</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Health – Others</td>
<td>Promotes dental awareness and healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Epilepsy Foundation</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Health – Diseases/ Illnesses Support Group</td>
<td>Promotes public awareness about epilepsy and supports people with epilepsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Eye Foundation</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Health – Diseases/ Illnesses Support Group</td>
<td>Promotes research and awareness of eye diseases; assists persons suffering from such diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Heart Foundation</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Health – Diseases/ Illnesses Support Group</td>
<td>Assists recovering heart patients and promotes preventive measures; supports related research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore International Foundation</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Promotes cross-cultural relationships for social change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Maritime Foundation</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Others – Think Tanks</td>
<td>Promotes Singapore's status as an international maritime centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Millennium Foundation Limited</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Others – Think Tanks</td>
<td>Awards annual scholarships; promotes networking among its research scholars at international conferences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Olympic Foundation</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Sports – Non-National Sports Associations (NSAs)</td>
<td>Promotes sports in Singapore; supports high-performing athletes to represent Singapore overseas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Press Holdings Foundation Limited</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Promotes life-long learning, language enrichment, creativity, diversity, healthy living and sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Sikh Education Foundation</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Education – Foundations and Trusts</td>
<td>Provides language education for Sikh and Punjabi Singaporeans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore Teochew Foundation Limited</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Supports charitable causes for those in need, especially the Teochew community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Founded</td>
<td>Sector/Classification</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore-India Partnership Foundation</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Strengthens Singapore-India ties through exchange fellowships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SingHealth Foundation</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Health – Cluster/Hospital Funds</td>
<td>Supports healthcare programmes in four core areas: cord blood bank, understanding patient care, research and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Gabriel's Foundation</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Education – Foundations and Trusts</td>
<td>Supervises its seven schools and raises funds for their operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tai Pei Foundation</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tan Ean Kiam Foundation</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Relieves human suffering and promotes education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tan Kah Kee Foundation</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Education – Foundations and Trusts, Local Educational Institutions/Funds</td>
<td>Supports Tan Kah Kee Young Inventors’ Awards, Tan Kah Kee and Tan Ean Kiam Postgraduate Scholarship, and Tan Kah Kee Professorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanglin Trust School Foundation Limited</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Education – Foundations and Trusts</td>
<td>Supports Tanglin Trust School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanoto Foundation</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Promotes research in metabolism, endocrinology and diabetes; supports medical scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tay Leck Teck Foundation</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temasek Education Foundation</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>See Appendix 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tet International Foundation</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Anglo-Chinese Schools Foundation</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Education – Foundations and Trusts</td>
<td>Funds Anglo-Chinese schools and bursaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Community Foundation of Singapore</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Connects donors with community needs through donor-centric programmes and grant-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Derek Hewett Foundation</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Education – Foundations and Trusts</td>
<td>Provides university bursaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Head Foundation</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Researches education and leadership in Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hokkien Foundation</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Supports causes/events in line with its objectives; contributes to infrastructural improvements of educational institutions, culture and the arts; awards bursaries and scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Island Foundation Ltd</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Promotes literacy and education, marine conservation, and village development and small businesses in the Riau Archipelago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lemon Tree Foundation</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Provides education and skills training for orphaned children and trafficked women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Founded</td>
<td>Sector/Classification</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Loke Cheng-Kim Foundation</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Education – Foundations and Trusts</td>
<td>Awards undergraduate scholarships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Malay Heritage Foundation Ltd</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Arts and Heritage – Historical and Cultural Conservation</td>
<td>Promotes awareness of Singaporean Malay heritage and history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The National Kidney Foundation</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Health – Renal Dialysis</td>
<td>Carries out fundraising and provides dialysis, prevention and awareness programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Operation Hope Foundation Limited</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Religious – Christianity</td>
<td>Funds children’s homes, skills training, basic construction, technology implementation, and international volunteerism in Singapore, Cambodia, Nepal and Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rajabali Jumabhoy Foundation Ltd</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Shaw Foundation</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Supports various charitable causes to aid the underprivileged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Silent Foundation</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Reaches out to the invisible underprivileged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sophia Foundation</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Promotes caring and giving among youth; provides care to the elderly and sick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tada Tetsuya Shushin Foundation</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Provides scholarships and bursaries for needy children and children from disadvantaged families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tan Chin Tuan Foundation</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Funds projects with social returns, accountability, and efficient outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The UWCSEA Foundation</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Education – Foreign Educational Institutions/Funds</td>
<td>Supports the United World College of South East Asia (UWCSEA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomson Shin Min Foundation</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Education – Foundations and Trusts</td>
<td>Provides scholarships and bursaries for the needy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailblazer Foundation Ltd</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Promotes cross-cultural appreciation; provides relief to persons suffering hardship; sponsors Singaporeans’ education overseas and participation in international events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsao Foundation</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Health – Others</td>
<td>Provides community health services; develops new approaches to eldercare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venerable Seck Hong Choon Memorial Foundation</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Religious – Buddhism</td>
<td>Promotes education, Buddhism; provides financial assistance to the aged and sick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viva Foundation for Children with Cancer</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Health – Others</td>
<td>Works to improve remission rates among children with cancer, particularly leukaemia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wee Foundation</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Others – General Charitable Purposes</td>
<td>Supports various causes in Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wing Tai Foundation</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Social and Welfare – Community</td>
<td>Financially assists needy elderly and youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Future Foundation</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Others – Environment</td>
<td>Funds technological development to promote social and environmental sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangzheng Foundation</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Education – Foundations and Trusts</td>
<td>Financially supports needy students; improves education in Singapore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deregistered foundations that are no longer active include:

1. Accident Victims Foundation
2. ASEAN Children’s Foundation
3. Brain and Spinal Injury Foundation
4. Children of Singapore Foundation
5. Children’s Leukaemia Foundation
6. Compass Welfare Foundation
7. Dreams and Wishes Foundation
8. Elias Pereira Foundation
9. Foundation for the Needy Elderly
10. Goei Foundation Ltd
11. Hope Foundation
12. Hwa Chong Education Foundation
13. Jag Foundation Limited
14. Kathryn Aguirre Worth Memorial Foundation
15. Khmer Foundation International (Singapore)
16. Man Fut Tong Foundation
17. Parkway Healthcare Foundation
18. PE Foundation Limited
19. Philippe Charriol Foundation
20. Singapore Brain and Spine Injury Foundation
21. Singapore Buddhist Community Foundation
22. Tan Khee Bak Foundation Ltd
23. The Asia Foundation Limited
24. The Foundation For Development Cooperation (Singapore)
25. The Gateway Foundation Asia Limited
26. Times Press Foundation (S) Pte Ltd
27. Toh Kian Chui Foundation
28. Want Want Foundation Ltd
29. Women’s & Children’s Healthcare Foundation Limited
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Appendix 2: Philanthropic Activities by Temasek Holdings

Temasek Holdings was formed in 1974 to manage the Singapore Government’s investments in key strategic industries. Today, it retains stakes in many major national companies – and philanthropic givers – such as DBS, Singtel, CapitaLand, Keppel and Sembcorp. While these companies have long articulated social responsibility as part of their aims, Temasek’s entrance into the philanthropic sector has come more recently. The 2002 Temasek Charter marked the first departure from its pursuit of primarily government-oriented outcomes with a new focus on internationalisation and regionalisation as well as a concerted programme of divestment and rationalisation. In 2003, it decided to put aside a share of its profits each year to fund community programmes. In 2007 Temasek Trust was established to oversee such disbursements, primarily through the Temasek Foundation (Temasek, 2002; Low, 2011).

Temasek’s 2009 charter institutionalised social responsibility as part of its remit, stating that “Temasek is a responsible corporate citizen and is committed to contributing part of its returns to encourage the growth and development of the wider community.” (Temasek, 2009). In line with this, Temasek also established a direct nonprofit arm, Temasek Cares, to enable it to more directly engage with social needs. The following year, it expanded the trust’s activities with the founding of Temasek International Foundation and Temasek Education Foundation to honour the pioneers of Temasek Holdings. In addition, its T-Touch employee volunteerism arm holds a yearly Community Day to mark Temasek’s anniversary with a company-wide volunteering event.

Various Avenues of Giving

Temasek Trust was launched in 2007 with $500 million and continued to add to its endowment through Temasek’s wealth creation. In addition to its support for the Temasek foundations, it promotes science and technology development through the Singapore Technologies Endowment programme, Singapore Millennium Foundation, and Temasek Life Sciences Laboratory.

Temasek Foundation was set up with an aim to benefit various sectors of the communities in Singapore and the rest of Asia (Low, 2011). The commitments of Temasek Foundation are four-fold – building people via healthcare and education, building institutions through enhancing public policy, rebuilding lives through helping those affected by natural disasters, and building bridges through partnerships with Asian countries (Temasek Foundation, 2015). Initiatives in Singapore are targeted at encouraging Asians to experience and appreciate other Asian cultures as well as building social networks with other Asian journalists. Temasek Foundation’s philosophy towards philanthropy is one of active engagement. It commits more towards building capacities instead of doing mere charity. In the words of Mr Benedict Cheong, CEO of the Foundation, “[a]nything we do must lead to some form of capability. An example would be for education – rather than donating money to build a school, why not develop teacher-training?” (Business Times, 2007)

The Temasek International Foundation disburses two main endowments – the $25 million S. Rajaratnam Endowment to promote regional cooperation, good governance and sustainability, and the $35 million Hon Sui Sen Endowment that builds talent in the Asian financial sector through the Temasek Regional Regulators Scholarship programme. The latter programme works with finance sector professionals to help them stay abreast with Asia’s developments and changes.

The Temasek Education Foundation administers five endowments worth $150 million in total. Three – the E.W. Barker Endowment, the Tay Eng Soon Endowment, and the David Marshall Endowment – worth $35 million each were named after pioneer leaders of Singapore. These three endowments
are meant for contributions towards developing budding talents in sports, furthering development in mathematics and science, and nurturing artistic talents. The fourth endowment, worth $10 million, is for the Temasek Education Foundation Sunburst Scholarship while the fifth endowment, worth $35 million, is for contributions towards music to be given through the Singapore Chinese Orchestra and the SSO (Temasek Trust, 2015). The foundation’s contributions towards education go beyond supporting education in mainstream courses. It also supports development of talents in sports, the arts and music.

**Temasek Cares** was launched in 2009 with a seed funding of $100 million and received two more endowments of $35 million each in 2010 focusing on special needs and long-term healthcare sectors (the Ee Peng Liang and Balaji Sadasivan endowments). Between 2014 and 2015, more funds were pledged to bring its total endowment to $289 million which helped to fund approximately 67 programmes in the first five years (Temasek Cares, 2014). The organisation’s main strategic focus is the development of innovative models of care so as to provide high impact, transformative programmes for the community. Major initiatives in recent years have focused on special needs children (with programmes to train and educate parents of such children and place learning specialists in preschools) and eldercare.

Like other foundations, Temasek Cares has developed several programmes to encourage ageing in place, including one in Tanjong Rhu, the Caring Assistance from Neighbours (CAN) pilot programme with the Agency for Integrated Care to help the elderly manage their health at home, iCommunity@ North to provide integrated mental healthcare for elderly with dementia, and SPICE which provides day services to enable caregivers to continue to work. Last year, it created a $40 million Temasek Emergency Preparedness Fund to launch its *Stay Prepared* initiative which has two key thrusts: Kids In Tough Situations aims to train 60 therapists and counsellors from community organisations and schools in Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioural Therapy while the Starter Kit programme encourages Singaporeans to be better prepared for emergencies through the distribution of N95 masks (Temasek, 2015).
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### Appendix 3: Glossary of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4PM</td>
<td>Persatuan Persuratan Pemuda Pemudi Melayu (Malay Youth Literary Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APB</td>
<td>Asia Pacific Breweries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSN</td>
<td>Association of Persons with Special Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARC</td>
<td>Autism Resource Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of Southeast Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVPN</td>
<td>Asia Venture Philanthropy Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWWA</td>
<td>Asian Women's Welfare Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLESS</td>
<td>Bringing Love to Every Single Soul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMA</td>
<td>British Military Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>[Indus Moral] Centre of Activity for Retired and Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>Citizens’ Consultative Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDAC</td>
<td>Chinese Development Assistance Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Community Development Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDL</td>
<td>City Development Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEF</td>
<td>Care for the Elderly Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>Community Involvement Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COC</td>
<td>Commissioner of Charities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ComChest</td>
<td>Community Chest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ComSA</td>
<td>Community for Successful Ageing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPF</td>
<td>Central Provident Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DBS</td>
<td>Development Bank of Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSW</td>
<td>Department of Social Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Eurasian Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecoYouth</td>
<td>Youth for Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIC</td>
<td>Enabling Innovation Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMCC</td>
<td>ExxonMobil Campus Concerts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESN</td>
<td>Elderly Sector Networking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCBC</td>
<td>Faith Community Baptist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMM</td>
<td>Franciscan Missionaries of Mary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSC</td>
<td>Family Service Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCF</td>
<td>Garden City Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>General Motors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>Great Singapore Sale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDB</td>
<td>Housing and Development Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELP</td>
<td>Helping Every Lone Parent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPB</td>
<td>Health Promotion Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC</td>
<td>Horseshoe Crab Rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAS</td>
<td>Indian Fine Arts Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPC</td>
<td>Institutions of Public Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITE</td>
<td>Institute of Technical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JTC</td>
<td>Jurong Town Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAA</td>
<td>Little Arts Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LASALLE</td>
<td>LASALLE College of the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBSA</td>
<td>Lions Befrienders Service Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCP</td>
<td>Malayan Communist Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCC</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture, Community and Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCYS</td>
<td>Ministry of Community Development, Youth and Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINDS</td>
<td>Movement for the Intellectually Disabled in Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIP</td>
<td>Mission: I'mPossible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOM</td>
<td>Ministry of Manpower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOVE</td>
<td>Managing and Organising Volunteer Efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPAJA</td>
<td>Malay People's Anti-Japanese Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSF</td>
<td>Ministry of Social and Family Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTFA</td>
<td>Muslimin Trust Fund Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUIS</td>
<td>Majlis Ugama Islam Singapura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWWA</td>
<td>Malay Women's Welfare Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAC</td>
<td>National Arts Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCSS</td>
<td>National Council of Social Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKF</td>
<td>National Kidney Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLB</td>
<td>National Library Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nparks</td>
<td>National Parks Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSS</td>
<td>Nature Society Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTI on CSR</td>
<td>National Tripartite Initiative on CSR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTU</td>
<td>Nanyang Technological University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTUC</td>
<td>National Trades Union Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUS</td>
<td>National University of Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUH</td>
<td>National University Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVPC</td>
<td>National Volunteer and Philanthropy Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NYC</td>
<td>National Youth Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUB</td>
<td>Overseas Union Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>People’s Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAP</td>
<td>People’s Action Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pertapis</td>
<td>Islamic Theological Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSB</td>
<td>Post Office Savings Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPIS</td>
<td>Persatuan Pemudi Islam Singapore (Young Women’s Muslim Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>Persons with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Residents’ Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSVP</td>
<td>The Organisation of Senior Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGE</td>
<td>Singapore Action Group of Elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARS</td>
<td>Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SASW</td>
<td>Singapore Association of Social Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SATA</td>
<td>Singapore Anti-Tuberculosis Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBF</td>
<td>Singapore Business Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCF</td>
<td>Singapore Cultural Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td>Singapore Corporation of Rehabilitative Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>Singapore Children’s Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCSS</td>
<td>Singapore Council of Social Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGH</td>
<td>Singapore General Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGX</td>
<td>Singapore Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARE</td>
<td>Social Help and Assistance Raised by Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHG</td>
<td>Self-help Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHHK</td>
<td>Singapore Hokkien Huay Kuan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIA</td>
<td>Singapore Airlines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SINDA</td>
<td>Singapore Indian Development Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIT</td>
<td>Singapore Improvement Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNEF</td>
<td>Singapore National Employers Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA</td>
<td>Singapore Medical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMU</td>
<td>Singapore Management University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>Samaritans of Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTA</td>
<td>School of the Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPD</td>
<td>Society for the Physically Disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPE</td>
<td>Single Parent Encounter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPH</td>
<td>Singapore Press Holdings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPMF</td>
<td>[Straits Times] School Pocket Money Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSO</td>
<td>Singapore Symphony Orchestra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STLF</td>
<td>Singtel Touching Lives Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAV</td>
<td>The Artist Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACH ME</td>
<td>Therapy and Education Assistance for Children in Mainstream Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THK</td>
<td>Thye Hua Kwan [Moral Charities]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTSH</td>
<td>Tan Tock Seng Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWC2</td>
<td>Transient Workers Count Too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMNO</td>
<td>United Malays National Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOB</td>
<td>United Overseas Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSA</td>
<td>Very Special Arts Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VWO</td>
<td>Voluntary Welfare Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINGS</td>
<td>Women’s Initiative for Ageing Successfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YFC</td>
<td>Youth for Causes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>Young Men’s Christian Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA</td>
<td>Young Women’s Christian Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This paper attempts to address the gap in knowledge on the contributions by philanthropic players to national development in Singapore. Using grounded research, it explores the evolution of giving by individuals, the community and the private sector in Singapore from the end of World War II in 1945 to today. It looks at how each group gives towards prevailing social needs, unexpected events and crises as well as government calls for community support across five key phases in Singapore's journey to nationhood. To provide context to the giving, the political and socio-economic situation of each time frame and concurrent government social welfare provisions in each phase are also described.

The data collected shows evidence of complementary efforts across the people, public and private sectors over time, from the rebuilding of Singapore after the war to the formation and running of the Singapore Council of Social Service, the Community Chest, Singapore Community Foundation, ethnic self-help groups and various social movements. In the immediate post-war period (1945-1959), all three sectors worked in tandem to rebuild Singapore. In the first years of independence (1959-1975), the public sector took the lead to build basic social and economic infrastructure with the people and private sectors filling in the gaps. Once Singapore had achieved economic stability, the government corralled the community and corporates to first unite in (1975-1990) and then initiate support for the underprivileged (1990-2004). In the last decade, there has been clear evidence of civil society taking the lead in advocating for social inclusion with the government responding with strategies that ensure economic growth without compromising the social and emotional well-being of the people.

From fighting fires in the kampong to containing the SARS epidemic and from donating trishaw-riding wages to build Nanyang University to emptying one's piggy bank to help the underprivileged, the sense of community spirit and initiative has been strong and enduring in Singapore since the end of World War II. Philanthropy has been both responsive and transformative, transcending time, age, social status and circumstance.